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Stonefields Community Centre Inc.

Barbarich Drive Stonefields

Presentation to the Orakei Local Board Business meeting 20 August 2020

Mr Chairman and Board member, and Council Officers, I am delighted to give you this update on progress to date with the Community centre.

Firstly I would like to take a moment to official thank Auckland Council and the Orakei Local Board for the generosity in providing the two grants we have received over the past months. These grants will be crucial in funding the project over the next few months, and ensuring that we can transit through the consenting process. I would particularly like to thank two council officers who have gone out of their way to facilitate grant applications and progress through stages of council approvals leading up to the Board confirming lease documentation earlier this year. Lucia Davis is a great asset to the Orakei Local Board and to Council. She is approachable, and always ready to attend to issues and requests. As the chair of a community group we could not ask more of an officer. Rachel Foster demonstrated an understanding of what we are trying to achieve quickly and was able to proactively resolve minor issues with our interaction with Council. I understand that she was on contract, and that subsequently she has another contract role in a different department. Officers like Lucia and Rachel are to commended for using initiative and enhancing the perception people have of Auckland Council.

Our group held a car boot sale post the shutdown period. The concept was to allow residents to rent some space and sell unwanted items to others. The event was a success with more than $1100.00 raised in the 4 hours, including space hire, selling items donated to the community centre group for sale and donations made on the day. There are plans to hold some similar events in the future, as this was requested by residents and stall holder alike.

We did learn that it is not allowable to put temporary promotional signs on the roadside! We had eight signs removed.

Progress report.

Covid 19 has been disruptive in all aspects of life, and our project is no different. During the lockdown period the Orakei Local Board approved the lease of a section of reserve land which we had surveyed. We are grateful for this agreement, and the generous terms of the lease.

We have applied for Landowner approval to place our buildings on the designated site, prior to applying for consents. Our application was made on 4 May 2020 and payment of fees made on 20 May 2020.
Stonefields Community Centre Inc.

Barbarich Drive Stonefields

It has been difficult to see where progress has been made with this application. We were asked questions about cladding and colour schemes for the building, maintenance of landscapes and planting plans, which we have answered. To speed up the process we were advised to provide a report (this one) to the OLB so that the OLB knew about the project and could pre-approve before the Landowner approvals team submitted its report.

I must express more than a little frustration with this process; OLB has been proactively involved in this project. We have an agreement to lease, with associated approvals, and resolution supporting the project. It is 4 months to the day since our application was paid for, and the application was submitted more than two weeks before this.

This is putting further delays in our consenting process, and means that now we are technically in breach of our approval to store the building on Auckland Netball land at Allison Ferguson Drive, which was for a 12 month period.

I have not been able to obtain a completion date from the Landowner Approvals team, nor has there been requests for additional information in the past two months.

We would like to request that the issue be taken up with Landowner Approvals to ascertain why there has been a 4 month process and request that the approval is expedited.

Final, one of our obligations to council is to provide a condition report on the repurposed building being temporarily stored at Allison Ferguson Drive. This report was to be completed by a Licenced Building Practitioner, after an examination of the building. This report is enclosed.

It was great to see the building remains in such good condition after 12 months. We removed some shutters so that our expert could gain access, and we were pleased to note the building was clean and dry internally.

Mr Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present this report to you.
Inspection Report
11/08/20

Property: Stonefields Community Centre
Address: Stored at Auckland Netball Centre, 7 Allsion Ferguson Drive, St Johns

Methodology:
A non-invasive inspection of the joists, trusses and wall linings. This involved inspecting under and inside the building.

Findings:
This building is sound and in good condition. It is fit for purpose as a community hall type space. A small amount of cosmetic work is required.

Greg Hafoka LBP No.BP104579

MILTON HARWARD CONSTRUCTION LTD
## Workshop Record

Workshop record of the Ōrākei Local Board held in the Ōrākei Local Board office meeting room on Thursday, 2 July 2020 commencing at 12.30pm

### Present
- **Chairman:** Scott Milne
- **Members:** Troy Churton, Colin Davis, Troy Elliott, Sarah Powrie, Margaret Voyce, David Wong
- **Also present:** Adam Milina, Relationship Manager, Suzanne Weld, Senior Local Board Advisor, Nick Palmisano, Local Board Advisor, Kim Lawgun, Democracy Advisor

### Workshop Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Governance role</th>
<th>Summary of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board member discussion</td>
<td>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workedshoped:</td>
<td>Board Member only session which provided with the Members' with the opportunity to bring any issues to discuss with the Board for input and direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks, Sports and Recreation staff were present to provide an update to the Board on the Outboard Boating Club's use of Hakamau Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Thompson Fell, Parks and Places Specialist David Barker, Parks and Places Team Leader Ron Johnson, Senior Community Lease Advisor</td>
<td>What is the local boards governance role with regards to the item being workedshoped:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facilities staff were present to update the Board on progress with its Community Facilities work programmes including project delivery, capital development, operational maintenance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vandna Kirmani</strong>, Senior Project Manager via Skype</td>
<td><strong>Local initiatives/specific decisions</strong></td>
<td>Community leasing. The Board was updated on the Selwyn Reserve playground and Churchill Park lookout projects' and the Board’s views sought regarding amendments to its draft Community Facilities work programme 2020-2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nina Rattray</strong>, Principal Landscape Architect</td>
<td><strong>Oversight and Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maiya Aldeen</strong>, Senior Project Manager via Skype</td>
<td><strong>Keeping informed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charlotte Grieve</strong>, Landscape Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure and Environmental Services update**

**Emma Cowie**, Relationship Advisor

**Chris Ferkins**, Conservation Advisor

**Michael Ngatai**, Team Manager Mainland Central/West

**Mary Stewart**, Senior Conservation Advisor

**Theresa Pearce**, Senior Healthy Waters Specialist via Skype for Business

The workshop concluded at 5.40pm
CCO Review report feedback

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek local board feedback on the report of the independent panel’s review of Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCO).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The independent panel that was set up to conduct a review of CCOs concluded its review at the end of July 2020 and has now submitted its findings (hereafter Review).
3. The Review is available online at: https://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/media/35576/ccoreview-final.pdf
4. The Review investigated how effective the CCO model is and whether there were any viable alternatives; whether the council has adequate accountability measures and is using them effectively; and the CCO culture.
5. The Review found that the CCO model is the right one and clear benefits are evident but there is room for improvement. It found that the lack of strategic direction to CCOs is a key failing and that the council has available mechanisms to ensure accountability but is not using these effectively. The Review highlighted the need for strategic planning and direction, effective use of accountability mechanisms and increased monitoring of CCO performance. In terms of culture, the Review found little evidence of a group culture and highlighted a need for greater collaboration across CCOs (and with the council), especially when working with and responding to the public.
6. The Review proposes a package of 64 recommendations. One of these recommendations is for a proposed merger of RFA and ATEED.
7. The Governing Body will be considering the Review at its meeting on 27 August 2020 and has had informal discussions in workshops on its findings and recommendations. Local board chairs were invited to attend one of these workshops (19 August 2020).
8. The Governing Body is expected to give some direction and make decisions on the package of recommendations from the Review at its meeting on 27 August.
9. The Governing Body will also be receiving another report at its meeting on 27 August seeking a decision on the proposed merger of RFA and ATEED and outlining an implementation process for that work.
10. Local boards are invited to share their views, if any, on this issue in addition to general views about the Review.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the xx 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 CCO review.

Horopaki
Context

11. In late 2019, the Governing Body requested a review of CCOs by an independent panel and directed the panel to focus on three key areas:
   • the effectiveness of the CCO model, roles and responsibilities – how effective it is and whether there are viable alternatives
   • the accountability mechanisms between CCOs and the council – are the mechanisms adequate
   • the culture of CCOs – how do CCOs engage with and respond to the council and public concerns?

12. In conducting the review, the independent panel consulted CCOs, local boards, the Independent Māori Statutory Board, key stakeholders and requested public feedback. The panel received 2250 submissions and considered a wide range of written material (e.g. statement of intents, annual reports, local board and Māori engagement plans, council policies and plans). The panel also held workshops with councillors, local board chairs, CCO chief executives and chairs, and iwi as well as drop-in sessions with the public.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

13. The Review concludes that the CCO model remains the right one for Auckland, as it strongly brings together business discipline, agile decision-making, a streamlined administrative structure, operational efficiencies and specialist skills and expertise that would not be possible if the council assumed direct control of CCO functions. The panel notes that most interviewees agree with this conclusion but also acknowledges that some submitters thought CCOs should be brought in-house.

14. The Review is divided into four parts – introduction, CCO model, CCO accountability and CCO culture. Each part is divided into three parts: the relevant facts and feedback, an assessment of current problems and the proposed improvements.
Part Two: CCO model

15. The Review concluded there were sound reasons why Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited (RFAL) should remain as CCOs. However, given the similarities in the outcomes and potential duplication in some services, the Review recommends a merger of these entities. (recommendation 1)

16. Key recommendations relating to Auckland Transport (AT) that may be of interest to local boards include a recommendation to jointly prepare the regional land transport plan (recommendation 4) and reviews 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. (recommendation 6)

17. Key recommendations relating to Panuku that may be of interest to local boards are outlined in recommendations 8-14 and includes a recommendation that the council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying and deciding which non-service properties to sell (excluding Panuku project location areas (recommendation 11). This recommendation is highlighted because it addresses an area that has been of significant interest to some local boards (for example decisions to classify service properties as non-service).

18. The Review acknowledges the need for a property strategy as well as several other strategies on key issues that CCOs work on – water (specifically a three waters strategy), economic development and stadiums. (recommendation 14 and 15)

19. The panel also concluded that the council should review the way it requires CCOs to monitor and report on risks and risk mitigation measures. (recommendation 19)

Part Three: Accountability

20. The Review also highlighted the absence of strategic direction to CCOs and recommends the council draws up detailed, implementable strategies that give CCOs more strategic direction (recommendation 20) and establishes a strategic planning process to facilitate the necessary conversations between Governing Body and CCOs.

21. The panel also reviewed current accountability mechanisms and concluded that the council has available to it all the mechanisms it needs to hold CCOs accountable – both to the council and to the public. However, the Review concluded that in many instances the council was not using these lever as effectively as it could and in one important instance accountability powers are not used at all – referring to Sec 92 of the Local Government Auckland Council Act (LG(AC)A) which gives the council the power to direct a CCO to act in accordance with a plan or strategy.

22. Some concrete suggestions that address these issues include supporting the use of statement of expectations (recommendation 22), developing templates for statements of intent and a set of common key performance measures (recommendation 23), rewrite the governance manual to focus squarely on expectations of CCOs and removing policies to a separate document (recommendation 29) and exercising the statutory powers under Sec 92 of LG(AC)A if there are any concerns that a CCO is not acting consistently with any strategy (recommendation 33).

CCO/Local board relationship

23. The Review looked at the role of local board plans and local board engagement plans that are developed by CCOs to cement CCO-local board relationships and ensure CCO accountability (pages 60-61) and noted that the engagement plans were not particularly effective as an accountability mechanism. It also noted that there does not appear to be a recognised or consistent process in place so local boards can have a
say about how elements of their local board plans can be included in a CCO’s statement of intent.

24. The Review concludes that the CCO-local board relationship is not working as it should and proposes a series of practical suggestions on how this can be reset. These are outlined in recommendation 34 and reads as follows:

**Recommendation 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.

25. The Review also outlined some practical recommendations that could improve the experience for local boards:

- development of joint engagement plans for each local board (reducing the number of plans from 105 to 21)
- combined CCO 6-monthly report
- recommend local boards present and share their plans with CCOs – to help improve engagement and to help CCOs understand local board aspirations and identify future work opportunities in the local board area
- liaison between CCO and local boards to be at a more senior level
- make better use of technology so boards and communities have up-to-date information
- CCOs to actively work with local boards at the planning stage of local projects so they can have meaningful input into their design, and also so boards can have a commitment to the projects and publicly support them.

26. The monitoring of CCOs is acknowledged as inadequate and under-resourced and recommends more resourcing towards this.

**Community responsiveness**

27. The Review also concluded that CCOs are not responsive enough to wider community concerns and recommends some improvements. (recommendation 41-43)

28. Recommendation 42 is for the council to give CCOs direction about what it considers the meaning of “commercial interest and public interest”, and how to balance these objectives.

**Part Four: Culture**

29. There are various recommendations to address issues that relate to the culture of CCOs. Included in these are recommendations that the CCO board membership should be more ethnically diverse, and include more mana whenua appointments.
30. The Review touched on practical issues such as branding, job descriptions, shared services including procurement, reporting to the council on complaints received and various others. The range of recommendations aimed at addressing these issues are contained in recommendations 44-64.

31. The Review highlighted that the public feedback on CCO culture-related issues was not overwhelmingly positive. It is noted that the public unquestionably regards CCOs and the council as not taking sufficient account of their views and recommends that the council and CCOs explore options to give ratepayers a more effective voice in what happens in Auckland.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

32. Climate impacts were not considered for this report on procedural matters, however the impact of implementing individual recommendations, if any, will be considered as part of the programme of implementation.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

33. The panel met with representatives of the council group including CCOs during its Review.

34. A joint submission by CCOs to the Review can be found online at: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/council-controlled-organisations/stakeholderupdates/cco-joint-submission.pdf

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

35. During the review, the panel engaged with local board chairs, holding two workshops and meeting with some chairs individually and collectively following requests by these members to understand their views on the model and how engagement between local boards and CCOs could be improved.

36. Sixteen local boards also provided written submissions to the panel, three local boards reserved the right to provide further comment when the recommendations of the Independent Panel were released and two local boards did not provide feedback due to COVID-19 or other reasons.

37. Local board chairs were invited to the Governing Body workshop on 19 August where the panel presented their findings.

38. Local board views on these findings are not known as local boards have yet to formally consider the Review.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**


40. The panel found that there are adequate mechanisms to ensure CCOs comply with their obligations to Māori at governance and senior management levels. However, the use of the mechanisms requires attention. The panel received feedback that there is confusion about roles and relationships, lack of clear direction and collaboration. Recommendations 35-40 address their findings in this area.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial Implications
41. Implementing the review will have financial implications. Some recommendations will provide cost savings (including merger of ATEED and RFAL) with more accruing over time.

42. The detail of financial implications will be presented in a report to the Governing Body.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
43. We have not undertaken a risk assessment for this procedural report. The risks associated with the Review findings and recommendations will be outlined to the Governing Body.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
44. Governing Body will receive the report on 27 August and will give direction to staff and the CCO Oversight Committee on the implementation of the Review.

45. An update on the process for establishing an implementation work programme will be provided to the 22 September CCO Oversight Committee.
Feedback from the Ōrākei Local Board on the Review of Auckland Council’s Council-controlled Organisations July 2020

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.

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 Auckland 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 that 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 carefully 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 28 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 Councillor 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.