

Governance, Communications & Engagement Committee - Agenda for 15 September 2022



Meeting is held in the Council Chamber, Level 2, Philip Laing House
144 Rattray Street, Dunedin - Councillors and staff only

[ORC YouTube Livestream - Members of the Public](#)

Members:

Cr Michael Deaker, Co-Chair	Cr Kevin Malcolm
Cr Michael Laws, Co-Chair	Cr Andrew Noone
Cr Hilary Calvert	Cr Gretchen Robertson
Cr Alexa Forbes	Cr Bryan Scott
Cr Carmen Hope	Cr Kate Wilson
Cr Gary Kelliher	

Senior Officer: Pim Borren, interim, Chief Executive

Meeting Support: Liz Spector, Governance Support Officer

15 September 2022 11:00 AM

Agenda Topic	Page
1. PUBLIC FORUM No requests to address the Committee under Public Forum were received prior to publication of the agenda.	
2. APOLOGIES Cr Michael Deaker has submitted his apologies.	
3. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA Note: Any additions must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.	
4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST Members are reminded of the need to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.	
5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES Minutes of previous meetings will be confirmed as true and accurate records, with or without changes.	3
5.1 Minutes of the 10 March 2022 Governance, Communications and Engagement Committee	3
6. OPEN ACTIONS FROM RESOLUTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE	8
7. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION	10

7.1 **COMMUNITY SURVEY 2022 - METHODOLOGY FOR REPORTING RESULTS** 10

The purpose of this report is to seek a decision on the rating methodology to be applied to the 2022 ORC Community Survey.

7.2 **ORC APPROACH TO ENGAGEMENT** 14

This report is provided to enable discussion on ORC's approach to strategic community engagement in response to a council resolution related to liaison groups.

8. **RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC** 20

Under 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act, the meeting will move into public excluded to consider:

- Minutes of the 10 March 2022 Public-excluded meeting

9. **CLOSURE**



Minutes of a meeting of the Governance, Communications and
Engagement Committee held in the Council Chamber on
Thursday 10 March 2022 at 9:00 AM

Membership

Cr Michael Deaker	<i>(Co-Chair)</i>
Cr Michael Laws	<i>(Co-Chair)</i>
Cr Hilary Calvert	
Cr Alexa Forbes	
Cr Carmen Hope	
Cr Gary Kelliher	
Cr Kevin Malcolm	
Cr Andrew Noone	
Cr Gretchen Robertson	
Cr Bryan Scott	
Cr Kate Wilson	

Welcome

Committee Co-Chair Michael Deaker welcomed Councillors and staff to the meeting at 9:00 am. Staff present included Richard Saunders (GM Regulatory and Communications), Gwyneth Ellum (GM Strategy, Policy and Science), Amanda Vercoe (GM Governance, Culture and Customer) and Liz Spector (Governance Support), and present electronically were Sarah Gardner (Chief Executive), Nick Donnelly (GM Corporate Services), Gavin Palmer (GM Operations) and Anita Dawe (Manager Policy and Planning).

1. APOLOGIES

Resolution: Cr Forbes Moved, Cr Robertson Seconded:

That the apologies for Cr Scott be accepted.

MOTION CARRIED

Councillors Hope, Kelliher and Laws were present electronically.

2. PUBLIC FORUM

No public forum was held.

3. CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

ORC Chairperson Andrew Noone requested to add an item of business under urgency and noted the issue would be discussed with the public excluded under LGOIMA 48(1)(a) Section 7(2)(a) to protect the privacy of natural persons, included that of deceased persons.

Resolution: Cr Noone Moved, Cr Robertson Seconded,

That the Committee accept an urgent matter of business to discuss a Governance Proposal and move into public excluded under LGOIMA 48(1)(a), 7(2)(a) following the conclusion of the public meeting.

MOTION CARRIED

4. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were advised.

5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Resolution: Cr Calvert Moved, Cr Malcolm Seconded

That minutes of the 10 November 2021 Governance, Communications and Engagement Committee meeting are adopted as a true and accurate record.

MOTION CARRIED

6. ACTIONS

Actions from resolutions of the Committee were reviewed. No changes were noted.

7. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

7.1. Otago Regional Council Community Survey 2021 - Draft Action Plan

As part of the 2020/2021 Annual Plan, Councillors requested that staff initiate delivery of a community survey for ORC. The first survey was carried out in the second half of 2021 and results presented to Council at a meeting on 9 December 2021. This report presents the Community Survey 2021/2022 Draft Action Plan to the Committee for consideration. Richard Saunders, General Manager Regulatory and Communications was present to respond to questions about the report. Following discussion, Cr Malcolm moved:

Resolution GCE22-101: Cr Malcolm Moved, Cr Calvert Seconded

That the Committee:

- 1) **Notes** this report.
- 2) **Adopts** the draft ORC Community Survey Action Plan 2021 / 2022.
- 3) **Requests** that staff report back on progress against the action plan as part of the reporting of ORC Community Survey Results for 2022/2023.

MOTION CARRIED

7.2. Port Directors Appointment Guidelines

Council adopted a Recruitment and Appointment Policy (Governance) which included Appendix B Guidelines for the Appointment of Directors to Port Otago Limited (the guidelines). The guidelines included a specific recommendation that a maximum of three terms (nine years) be recommended for Director appointments. At a meeting of the Port Liaison Working Group on 2 December 2021 it was discussed and agreed that these maximum terms should not apply to the Board Chair. The guidelines were amended to reflect this change and were presented to the Committee for consideration. Nick Donnelly, General Manager Corporate Services, was present electronically to respond to questions about the report. Following a discussion of the report, Cr Calvert moved:

Resolution GCE22-102: Cr Calvert Moved, Cr Malcolm Seconded

That the Committee:

- 1) **Notes** this report.
- 2) **Approves** the amended Appendix B Guidelines for the Appointment of Directors to Port Otago Limited.

MOTION CARRIED

7.3. Chief Executive's Staff/Councillor Protocol

The report was provided to the Committee to further discussion of the Chief Executive's draft Protocol for Contact between Elected Members and Employees per a resolution of the Implementation Committee on 8 December 2021. Chief Executive Sarah Gardner was present electronically to respond to questions.

Mrs Gardner responded to questions about how the Protocols sat alongside the Code of Conduct for Councillors. She noted the Code provides for her to set such a protocol and per the resolution made at the previous committee meeting, she had written one and presented to Councillors. Cr Calvert suggested the Protocols would then form part of the Code of Conduct. Cr Wilson asked if this Protocol should then be reviewed alongside the Code of Conduct as part of the review currently underway by Bruce Robertson. Mrs Gardner said the Code states if there is a staff issue that concerns Councillors, the issue must be raised with the Chief Executive. Cr Laws said the review of the Code of Conduct was to determine if it was fit for purpose and suggested the Protocols should be considered alongside the review.

Cr Malcolm queried how Councillors would be able to ask questions of staff at a community event such as a field day if he followed the Protocol as written. Mrs Gardner suggested she could make a small amendment to the Protocol to address this type of engagement.

Cr Calvert suggested that a motion could be made to include review of the Protocol with the Code of Conduct review currently underway. Cr Wilson agreed and said it would not add a great amount of work to the review, but better to include as it may point out any inconsistencies before becoming a functional part of the Code of Conduct.

Questions were asked about the scope of the review, with several Councillors understanding they had resolved to have a full review of the Code of Conduct performed while others and staff understood the resolution was to review only the issues particularly noted by Len Andersen QC at a previous meeting. Cr Noone motioned that the meeting move into an adjournment to review the video of the 23 February Council meeting where this business was considered to gain clarity about the original motion to review the Code. Cr Robertson seconded the motion.

Further discussion was held as to whether an adjournment would be an appropriate measure to take. Cr Malcolm suggested the report be laid on the table and considered in the future after video of the meeting had been reviewed.

Cr Noone withdrew his motion for an adjournment with agreement of Cr Robertson.

Cr Malcolm then moved:

Resolution GCE22-103: Cr Malcolm Moved, Cr Forbes Seconded

That the Committee:

- 1) *Lays this report on the table to allow the Chief Executive and Councillors to review video of discussions held on the Code of Conduct Review: Update report to the 23 Feb 2023 Council Meeting.*

MOTION CARRIED

8. NOTICES OF MOTION

8.1. Notice of Motion - Community engagement work programme for the Land and Water Regional Plan FMUs

Cr Michael Deaker spoke to his Notice of Motion. He asked for an update on the community engagement work programme planned for the Land and Water Regional Plan FMUs to include events planned for community consultation and information about the online component of the consultation survey, including information about anonymous submissions.

Chief Executive Sarah Gardner and General Manager Strategy, Policy and Science Gwyneth Elsum said they would be happy to provide the update to this meeting. Manager Policy and Planning Anita Dawe was also available electronically to respond to questions.

Cr Deaker then moved:

Resolution GCE22-104: Cr Deaker Moved, Cr Calvert Seconded

That the Committee:

- 1) *Receive an update from staff on the community engagement work programme for the LWRP FMUs, including:*
 - a) *The community consultation events, their conduct, and their publicity, and*
 - b) *The online survey component of the consultation, including the ability to make anonymous submissions*

MOTION CARRIED

Mrs Gardner and Ms Elsum then updated the meeting about the planned community engagement. Several Councillors expressed concern about the component of the online survey which was set up to accept anonymous submissions. Mrs Gardner said the survey was set up with controls to keep individuals from submitting multiple times. She also noted that public consultation was not only open to those living in the community but also to anyone who had an interest. She said it was important to consider all opinions in this pre-consultation period. Ms Elsum said the programme was designed around a critical timeline and noted the online survey was a small piece of a very comprehensive piece of work to foster engagement. Cr Wilson indicated a disconnect with the process because the Governance Group had not met in the last three months. She also noted COVID-19 restrictions had impacted engagement opportunities.

Ms Elsum said it was difficult to do engagement in customary ways due to COVID-19 and a good option was to take the engagement online. She said while multiple small engagements across each rohe/FMU to minimise COVID-19 impacts could be useful, there was not enough staff nor enough time to meet the 2023 timeframe if this process was to be undertaken. Mrs Gardner said she was confident staff was doing everything possible to provide good opportunities for pre-consultation engagement. Ms Dawe agreed and said staff was meeting to debrief following each engagement to learn how to improve each time.

Following the end of questions, Cr Wilson moved:

Resolution GCE22-105: Cr Wilson Moved, Cr Calvert Seconded

That the Committee:

- 1) *Receives the verbal update from General Manager Strategy, Planning and Science Gwyneth Elsum.*
- 2) *Directs the ORC Chair to seek clarification from Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) as to consultation advice, particularly the use of anonymity in online surveys and feed that clarification back into this process through the Land and Water Regional Plan Governance Group.*

MOTION CARRIED

9. CLOSURE

There was no further business and Committee Co-Chair Michael Deaker declared the public meeting closed at 10:51 am.

Chairperson

Date

Action Register

Search Criteria

Showing Completed Items: Yes

Include Items Completed From: 15/03/2022

Applied Filters

Meeting Types: Governance, Communications and Engagement Committee

Generated By: Liz Spector

Generated On: 07/09/2022 at 11:45am

Meeting Date	Item	Status	Action Required	Assignee/s	Action Taken	Due Date
11/08/2021	COMS2104 Update on Enviroschools	Completed	Provide a staff report to Council in time for the 2022/23 Annual Plan regarding costs of offering the Enviroschools programme to all schools and other education centres in Otago to include information regarding any territorial authority funding that would be required. RES GCE21-103	General Manager Regulatory and Communications	02/03/2022 Governance Support Officer This report was provided to the Finance Committee at the 23 February 2022 meeting. It was resolved to refer consideration of joint funding of the programme to the Otago Mayoral Forum through Chair Noone.	31/05/2022
10/03/2022	COMS2202 Otago Regional Council Community Survey 2021 - Draft Action Plan	In Progress	Staff to report back on progress against the Community Survey Action Plan 2021/22 as part of reporting results of the 2022/2023 survey. Res GCE22-101	General Manager Regulatory and Communications	01/09/2022 Executive Assistant - Regulatory A Paper will be presented as part of the 22/23 Annual Plan deliberations for consideration.	31/12/2022

7.1. Community Survey 2022 - Methodology for Reporting Results

Prepared for:	Governance, Communications and Engagement Committee
Report No.	COMS2203
Activity:	Council-wide Communications and Engagement
Author:	Richard Saunders, General Manager Regulatory and Communications
Endorsed by:	Richard Saunders, General Manager Regulatory and Communications
Date:	15 September 2022

PURPOSE

- [1] The purpose of this report is to seek a decision on the rating methodology to be applied to the 2022 ORC Community Survey

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- [2] In 2021 ORC engaged Versus Research to undertake an annual Community Survey for three years. The results of the first survey were reported to Council in December 2021 and an action plan responding to the results was approved in March 2022.
- [3] The 2022 survey is currently underway, and staff are seeking a decision from Councillors on the rating methodology to be applied to the results of the survey.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Governance, Communications and Engagement Committee:

- 1) **Notes** this report.
- 2) **Adopts** the following methodology for the reporting of the ORC 2022 Community Survey results: (one to be deleted from the final resolution)
 - a. 1-4 Negative / 5-7 Neutral / 8-10 Positive
 - b. 1-3 Negative / 4-6 Neutral / 7-10 Positive
- 3) **Notes** that the results of the 2022 survey will be reported to Council in December 2022.
- 4) **Notes** that should a change be made to the reporting methodology, the 2021 results will be recast to ensure consistent analysis of results for the purpose of benchmarking.

BACKGROUND

- [4] During the 2020-2021 Annual Plan Councillors requested that staff initiate a project to deliver a community survey for ORC. Versus Research were subsequently engaged to deliver an annual Community Survey for three years, commencing in 2021.
- [5] The results of the 2021 survey were reported to Council in 2021. The results of several questions posed in the survey are reported using a Negative/Neutral/Positive scale based on a rating out of 10 given by the respondent. The assessment methodology used in the results reported to Council was: 1 - 4 Negative / 5 - 7 Neutral / 8 - 10 Positive.

- [6] During the meeting there was some discussion about the suitability of this assessment methodology and whether modifications should be made for future surveys. No decision was made at the time of the meeting, but it was agreed to revisit this issue prior to completing assessment of the 2022 data.

DISCUSSION

Assessment Methodology

- [7] The 2022 ORC Community Survey is currently underway with results expected to be reported to Council in December. To inform this reporting Council needs to decide what methodology is applied to the reporting of results.
- [8] Versus Research have confirmed they have no preferred methodology. The only recommendation made by Versus is that the methodology chosen for 2022 is confirmed for the next two years and should there be a change from the 2021 methodology that those results are recast to reflect the change and ensure accurate benchmarking in 2022.
- [9] Council is asked to choose between two methodologies for the assessment of responses. These are set out in the table below.

Rating	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Option 1 (Status quo)	1 – 4	5 – 7	8 – 10
Option 2	1 – 3	4 – 6	7 – 10

Additional Minor Changes to 2021 Survey

- [10] In preparation for the 2022 survey Versus Research have completed an assessment of the 2021 project and have implemented some minor changes for 2022. These changes aim to provide a greater level of detail in two areas of the survey.
- [11] The first of these relates to the section on Perceptions of Services. In 2021 respondents were asked whether they had used one of four services offered by ORC. Those that had used those services were then asked to rate their level of satisfaction.
- [12] In the 2022 survey respondents who have used the services identified will be asked to rate their satisfaction and the **give reasons for their rating**. This will provide an additional level of detail to inform the staff response.
- [13] In the expectations section of the survey Versus asks about the most important issue facing the region today and how ORC is managing this issue. Based on similar surveys completed with another regional Council an additional question is added asking **why do you think this is the most important issue?** This will provide some context to the response which will again help to inform ORC’s action planning.
- [14] The 2021 survey included a section on the New Ecological Paradigm. Versus Research have recommended the removal of this section as it is not required to be measured each year. They recommend revisiting this section following the completion of the initial three years of surveys.

Survey Programme

- [15] The proposed dates for this year's survey programme are as follows:
- a. Pilot Survey – Week commencing 5th of September
 - b. Data Collections – 12th September 2022 – 21st October 2022
 - c. Draft report available to ORC – 21st November
 - d. Report back to Council including Action Plan – Prior to Christmas

OPTIONS

- [16] Option 1: Status quo – The rating methodology for the 2022 survey is consistent with the methodology used in the 2021 survey.
- 1 - 4 Negative / 5 - 7 Neutral / 8 - 10 Positive
- [17] Option 2: The rating methodology for the 2022 survey is modified.
- 1 - 3 Negative / 4 - 6 Neutral / 7 - 10 Positive
- [18] There are no significant advantages or disadvantages associated with these options. Versus Research have confirmed they have no opinion on a preferred methodology.

CONSIDERATIONS

Strategic Framework and Policy Considerations

- [19] The ORC Community Survey supports effective engagement with our community.

Financial Considerations

- [20] This decision has no financial impact. The funds for the survey are included in the 2022/2023 budgets.

Significance and Engagement Considerations

- [21] There are no considerations associated with this decision.

Legislative and Risk Considerations

- [22] There are minor reputational risk considerations associated with this decision. It could be perceived that ORC has chosen to modify the assessment methodology to score higher in future surveys.

Climate Change Considerations

- [23] There are no climate change considerations associated with this decision.

Communications Considerations

- [24] There are no communications considerations associated with this report.

NEXT STEPS

- [25] Staff will work with Versus to implement the decision of Council when analysing the 2022 Community Survey Results.
- [26] Should a change be made to the 2022 assessment methodology staff will work with Versus Research to ensure the 2021 results are recast for consistency of benchmarking.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

7.2. ORC - Approach to Engagement

Prepared for: Governance, Communications and Engagement Committee

Report No. GOV2247

Activity: Governance Report

Author: Amanda Vercoe, GM Governance, Culture and Customer

Endorsed by: Pim Borren, Interim Chief Executive

Date: 7 September 2022

PURPOSE

- [1] To discuss ORC’s approach to strategic community engagement, in response to a council resolution related to liaison groups.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- [2] Engagement is a two-way process, often face to face, where dialogue is held to a point where people engaged in the process with the council feel as though they have successfully conveyed their point of view, and that they have been heard. The ‘hearing’ part is then reflected back to them at the conclusion of the engagement process. It is different from consultation (required by legislation to help support decision makers), and communication (one way sharing of information).
- [3] At a high-level, ORC’s Strategic Directions, through its vision statement, indicate ORC’s desire to build trust in its decision making through engagement. ORC has a further commitment in its Strategic Directions to “effectively engage communities” as part of how it does business.
- [4] In order to implement the Strategic Directions vision and commitment, the ORC has He Mahi Rau Rika (Significance, Engagement and Māori Participation Policy) which is an external policy (required by the Local Government Act 2002) setting out ORC’s approach to when communities can expect to be engaged by ORC, the principles that underpin that engagement and the degree of influence they can expect to have on the matter (using the IAP2 model as the base).
- [5] Considering the council resolution regarding use of liaison groups has highlighted an opportunity to consider ORC’s community engagement approach. Currently we do not have a strategy or framework that articulates our objectives and priorities, nor do we have ‘all of organisation’ specialist strategic engagement roles to develop effective approaches, grow internal capabilities and support engagement delivery through teams across ORC. Instead, operational engagement is planned on a project-by-project basis, sometimes bringing in external expertise, sometimes using the skills that sit within teams. We acknowledge this has been a point of frustration at times for elected members.
- [6] This paper recommends the development of a community engagement framework and implementation plan. This would allow us to focus on identifying our overarching objectives, priorities, and actions – for example, considering place-focused engagement

(integrated catchment management model), demographics (e.g., youth), and current and emerging issues (e.g., public transport) and how we want to build long-term engagement across these priority subject areas.

- [7] With a clearly articulated framework and implementation plan, resourcing needs could be established and considered against other priorities through the Annual Plan 2023/24 process. For example, what resourcing is needed to manage ‘all of organisation’ strategic engagement, and should ORC have specialist engagement expertise on staff. Technology, coordination processes, and “toolboxes” for engagement techniques (such as liaison groups) could then be developed. In the case of liaison groups, having a consistent policy covering things like purpose, terms of reference, appointment processes, remuneration and internal resourcing (both councillors and staff) would mean these could be more efficiently established and consistently operated.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee:

- 1) **Notes** this report.
- 2) **Asks** the Chief Executive to develop a draft community engagement framework and implementation plan (or similar) which develops an ORC approach to engagement for council consideration and approval.
- 3) **Notes** that a framework and implementation plan would be a mechanism for ORC to organise itself internally, and resource our engagement appropriately, and develop a way to measure and evaluate our approach as an organisation.
- 4) **Notes** operational engagement tools such as the establishment of liaison groups would then be considered within the agreed strategic approach and council’s implementation plan.

BACKGROUND

- [8] In September 2021, a briefing was prepared on liaison groups for flood schemes which covered off the history and future considerations.
- [9] On 27 October 2021 Council adopted He Mahi Rau Rika (Significance, Engagement and Māori Participation Policy). This policy is a requirement under the Local Government Act and sets out an approach to identifying the degree of significance attached to issues, proposals, assets, decisions, and activities and providing clarity about how and when communities can expect to be engaged in decisions. Importantly the updated policy adopted in October 2021 articulated ORC’s partnership with mana whenua, and commitments to engaging with iwi. It is a key external facing policy for Council.
- [10] On 1 June 2022 as part of Annual Plan deliberations, the following resolution was passed
- “Report to Governance, Comms & Engagement on 15 Sept 2022 as to how nominated community members and councillors work with staff and their preferred timetables for meetings of liaison committees, e.g., bus users, central lakes works, river management groups, etc. as trials for community engagement and communications on upcoming work schedules. Include a draft timeline for staff/councillors to work together on nominating community members and proposing ToRs”.*

DISCUSSION

- [11] Strategic engagement is essential for building trust and social capital within communities for ORC. To be successful, we should aim for it to be:
- a. Long-term relationship and place focused
 - b. Ongoing and enduring
 - c. Driven by communities' needs and preferences
 - d. Done by us all (Councillors, staff, consultants)
 - e. Drawing communities into the work of the ORC
 - f. Clear on its design and purpose
 - g. Focused on ensuring communities feel heard
 - h. Representative
 - i. Continually evaluated for its effectiveness.
- [12] Given our regulatory functions, it is unlikely that we can satisfy all our communities requirements, particularly in those areas where diversity of views is common. Nevertheless, we aspire to ensure innovative and effective engagement. Currently ORC community engagement tends to receive mixed feedback. Where feedback has been positive this has been because ORC has had good relationships, delivered on commitments, presented well, had strong technical expertise, listened and offered genuine participation and been supported by good communications. Negative feedback has been where ORC's role has not been clear, where we have had competing engagement requests on the same communities, where our "why" hasn't been clear enough, and it has been perceived that we haven't followed through on community feedback or provided enough information. The recommendations from the community survey from 2021 (<https://www.orc.govt.nz/media/11406/council-agenda-20211209.pdf>) are linked to engagement.
- [13] Since adopting the LTP 2021/31 we have grown considerably as an organisation, to deliver on an expanded work programme. We have more staff on the ground doing the 'do' - including building a network of catchment advisors, developing integrated catchment management, and delivering on natural hazards work programmes. At the same time, we have been working through an ambitious programme of policy and planning work including a Regional Policy Statement and Land and Water Regional Plan and implementing the National Policy Statement Freshwater Management (among others). In addition, there has been a significant amount of central government engagement (particularly around consultations on new legislation and policy), and COVID – which has meant we have not always been able to meet with communities face to face. These things put together help to highlight the challenges we have in what is a crowded community engagement space.
- [14] While we engage using several approaches, generally ORC has tended towards more operational engagement based on work programmes, projects, or when we have needed public and stakeholder inputs. Key activities ORC has used include surveys (e.g., Your Say) expert panels, working groups, drop-ins, and education sessions.
- [15] Communications and Marketing staff promote and support the above engagement and consultation activities by editing and producing written materials, e.g., reports and presentations, on which to consult, producing advertising, flyers, media releases, social media posts, newsletter updates, email updates, website content, and through promoting and writing up Your Say content, among other activities.

- [16] There are existing initiatives that support strategic engagement including the work by councillors to build connections in the community, our work with iwi, and the proactive outreach work being done by our front facing teams. This is in addition to the long-term relationship building that takes place day to day by staff across the organisation. However, we recognise that we could do better in delivering more strategic, coordinated, and best practice engagement.
- [17] There are new initiatives underway to support our strategic engagement, including the recently established Principal Advisor Iwi Relationships and Strategic Stakeholders, and the development of integrated catchment management. The Principal Advisor role (currently under recruitment) has played a key role in deepening and strengthening our relationships with mana whenua and mata waka, to fulfil our commitments in He Mahi Rau Rika.
- [18] The development of integrated catchment management as part of the 2021/31 Long-term Plan is continuing to evolve our engagement approach and will see an eventual shift to place-focussed engagement at a catchment level. Alongside our team of geographically dispersed catchment and biosecurity advisors, this will help build and coordinate engagement on the ground once underway (the Catlins pilot will help steer the direction of this).
- [19] There are still gaps however and there continues to be actual and potential duplication and/or overlap. There is also a lack of specific expertise in-house in the design and evaluation of engagement, requiring continuing use of consultants.
- [20] A systematic strategic engagement framework would assist ORC to organise its approach and resources internally in a more focussed and effective way. This would enable us to consider how to target engagement across different sectors, demographics and activities and then develop more operational guidance and goals that are responsive to diverse needs. For example, the kind of engagement that may work well from a catchment perspective may be different to best practice engagement on public transport matters, which may differ again for how we engage our rangatahi (young leaders). Access to clear guidance on roles and to in-house expertise could also facilitate internal capacity building.
- [21] There are also new 'whole of organisation' approaches being used by other councils that ORC needs to be considering. But these all come with resourcing needs (both staff time and capability, and delivery costs), that we do not currently have. An overarching framework would be a useful tool to then develop priorities and explore what options would best suit the ORC. Examples include:
- a. **Online Peoples' Panels:** used to test ideas, issues being worked on. Feedback is used to help with staff, and councillor decision making.
 - b. **Regional Forums**
 - c. **Regional environmental awards** (or similar)
 - d. **Youth Rōpū**
 - e. **Participatory budgeting**

Liaison Groups

- [22] Liaison groups are an engagement tool that could be useful for the operational work of the ORC. There are a number of considerations that would benefit from a consistent

approach, including purpose (i.e., decision making or advisory), terms of reference, appointment processes, remuneration, reporting requirements, and resourcing (both councillors and staff).

- [23] Establishing guidance on the use of liaison groups as part of an overall ORC engagement toolbox would mean these could be efficiently established and consistently operated. It would also enable members of the public who were participating to have a clear sense of why they were there, and what the work was contributing to.

OPTIONS

- [24] Option 1: Preferred Option - Develop a community engagement framework and implementation plan, that will allow us to look at ORC's strategic engagement and identify priorities, and resourcing needs to be included in the Annual Plan 2023/24. Consultant spend would be needed to develop the framework and implementation plan in a timely way, though staff are confident this can be managed within existing budgets.

Advantages:

- *Engagement priorities, actions and resourcing needs can be identified and considered as part of the Annual Plan 2023/24 process (against other priorities)*
- *ORC can explore different approaches to engagement and deliver advice and options to councillors.*
- *Engagement activities undertaken by ORC will be efficient and delivered consistently resulting in a more positive experience for our community.*

Disadvantages

- *There is a cost associated with the preparation of an engagement framework and implementation plan. This will be within approved budgets.*
- *The formation of liaison groups would be delayed until we have a framework and plan signed off by Council.*

- [25] Option 2: Continue with the status quo, which is case by case operational engagement on work plans and projects, and strategic engagement continuing in our partnership with iwi, strategic stakeholders, and integrated catchment management development.

Advantages:

- *No additional resourcing would be needed.*
- *Ad hoc liaison groups can be established without further delay.*

Disadvantages:

- *The community may continue to express frustration at a lack of organisation, connectedness and joined up approach from the ORC.*
- *Staff will continue to struggle to explore different approaches to engagement in response to councillor requests, due to resourcing constraints.*
- *Engagement activities undertaken by ORC may be inconsistent and inefficient in the absence of a framework and implementation plan.*

CONSIDERATIONS

Strategic Framework and Policy Considerations

- [26] Strategic Directions envisions ORC as an organisation that will build trust in its decision making through engagement. Strategic Directions also commits ORC to “effectively engage communities”. Developing a community engagement framework and implementation plan would enable us to articulate how we are going to contribute to the ORC vision and deliver on the commitment. This also fits within the He Mahi Rau Rika.

Financial Considerations

- [27] To ensure resourcing considerations could be factored into Annual Plan 2023/24 discussions, we would need to engage a consultant to help with developing the framework and implementation plan. Staff are confident this spend could be managed within existing budgets.

Significance and Engagement Considerations

- [28] Development of the framework would be an internal process, with council involvement, but it would not trigger the He Mahi Rau Rika in terms of formal consultation.

Legislative and Risk Considerations

- [29] Community engagement is included as a risk on the ORC Strategic Risk Register. Developing a framework would help mitigate this risk.

Climate Change Considerations

- [30] Climate change is one of the key topics that ORC already engages with the community on, and the need for this will only grow in the future. Developing an engagement framework would further support this work.

Communications Considerations

- [31] Communications is a key supporting function of any engagement. Communications material ensures the community understands what engagement is occurring and the purpose of it.

NEXT STEPS

- [32] To engage a consultant to assist staff with the development of a draft framework and implementation plan, workshop with council, and then bring back for formal approval. The timeframe for seeking approve would be early 2023.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under [section 48\(1\)](#) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
<i>Minutes of the public-excluded portion of the 10 March 2022 Governance, Communications and Engagement Committee meeting</i>	To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons – Section 7(2)(a)	Section 48(1)(a) - Subject to subsection (3), a local authority may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on 1 or more of the following grounds: (a) that the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist.

This resolution is made in reliance on [section 48\(1\)\(a\)](#) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by [section 6](#) or [section 7](#) of that Act or [section 6](#) or [section 7](#) or [section 9](#) of the Official Information Act 1982, as the case may require, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public.