

SELF-ASSESSMENT RESULT RECORDING

**Council: Greater Wellington
Group Six**

Consultation

	Comments
<p>Areas of strength in process or approach</p>	<p>Good stakeholder database of individuals and groups including the nature of their interest and most recent consultation contact. Information owner identified. This database is important to help Council identify affected or interested groups and individuals given that general public information does not traditionally generate significant numbers of responses.</p> <p>Prepares consultation plans on major issues (including on issues where the Council believes there is public interest in a matter, but it is not required by statute to consult).</p> <p>Consults interested and affected groups on issues and options prior to consultation on a preferred option.</p> <p>Uses a range of print information such as website, newspaper and 'Elements' which is delivered to households (which are clear and easily read and provide easy options for giving written feedback, also accepts oral feedback) as well as staff and Councillors attending meetings and providing briefings as sought or identified as useful. Support was recently provided for a deaf person wanting to make a submission on a resource consent hearing.</p> <p>Liaises with local Maori about how they want to be consulted on specific issues and has had hui about how the Council can best involve Maori for the purpose of its LGA requirements. These hui also considered how Council could assist to develop Maori capacity to contribute to decision-making although no specific proposals were agreed.</p> <p>Very personalised responses are often sent to submitters – probably reflecting that the Council receives lower levels of submissions relative to many territorial Councils.</p>
<p>Areas of weakness/opportunity in process or approach</p>	<p>Heavy reliance on print media, which is traditional for Councils of its size. Other City Councils tend</p>

	<p>to be using other less conventional types of consultation – but given Greater Wellington is a Regional Council which traditionally get lower levels of public engagement, the current approach is probably appropriate.</p> <p>There was no specific information about how the Council evaluates the effectiveness of its current consultation approaches and it does not appear that feedback is sought in any way on this question (although the Council does consider the levels of response to submission processes to see what can be learned). Likewise the Council uses Elements extensively and it could be interesting to assess whether this is building public recognition and is seen as useful for communication and consultation by communities.</p>
Further development work proposed	
Any completeness issues or uncertainties in the information provided	
Conclusion on audit risk	No significant risks noted.

Outcomes

	Comments
Areas of strength in process or approach	<p>There has been strong regional collaboration for the 2006 outcomes process, which built off the community outcomes-like process Greater Wellington had undertaken in 2002 but involved Greater Wellington relying for 2006 on the outcomes consultation undertaken through the Territorial Authorities processes (the Wellington Regional Strategy). Greater Wellington was also involved with regional processes involving other groups and organisations, with distillation of proposed outcomes being undertaken by a group representing the nine Councils.</p> <p>Information about the current state of wellbeing and trends was provided for use through the Wgtn Regional Strategy, and Greater Wellington also had website information available.</p> <p>Greater Wellington considered its own role in contributing to outcomes through ‘Take Ten’ – which it sees as intermediate outcomes to the Community Outcomes. Councillors worked with officers to develop targets that would allow specific monitoring of the Take Ten targets with the link to the wider community outcomes being explicitly shown. It found that the community outcomes and its own sustainability focus were closely aligned.</p> <p>A framework for developing outcome monitoring is being used. The Council is using a model that provides a ‘thinking framework’ (Genuine Progress Indicator) for outcomes, which puts a \$ value against community and environmental values, as well as allowing the impact of change in values to be seen.</p> <p>Councillors made decisions about how to prioritise the direction of its work through considering its role, the state and direction of wellbeing and the Community Outcome feedback.</p>
Areas of weakness/opportunity in process or approach	Running outcomes through TA’s makes sense from both a collaboration perspective and that of coherence for communities – but relies heavily on TAs adequately covering the regional view in their outcome consultation.
Further development work proposed	

	Considerable potential to improve monitoring and measurement of outcomes, which is being addressed through councils collectively agreeing the measures using a GPI.
Any completeness issues or uncertainties in the information provided	
Conclusion on audit risk	While there is potential for unease about whether the TA's processes for involving communities in community outcomes dealt with the regional outcomes process requirements, the process seems sensible and designed to make engagement more coherent for communities. Need to focus on the outcome measures and monitoring systems.

Decision making

	Comments
Areas of strength in process or approach	<p>Overall there is a good cultural context for decision-making. While some of the decision-making processes appeared less formal for Greater Wgtn than in other large councils, normal core control processes are in place, such as report templates and delegations with these being reviewed from time to time. However review of the decision-making advice provided with the self-assessment suggested that the processes that are in place are supported by a strong strategic sense of the Council's role and contribution to outcomes, which is drawn from the Council's understanding of the state of outcomes, and is embedded in business planning and monitoring of projects and programmes.</p> <p>Feedback from users is sought and used for development of service levels (for example for flood protection and public transport).</p>
Areas of weakness/opportunity in process or approach	
Further development work proposed	
Any completeness issues or uncertainties in the information provided	
Conclusion on audit risk	<p>Decision-making is potentially a weaker area. Some comfort was taken from the information provided which suggested that Council uses its range of monitoring information to evaluate the effects of decisions.</p>

Governance and Purpose

	Comments
Areas of strength in process or approach	<p>Undertakes structured and thoughtful engagement of elected members – particularly through the outcomes, role, service level and performance measure discussions involving consideration of monitoring information and of progress toward outcomes and Take Ten goals.</p> <p>A good staff attendance (80%) was achieved at voluntary briefings about outcomes – at which staff were also asked for their views about the Council’s role in helping to achieve the outcomes.</p> <p>Has evaluated a number of activities against contribution to outcomes through workshops that have drawn information from monitoring information produced (suggesting that monitoring info is used in business decision-making).</p> <p>Commissioned a study on good practice in LTCCPs that drew on NZ and some international sources. Report concluded that Greater Wgtn is applying good practice as it stands at present.</p> <p>Relates its business practices to its wider SD objectives in seeking opportunities for organisational development.</p> <p>Understands how its strategy and business planning processes relate.</p>
Areas of weakness/opportunity in process or approach	
Further development work proposed	
Any completeness issues or uncertainties in the information provided	
Conclusion on audit risk	No significant risks

Performance Management Systems and Controls

	Comments
Areas of strength in process or approach	<p>Has a coherent flow to performance information from outcomes to intermediate outcomes to long-term targets and short-term targets. LTCCP and business planning appear fully integrated and therefore flow through organisational, departmental and individual accountability arrangements.</p> <p>Monitoring systems take a long-term and outcome impact focus as well as a short-term deliverable focus.</p> <p>Greater Wellington carries out extensive studies of existing programmes as part of the LTCCP (for example reviewing the state of the environment and the land transport strategy annually). There is also a range of mechanisms to involve users of services in service reviews, with the Council having a scheduled approach to reviewing many of its ongoing activities. Therefore it is regularly reviewing the effectiveness and performance of its activities.</p>
Areas of weakness/opportunity in process or approach	Does not appear to be strong on general resident evaluation feedback about the Council (for example market research only asks how well respondents think the Council is performing its role). However specific and regular market research is conducted in association with regular reviews of activities, which focus on the needs and experiences of users of service.
Further development work proposed	Identifies the key challenge as being finding meaningful performance measures for hard to measure activities.
Any completeness issues or uncertainties in the information provided	
Conclusion on audit risk	Again performance measures and monitoring systems require further attention. Validation of the integration of LTCCP to other areas of business planning through detailed audit review.