

# Local Government Reform – Summary of Proposed Reforms

#### SUBMISSION BY KAREN VERNON, MAYOR OF VICTORIA PARK

The views in this submission are my personal views, and not the views of the Town of Victoria Park or its Council.

The majority of the proposed reforms seem appropriate and sensible, however some of them require considerably more detail for the local government sector to understand how they will operate. In the absence of such detail, I would urge the Minister to consult further with the sector before finalising those reforms. To do otherwise would be to deprive the sector of an opportunity to be engaged, one of the very things the proposed reforms on community engagement are seeking to overcome.

Theme 1: Early Intervention, Effective Regulation and Stronger Penalties

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS		
1.1 Early Intervention Powers				
1.1 Early Intervention Powers  The Act provides the means to regulate the conduct of local government staff and council members and sets out powers to scrutinise the affairs of local government. The Act provides certain limited powers to:  Suspend or dismiss councils  Appoint Commissioners  Suspend or, order remedial action (such as training) for individual councillors.  The Act also provides the Director General with the power to:  Conduct Authorised Inquiries  Refer allegations of serious or recurrent breaches to the State Administrative Tribunal  Commence prosecution for an offence under the Act.  Authorised Inquiries are a costly and a relatively slow response to significant issues. Authorised Inquiries are currently the only significant tool for addressing significant issues within a local government.  The Panel Report, City of Perth Inquiry, and the Select Committee Report made various recommendations related to the establishment of a specific office for local government oversight.	<ul> <li>It is proposed to establish a Chief Inspector of Local Government (the Inspector), supported by an Office of the Local Government Inspector (the Inspectorate).</li> <li>The Inspector would receive minor and serious complaints about elected members.</li> <li>The Inspector would oversee complaints relating to local government CEOs.</li> <li>Local Governments would still be responsible for dealing with minor behavioural complaints.</li> <li>The Inspector would have powers of a standing inquiry, able to investigate and intervene in any local government where potential issues are identified.</li> <li>The Inspector would have the authority to assess, triage, refer, investigate, or close complaints, having regard to various public interest criteria – considering laws such as the Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003, the Occupational Safety and Health Act 1984, the Building Act 2011, and other legislation.</li> <li>The Inspector would have powers to implement minor penalties for less serious breaches of the Act, with an appeal mechanism.</li> <li>The Inspector would also have the power to order a local government to address non-compliance with the Act or Regulations.</li> <li>The Inspector would be supported by a panel of Local Government Monitors (see item 1.2).</li> <li>The existing Local Government Standards Panel would be replaced with a new Conduct Panel (see item 1.3).</li> </ul>	PARTIALLY SUPPORT/ PARTIALLY OPPOSE  I support reform of the complaints process, but I don't think there is sufficient information provided in support of the proposed reforms to understand exactly how this would work, without becoming unnecessarily bureaucratic.  All the complaints I have heard about the LG Standards Panel have been related to the procedure of the Panel, the constitution of its members, and the poor quality of its decisions. It also lacks powers it should have.  Reform of the Standards Panel into a better constituted and resourced Conduct Panel, should be able to bring accountability and procedural fairness to the process without the need for an Inspectorate, which will add a level of unnecessary bureaucracy to the LG sector.		
	• <b>Penalties</b> for breaches to the Local Government Act and Regulations will be reviewed and are proposed to be generally strengthened (see item 1.4).	If a new model is needed, the Legal Practitioners Complaints		

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	• These reforms would be supported by new powers to more quickly resolve issues within local government (see items 1.5 and 1.6).	Committee is a better model which could be adapted for LG.
		They have a Rapid Resolution Team which resolves less serious complaints by conciliation and identifies possible conduct issues.
1.2 Local Government Monitors		
There are currently no legislative powers for the provision of monitors/ temporary	A panel of Local Government Monitors would be established.	OPPOSE
advisors.  The DLGSC provides support and advice to local governments, however there is no existing mechanism for pre-qualified, specialised assistance to manage complex cases.	<ul> <li>Monitors could be appointed by the Inspector to go into a local government and try to resolve problems.</li> <li>The purpose of Monitors would be to proactively fix problems, rather than to identify blame or collect evidence.</li> <li>Monitors would be qualified specialists, such as:         <ul> <li>Experienced and respected former Mayors, Presidents, and CEOs - to act as mentors and facilitators</li> <li>Dispute resolution experts - to address the breakdown of professional working relationships</li> <li>Certified Practicing Accountants and other financial specialists - to assist with financial management and reporting issues</li> <li>Governance specialists and lawyers - to assist councils resolve legal issues</li> <li>HR and procurement experts - to help with processes like recruiting a CEO or undertaking a major land transaction.</li> <li>Only the Inspector would have the power to appoint Monitors.</li> <li>Local governments would be able to make requests to the Inspector to appoint Monitors for a specific purpose.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <li>Monitor Case Study 1 - Financial Management</li>	LG Monitors are an unnecessary and costly level of bureaucracy imposed onto the LG sector.  It is not clear why they would be necessary, given LGs currently can (and should remain at liberty to) directly engage qualified specialist advisors of the types listed to assist the LG to address the problems identified.  Case Study 1 seems an extraordinary example to justify monitors, given LGs are subject to extensive legislative compliance regimes, all of which would detect this issue, and a monitor would add nothing to the process except additional costs. Case Study 2 refers to the type of example that is likely to dominate an Inspectorate, be costly to

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	The Inspector receives information that a local government is not collecting rates correctly under the <i>Local Government Act</i> 1995. Upon initial review, the Inspector identifies that there may be a problem. The Inspector appoints a Monitor who specialises in financial management in local government. The Monitor visits the local government and identifies that the system used to manage rates is not correctly issuing rates notices. The Monitor works with the local government to rectify the error, and issue	deliver, and has no counterpart in other levels of government.  Training and mentoring of local government elected members would be a more useful, enabling strategy through:  1. making leadership training
	corrections to impacted ratepayers.  Monitor Case Study 2 – Dispute Resolution	mandatory, which is a component of mandatory
	The Inspector receives a complaint from one councillor that another councillor is repeatedly publishing derogatory personal attacks against another councillor on social media, and that the issue has not been able to be resolved at the local government level. The Inspector identifies that there has been a relationship breakdown between the two councillors due to a disagreement on council.	training that is currently missing; 2. WALGA implementing a mentor program like that run by LG Professionals.
	The Inspector appoints a Monitor to host mediation sessions between the councillors. The Monitor works with the councillors to address the dispute. Through regular meetings, the councillors agree to a working relationship based on the council's code of conduct. After the mediation, the Monitor occasionally makes contact with both councillors to ensure there is a cordial working relationship between the councillors.	
1.3 Conduct Panel		
The Local Government Standards Panel was established in 2007 to resolve minor breach complaints relatively quickly and provide the sector with guidance and benchmarks about acceptable standards of behaviour.	<ul> <li>The Standards Panel is proposed to be replaced with a new Local Government Conduct Panel.</li> <li>The Conduct Panel would be comprised of suitably qualified and experienced professionals. Sitting councillors will not be eligible to serve on the Conduct Panel.</li> <li>The Inspector would provide evidence to the Conduct Panel for adjudication.</li> </ul>	PARTIALLY SUPPORT  Although I support reforming the current Standards Panel, there is insufficient detail about the purpose of the Conduct Panel or how the Conduct Panel will

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul> <li>Currently, the Panel makes findings about alleged breaches based on written submissions.</li> <li>The City of Perth Inquiry report made various recommendations that functions of the Local Government Standards Panel be reformed.</li> </ul>	penalties – potentially including being able to suspend councillors for up to three months, with an appeal mechanism.	operate more efficiently or effectively than the Standards Panel.  The information provided for this proposed reform is also contradictory.  Currently the Standards Panel is for minor breaches. Serious breaches can be addressed by statutory prosecutions by the DLG, or via the CCC. Historically neither the DLG nor the CCC have been effective or efficient at statutory prosecutions.  Since the Conduct Panel doesn't seem to be contemplated to be an investigative body, it's difficult to understand how it would have power to recommend statutory prosecutions for serious breaches.  The work of a Conduct Panel should be limited to adjudicating minor breaches. Improving the qualifications of the panel members, and improving the panel's decision-making processes should result in better decisions.

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		The merit of having the Inspector provide evidence to the Panel is not likely to be an efficient or timely process. It will be akin to the investigators who gather and present evidence to the Coroner, which then gets dissected during coronial inquiries by lawyers. The delays in the coroners court are legendary.  Difficult to understand how or why the Conduct Panel should have the power to recommend
		prosecution in the courts for serious or repeated breaches of the Act.
		Simply giving a respondent the chance to address the Panel means little if the Panel's process otherwise lacks procedural fairness.
1.4 Review of Penalties		
There are currently limited penalties in the Act for certain types of non-compliance with	<ul> <li>Penalties for breaching the Local Government Act are proposed to be strengthened.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT
the Local Government Act.	It is proposed that the suspension of councillors (for up to three months) is established as the main penalty where a councillor breaches the Local Government Act or Regulations on more than one occasion.	The introduction of more serious penalties including suspension and disqualification must be accompanied by a more rigorous

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>Councillors who are disqualified would not be eligible for sitting fees or allowances. They will also not be able to attend meetings, or use their official office (such as their title or council email address).</li> <li>It is proposed that a councillor who is suspended multiple times may become disqualified from office.</li> <li>Councillors who do not complete mandatory training within a certain timeframe will also not be able to receive sitting fees or allowances.</li> </ul>	and procedurally fair process for investigation, inquiry and decision-making.  OPPOSE I do not support the introduction of mandatory suspensions of councillors because every breach is different. That is a blunt instrument that does not take account of mitigatory circumstances.  For regulatory offences (e.g. Traffic Code violations) where subsequent offences attract mandatory penalties, the offending conduct is always the same. That is unlikely to be the case for LG Act breaches.
1.5 Rapid Red Card Resolutions		
<ul> <li>Currently, local governments have different local laws and standing orders that govern the way meetings run. Presiding members (Mayors and Presidents) are reliant on the powers provided in the local government standing orders local laws.</li> <li>Differences between local governments is a source of confusion about the powers that presiding members have to deal with disruptive behaviours at council meetings.</li> </ul>	across Western Australia (see item 2.6). Published recordings of all meetings would also become standard (item 3.1).	SUPPORT Standardised, or at least consistent Standing Orders will be a significant improvement for LGs, especially smaller LGs with limited governance resources.  CONCERNS The "red card" system is not dissimilar to the provisions in most

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
Disruptive behaviour at council meetings is a very common cause of complaints. Having the Presiding Member be able to deal with these problems should more quickly resolve problems that occur at council meetings.	<ul> <li>If the disruptions continue, the Presiding Member will have the power to "red card" that person, who must be silent for the rest of the meeting. A councillor issued with a red card will still vote, but must not speak or move motions</li> <li>If the person continues to be disruptive, the Presiding Member can instruct that they leave the meeting.</li> <li>Any Presiding Member who uses the "red card" or ejection power will be required to notify the Inspector.</li> <li>Where an elected member refuses to comply with an instruction to be silent or leave, or where it can be demonstrated that the presiding member has not followed the law in using these powers, penalties can be imposed through a review by the Inspector.</li> </ul>	current Standing Orders requiring the Presiding Member to warn a person who interrupts or disrupts a meeting or breaches certain orders, before ordering them to leave the meeting.  The real issue is the power of the Presiding Member to enforce such orders.  First, there is no point in having such a system if Councillors can move a motion to disagree with the Presiding Member's decisions on such matters.  This issue is especially disturbing, since Presiding Members are elected to lead the Council and its meetings. That has to mean something, not be susceptible to subversion or attack by disgruntled colleagues with alternative agendas.  Secondly, Presiding Members lack any powers to enforce their orders. If a PM orders a person to leave a meeting, there must be a corresponding power to enforce that order to make someone leave if they refuse to do so.

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS		
1.6 Vexatious Complaint Referrals				
<ul> <li>No current provisions.</li> <li>The Act already provides a requirement for Public Question Time at council meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Local governments already have a general responsibility to provide ratepayers and members of the public with assistance in responding to queries about the local government's operations. Local governments should resolve queries and complaints in a respectful, transparent and equitable manner.</li> <li>Unfortunately, local government resources can become unreasonably diverted when a person makes repeated vexatious queries, especially after a local government has already provided a substantial response to the person's query.</li> <li>It is proposed that if a person makes repeated complaints to a local government CEO that are vexatious, the CEO will have the power to refer that person's complaints to the Inspectorate, which after assessment of the facts may then rule the complaint vexatious.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT  A process for determining vexatious complaints is appropriate, provided the decision does not rest with the CEO, as there may be conflicts of interest where a CEO tries to stifle genuine enquiries under the label of vexatious complaint.		
1.7 Minor Other Reforms				
<ul> <li>Other minor reforms are being considered to enhance the oversight of local government.</li> <li>Ministerial Circulars have traditionally been used to provide guidance to the local government sector.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Potential other reforms to strengthen guidance for local governments are being considered.</li> <li>For example, one option being considered is the potential use of sector-wide guidance notices. Guidance notices could be published by the Minister or Inspector, to give specific direction for how local governments should meet the requirements of the Local Government Act and Regulations. For instance, the Minister could publish guidance notices to clarify the process for how potential conflicts of interests should be managed.</li> <li>It is also proposed (see item 1.1) that the Inspector has the power to issue notices to individual local governments to</li> </ul>	PARTIALLY SUPPORT/ PARTIALLY OPPOSE  I support the DLG issuing Guidelines as they have done for many years. That process should be enhanced.  Guidance notes should not be done by politicians (vested interests) or inspectors (who don't set the standards).		

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS	
	require them to rectify non-compliance with the Act or Regulations.	SUPPORT  Power to issue notices of non-compliance following an appropriate method to determine non-compliance could be appropriate.	

Theme 2: Reducing Red Tape, Increasing Consistency and Simplicity

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS		
2.1 Resource Sharing	2.1 Resource Sharing			
<ul> <li>The Act does not currently include specific provisions to allow for certain types of resource sharing – especially for sharing CEOs.</li> <li>Regional local governments would benefit from having clearer mechanisms for voluntary resource-sharing.</li> </ul>	governments, especially smaller regional local governments, to share resources, including Chief Executive Officers and senior employees.	SUPPORT		
2.2 Standardisation of Crossovers				
<ul> <li>Approvals and standards for crossovers (the section of driveways that run between the kerb and private property) are inconsistent between local government areas, often with very minor differences.</li> <li>This can create confusion and complexity for homeowners and small businesses in the construction sector.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed to amend the Local Government (Uniform Local Provisions) Regulations 1996 to standardise the process for approving crossovers for residential properties and residential developments on local roads.</li> <li>A Crossover Working Group has provided preliminary advice to the Minister and DLGSC to inform this.</li> <li>The DLGSC will work with the sector to develop standardised design and construction standards.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT		
2.3 Introduce Innovation Provisions				
The Local Government Act 1995 currently has very limited provisions to allow for innovations and responses to emergencies to (such as the Shire of Bruce Rock Supermarket).	<ul> <li>New provisions are proposed to allow exemptions from certain requirements of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>, for:         <ul> <li>Short-term trials and pilot projects</li> <li>Urgent responses to emergencies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SUPPORT		

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS			
2.4 Streamline Local Laws					
<ul> <li>Local laws are required to be reviewed every eight years.</li> <li>The review of local laws (especially when they are standard) has been identified as a burden for the sector.</li> <li>Inconsistency between local laws is frustrating for residents and business stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>by the local government every 15 years.</li> <li>Local laws not reviewed in the timeframe would lapse, meaning that old laws will be automatically removed and no longer applicable.</li> <li>Local governments adopting Model Local Laws will have reduced advertising requirements.</li> </ul>	A suite of Model Local Laws is a necessity for sector wide reform.  OPPOSE  Review every 15 years is far too long for delegated legislation like this, and is not good governance. This is central to much of the criticism of the application of Local Laws they are often authored.			
		Laws – they are often outdated, the review process takes too long and this disincentivises review.  Would prefer to see the system for review reformed. The process for review should be simpler, and approval through the JSC on Delegated Legislation should be abolished or streamlined.			
2.5 Simplifying Approvals for Small Business	and Community Events				
<ul> <li>Inconsistency between local laws and approvals processes for events, street activation, and initiatives by local businesses is frustrating for business and local communities.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Proposed reforms would introduce greater consistency for approvals for:         <ul> <li>alfresco and outdoor dining</li> <li>minor small business signage rules</li> <li>running community events.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SUPPORT  The Town of Victoria Park and the Cities of Canning and Gosnells launched a simplified trading permit for mobile food vendors across 3 LGAs – this is a model that should be adapted for many other regulated activities, to create consistency and convenience for			

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS		
		businesses alike.	and	communities
2.6 Standardised Meeting Procedures, Includ	ling Public Question Time			
<ul> <li>Local governments currently prepare individual standing order local laws.</li> <li>The Local Government Act 1995 and regulations require local governments to allocate time at meetings for questions from the public.</li> <li>Inconsistency among the meeting procedures between local governments is a common source of complaints.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>To provide greater clarity for ratepayers and applicants for decisions made by council, it is proposed that the meeting procedures and standing orders for all local government meetings, including for public question time, are standardised across the State.</li> <li>Regulations would introduce standard requirements for public question time, and the procedures for meetings generally.</li> <li>Members of the public across all local governments would have the same opportunities to address council and ask questions.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT		

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
2.7 Regional Subsidiaries		
<ul> <li>Initiatives by multiple local governments may be managed through formal Regional Councils, or through less formal "organisations of councils", such as NEWROC and WESROC.</li> <li>These initiatives typically have to be managed by a lead local government.</li> <li>In 2016-17, provisions were introduced to allow for the formation of Regional Subsidiaries. Regional Subsidiaries can be formed in line with the Local Government (Regional Subsidiaries) Regulations 2017.</li> <li>So far, no Regional Subsidiary has been formed.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Work is continuing to consider how Regional Subsidiaries can be best established to:         <ul> <li>Enable Regional Subsidiaries to provide a clear and defined public benefit for people within member local governments</li> <li>Provide for flexibility and innovation while ensuring appropriate transparency and accountability of ratepayer funds</li> <li>Where appropriate, facilitate financing of initiatives by Regional Subsidiaries within a reasonable and defined limit of risk</li> <li>Ensure all employees of a Regional Subsidiary have the same employment conditions as those directly employed by member local governments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SUPPORT

Theme 3: Greater Transparency & Accountability

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
3.1 Recordings and Live-Streaming of All Co.	uncil Meetings	
<ul> <li>Currently, local governments are only required to make written minutes of meetings.</li> <li>While there is no legal requirement for livestreaming or video or audio recording of council meetings, many local governments now stream and record their meetings.</li> <li>Complaints relating to behaviours and decisions at meetings constitute a large proportion of complaints about local governments.</li> <li>Local governments are divided into bands with the largest falling in bands 1 and 2, and smaller local governments falling bands 3 and 4. The allocation of local governments into bands is determined by The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal based on factors¹ such as:         <ul> <li>Growth and development</li> <li>Strategic planning issues</li> <li>Demands and diversity of services provided to the community</li> <li>Total expenditure</li> <li>Population</li> <li>Staffing levels.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>record meetings.</li> <li>Band 1 and 2 local governments would be required to livestream meetings, and make video recordings available as public archives.</li> <li>Band 1 and 2 are larger local governments are generally located in larger urban areas, with generally very good telecommunications infrastructure, and many already have audio-visual equipment.</li> <li>Band 1 and 2 local governments would be required to livestream meetings, and make video recordings available as public archives.</li> <li>Several local governments already use platforms such as YouTube, Microsoft Teams, and Vimeo to stream and publish meeting recordings.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See page 3 of the <u>2018 Salaries and Allowance Tribunal Determination</u>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS	
3.2 Recording All Votes in Council Minutes			
<ul> <li>A local government is only required to record which councillor voted for or against a motion in the minutes of that meeting if a request is made by an elected member at the time of the resolution during the meeting.</li> <li>The existing provision does not mandate transparency.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>To support the transparency of decision-making by councillors, it is proposed that the individual votes cast by all councillors for all council resolutions would be required to be published in the council minutes, and identify those for, against, on leave, absent or who left the chamber.</li> <li>Regulations would prescribe how votes are to be consistently minuted.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT	
3.3 Clearer Guidance for Meeting Items that may be Confidential			
<ul> <li>The Act currently provides broad definitions of what type of matters may be discussed as a confidential item.</li> <li>There is limited potential for review of issues managed as confidential items under the current legislation.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Recognising the importance of open and transparent decision-making, it is considered that confidential meetings and confidential meeting items should only be used in limited, specific circumstances.</li> <li>It is proposed to make the Act more specific in prescribing items that may be confidential, and items that should remain open to the public.</li> <li>Items not prescribed as being confidential could still be held as confidential items only with the prior written consent of the Inspector.</li> <li>All confidential items would be required to be audio recorded, with those recordings submitted to the DLGSC.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT Clearer guidelines on confidential items. OPPOSE Do not agree that confidential items required to be audio recorded and submitted to the DLG. This is neither agile, modern or smart. It will be weaponised through FOI applications.	
3.4 Additional Online Registers			
<ul> <li>Local governments are required to provide information to the community through annual reports, council minutes and the publication of information online.</li> <li>Consistent online publication of information can substitute for certain material in annual reports.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed to require local governments to report specific information in online registers on the local government's website. Regulations would prescribe the information to be included.</li> <li>The following new registers, each updated quarterly, are proposed:</li> </ul>	SUPPORT	

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul> <li>Consistency in online reporting across the sector will provide ratepayers with better information.</li> <li>These registers supplement the simplification of financial statements in Theme 6.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lease Register to capture information about the leases the local government is party to (either as lessor or lessee)</li> <li>Community Grants Register to outline all grants and funding provided by the local government</li> <li>Interests Disclosure Register which collates all disclosures made by elected members about their interests related to matters considered by council</li> <li>Applicant Contribution Register accounting for funds collected from applicant contributions, such as cash-in-lieu for public open space and car parking</li> <li>Contracts Register that discloses all contracts above \$100,000.</li> </ul>	
3.5 Chief Executive Officer Key Performance	Indicators (KPIs) be Published	
<ul> <li>It is a requirement of the Local Government Act 1995 that CEO performance reviews are conducted annually.</li> <li>The Model Standards for CEO recruitment and selection, performance review and termination require that a local government must review the performance of the CEO against contractual performance criteria.</li> <li>Additional performance criteria can be used for performance review by agreement between both parties.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>To provide for minimum transparency, it is proposed to mandate that the KPIs agreed as performance metrics for CEOs:         <ul> <li>Be published in council meeting minutes as soon as they are agreed prior to (before the start of the annual period)</li> <li>The KPIs and the results be published in the minutes of the performance review meeting (at the end of the period)</li> <li>The CEO has a right to provide written comments to be published alongside the KPIs and results to provide context as may be appropriate (for instance, the impact of events in that year that may have influenced the results against KPIs).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SUPPORT  Transparency of CEO KPIs will allow the community to understand how the Council is managing the CEO.  Guidance on KPI setting is required.  OPPOSE  I do not support publication of detailed results of CEO performance review process, if that is what is being contemplated in the proposed reforms.

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		It is entirely inappropriate for any part of the Annual Performance Review of a CEO to be made public, except the resolution that acknowledges the review process has occurred. This does not occur in the private sector, nor other levels of government.
		Making this process public will only galvanise disgruntled electors with a grudge against a CEO, embolden elected members in conflict with the CEO to advance their hidden agendas designed to publicly criticise a CEO, and expose CEOs to sector wide approbation and criticism.
		This would undermine the fundamental relationship of trust in the contract of employment between employer and employee.

Theme 4: Stronger Local Democracy and Community Engagement

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS		
4.1 Community and Stakeholder Engagement	4.1 Community and Stakeholder Engagement Charters			
<ul> <li>There is currently no requirement for local governments to have a specific engagement charter or policy.</li> <li>Many local governments have introduced charters or policies for how they will engage with their community.</li> <li>Other States have introduced a specific requirement for engagement charters.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed to introduce a requirement for local governments to prepare a community and stakeholder engagement charter which sets out how local government will communicate processes and decisions with their community.</li> <li>A model Charter would be published to assist local governments who wish to adopt a standard form.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT		
4.2 Ratepayer Satisfaction Surveys (Band 1 and 2 local governments only)				
<ul> <li>Many local governments already commission independent surveying consultants to hold a satisfaction survey of residents/ratepayers.</li> <li>These surveys provide valuable data on the performance of local governments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed to introduce a requirement that every four years, all local governments in bands 1 and 2 hold an independently-managed ratepayer satisfaction survey.</li> <li>Results would be required to be reported publicly at a council meeting and published on the local government's website.</li> <li>All local governments would be required to publish a response to the results.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT		
4.3 Introduction of Preferential Voting				
<ul> <li>The current voting method for local government elections is first past the post.</li> <li>The existing first-past-the-post does not allow for electors to express more than one preference.</li> <li>The candidate with the most votes wins, even if that candidate does not have a majority.</li> <li>Preferential voting better captures the precise intentions of voters and as a result</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Preferential voting is proposed be adopted as the method to replace the current first past the post system in local government elections.</li> <li>In preferential voting, voters number candidates in order of their preferences.</li> <li>Preferential voting is used in State and Federal elections in Western Australia (and in other states). This provides voters with more choice and control over who they elect.</li> <li>All other states use a form of preferential voting for local government.</li> </ul>	Oppose  There is no problem with first past the post voting in local government in WA that needs fixing.  Preferential voting is a key feature of political party systems, where voting is compulsory and local		

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
may be regarded as a fairer and more representative system. Voters have more specific choice.		government is supposed to be apolitical.
opeoille drielee.		There is no evidence in any jurisdictions with preferential but non-compulsory voting that it increases voter turnout, or has a positive effect on fairer representation.
		The better way to create democratic fairness in representation at LG level is COMPULSORY VOTING.
		Preferential voting will politicise local government voting by making it easier for political parties to run candidates and/or for candidates to make deals with each other on preferences.
		The easier it is for political parties to get their candidates elected via preferences, the less independent candidates will be likely to run, and the less representative the councils will become. Councils will also be at risk of becoming puppets of state government.
		It will also make it easier for candidates to organise themselves to run on "tickets", both officially and unofficially, which will result in many

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		votes wasting their votes because they are unaware that the preference deals are done prior to them casting their votes.  The running of "tickets" in LG elections were expressly referred to in the City of Perth Inquiry report as being a root cause of Council dysfunction.
4.4 Public Vote to Elect the Mayor and Presid	lent	
The Act currently allows local governments to have the Presiding Member (the Mayor or President) elected either:  by the electors of the district through a public vote; or  by the council as a resolution at a council meeting.	important public leadership role within their local communities.	SUPPORT
4.5 Tiered Limits on the Number of Councillors		
The number of councillors (between 5-15 councillors) is decided by each local government, reviewed by the Local Government Advisory Board, and if approved by the Minister.	<ul> <li>It is proposed to limit the number of councillors based on the population of the entire local government.</li> <li>Some smaller local governments have already been moving to having smaller councils to reduce costs for ratepayers.</li> <li>The Local Government Panel Report proposed:</li> </ul>	SUPPORT

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
The Panel Report recommended electoral reforms to improve representativeness.	<ul> <li>For a population of up to 5,000 – five councillors (including the President)</li> <li>population of between 5,000 and 75,000 – five to nine councillors (including the Mayor/President)</li> <li>population of above 75,000 – nine to fifteen councillors (including Mayor).</li> </ul>	
4.6 No Wards for Small Councils (Band 3 and	4 Councils only)	
<ul> <li>A local government can make an application to be divided into wards, with councillors elected to those wards.</li> <li>Only about 10% of band 3 and 4 local governments currently have wards.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed that the use of wards for councils in bands 3 and 4 is abolished.</li> <li>Wards increase the complexity of elections, as this requires multiple versions of ballot papers to be prepared for a local government's election.</li> <li>In smaller local governments, the population of wards can be very small.</li> <li>These wards often have councillors elected unopposed, or elect a councillor with a very small number of votes. Some local governments have ward councillors elected with less than 50 votes.</li> <li>There has been a trend in smaller local governments looking to reduce the use of wards, with only 10 councils in bands 3 and 4 still having wards.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT
4.7 Electoral Reform – Clear Lease Requirem	ents for Candidate and Voter Eligibility	
<ul> <li>A person with a lease in a local government district is eligible to nominate as a candidate in that district.</li> <li>A person with a lease in a local government district is eligible to apply to vote in that district.</li> <li>The City of Perth Inquiry Report identified a number of instances where dubious lease arrangements put to question the validity of</li> </ul>	in council elections. Sham leases are where a person creates a lease only to be able to vote or run as a candidate for council.	Good governance demands reform in this area. Recent inquiries have exposed the unlawful use of "leases" to create eligibility to nominate for council. Any restrictions on this loophole is welcome.

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
candidates in local government elections, and subsequently their legitimacy as councillors.	<ul> <li>A minimum lease period of 12 months will be required for anyone to register a person to vote or run for council.</li> <li>Home based businesses will not be eligible to register a person to vote or run for council, because any residents are already the eligible voter(s) for that address.</li> <li>Clarifying the minimum criteria for leases eligible to register a person to vote or run for council.</li> <li>The reforms would include minimum lease periods to qualify as a registered business (minimum of 12 months), and the exclusion of home based businesses (where the resident is already eligible) and very small sub-leases.</li> <li>The basis of eligibility for each candidate (e.g. type of property and suburb of property) is proposed to be published, including in the candidate pack for electors.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT reforms that exclude "sham subleases and leases" from related parties to the candidate.
Candidate profiles can only be 800 characters, including spaces. This is equivalent to approximately 150 words.	<ul> <li>Further work will be undertaken to evaluate how longer candidate profiles could be accommodated.</li> <li>Longer candidate profiles would provide more information to electors, potentially through publishing profiles online.</li> <li>It is important to have sufficient information available to assist electors make informed decisions when casting their vote.</li> </ul>	OPPOSE  This is a bit too short. Often this is the only information available to electors, and they deserve the chance to receive valuable information.  DO SUPPORT consideration of slightly longer profiles for Mayoral elections.

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
4.9 Minor Other Electoral Reforms		
Other minor reforms are proposed to improve local government elections.	Minor other electoral reforms are proposed to include:     The introduction of standard processes for vote recounts if there is a very small margin between candidates (e.g. where there is a margin of less than 10 votes a recount will always be required)     The introduction of more specific rules concerning local government council candidates' use of electoral rolls.	

Theme 5: Clear Roles and Responsibilities

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
5.1 Introduce Principles in the Act		
<ul> <li>The Act does not currently outline specific principles.</li> <li>The Act contains a short "Content and Intent" section only.</li> <li>The Panel Report recommended greater articulation of principles</li> <li>5.2 Greater Role Clarity</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed to include new principles in the Act, including:         <ul> <li>The recognition of Aboriginal Western Australians</li> <li>Tiering of local governments (with bands being as assigned by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal)</li> <li>Community Engagement</li> <li>Financial Management.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>The Act provides for the role of council, councillor, mayor or president and CEO.</li> <li>The role of the council is to:         <ul> <li>govern the local government's affairs</li> <li>be responsible for the performance of the local government's functions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The Local Government Act Review Panel recommended that roles and responsibilities of elected members and senior staff be better defined in law.</li> <li>It is proposed that these roles and responsibilities are further defined in the legislation.</li> <li>These proposed roles will be open to further consultation and input.</li> <li>These roles would be further strengthened through Council Communications Agreements (see item 5.3).</li> </ul>	SUPPORT SUBJECT TO DELOW I
	<ul> <li>5.2.1 - Mayor or President Role</li> <li>It is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of the Mayor or President.</li> <li>While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that the Mayor or President is responsible for: <ul> <li>Representing and speaking on behalf of the whole council and the local government, at all times being consistent with the resolutions of council</li> <li>Facilitating the democratic decision-making of council by presiding at council meetings in accordance with the Act</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	unwillingness of councillors to work

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>Developing and maintaining professional working relationships between councillors and the CEO</li> <li>Performing civic and ceremonial duties on behalf of the local government</li> <li>Working effectively with the CEO and councillors in overseeing the delivery of the services, operations, initiatives and functions of the local government.</li> </ul>	
	5.2.2 - Council Role	
	<ul> <li>It is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of the Council, which is the entity consisting of all of the councillors and led by the Mayor or President.</li> <li>While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that the Council is responsible for:         <ul> <li>Making significant decisions and determining policies through democratic deliberation at council meetings</li> <li>Ensuring the local government is adequately resourced to deliver the local governments operations, services and functions - including all functions that support informed decision-making by council</li> <li>Providing a safe working environment for the CEO;</li> <li>Providing strategic direction to the CEO;</li> <li>Monitoring and reviewing the performance of the local government.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	5.2.3 - Elected Member (Councillor) Role	
	<ul> <li>It is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of all elected councillors.</li> <li>While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that every elected councillor is responsible for:</li> </ul>	

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>Considering and representing, fairly and without bias, the current and future interests of all people who live, work and visit the district (including for councillors elected for a particular ward)</li> <li>Positively and fairly contribute and apply their knowledge, skill, and judgement to the democratic decision-making process of council</li> <li>Applying relevant law and policy in contributing to the decision-making of the council</li> <li>Engaging in the effective forward planning and review of the local governments' resources, and the performance of its operations, services, and functions</li> <li>Communicating the decisions and resolutions of council to stakeholders and the public</li> <li>Developing and maintaining professional working relationships with all other councillors and the CEO</li> <li>Maintaining and developing their knowledge and skills relevant to local government</li> <li>Facilitating public engagement with local government.</li> <li>It is proposed that elected members should not be able to use their title (e.g. "Councillor", "Mayor", or "President") and associated resources of their office (such as email address) unless they are performing their role in their official capacity.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>5.2.4 - CEO Role</li> <li>The Local Government Act 1995 requires local governments to employ a CEO to run the local government administration and implement the decisions of council.</li> <li>To provide greater clarity, it is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of all local government CEOs.</li> </ul>	

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that the CEO of a local government is responsible for:         <ul> <li>Coordinating the professional advice and assistance necessary for all elected members to enable the council to perform its decision-making functions</li> <li>Facilitating the implementation of council decisions</li> <li>Ensuring functions and decisions lawfully delegated by council are managed prudently on behalf of the council</li> <li>Managing the effective delivery of the services, operations, initiatives and functions of the local government determined by the council</li> <li>Providing timely and accurate information and advice to all councillors in line with the Council Communications Agreement (see item 5.3)</li> <li>Overseeing the compliance of the operations of the local government with State and Federal legislation on behalf of the council</li> <li>Implementing and maintaining systems to enable effective planning, management, and reporting on behalf of the council.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
5.3 Council Communication Agreements		
<ul> <li>The Act provides that council and committee members can have access to any information held by the local government that is relevant to the performance of the member in their functions.</li> <li>The availability of information is sometimes a source of conflict within local governments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>In State Government, there are written Communication Agreements between Ministers and agencies that set standards for how information and advice will be provided.</li> <li>It is proposed that local governments will need to have Council Communications Agreements between the council and the CEO.</li> <li>These Council Communication Agreements would clearly specify the information that is to be provided to councillors, how it will be provided, and the timeframes for when it will be provided.</li> </ul>	

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	A template would be published by DLGSC. This default template will come into force if a council and CEO do not make a specific other agreement within a certain timeframe following any election.	
5.4 Local Governments May Pay Superannua	tion Contributions for Elected Members	
<ul> <li>Elected members are eligible to receive sitting fees or an annual allowance.</li> <li>Superannuation is not paid to elected members. However, councillors can currently divert part of their allowances to a superannuation fund.</li> <li>Councils should be reflective and representative of the people living within the district. Local governments should be empowered to remove any barriers to the participation of gender and age diverse people on councils.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed that local governments should be able to decide, through a vote of council, to pay superannuation contributions for elected members. These contributions would be additional to existing allowances.</li> <li>Superannuation is widely recognised as an important entitlement to provide long term financial security.</li> <li>Other states have already moved to allow councils to make superannuation contributions for councillors.</li> <li>Allowing council to provide superannuation is important part of encouraging equality for people represented on council – particularly for women and younger people.</li> <li>Providing superannuation to councillors recognises that the commitment to elected office can reduce a person's opportunity to undertake employment and earn superannuation contributions.</li> </ul>	Support SUPPORT  This should be mandated under the Act to ensure consistency across all LGs, and equal access by all elected members, rather than making it optional for councils.  Making it optional will defeat the purposes behind the superannuation legislation, which is an equitable scheme for all.  Superannuation for elected members will be particularly important for supporting women, and for supporting those who take on Mayoral roles full-time so they are not unfairly disadvantaged for their service and sacrifice of income earning potential.  Lack of superannuation for elected members is a significant and well-documented barrier for women considering elected leadership roles.

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		Those elected to State and Federal Parliament get superannuation. Elected members who sit on statutory bodies like DAPs, WAPC and various statutory boards receive superannuation.
		Councils in Victoria, NSW and Qld receive superannuation.
		Making it mandatory is important because:
		<ol> <li>If it is optional, any decision made by a Council can be changed by a later decision, or it risks becoming an annual cycle of inconsistent contested decisions dependent on the composition of the Council;</li> <li>it will prevent the issue becoming weaponised against individuals during elections.</li> </ol>
5.5 Local Governments May Establish Education	tion Allowances	
<ul> <li>Local government elected members must complete mandatory training.</li> <li>There is no specific allowance for undertaking further education.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Local governments will have the option of contributing to the education expenses for councillors, up to a defined maximum value, for tuition costs for further education that is directly related to their role on council.</li> <li>Councils will be able to decide on a policy for education expenses, up to a maximum yearly value for each councillor. Councils may also decide not to make this entitlement available to elected members.</li> </ul>	CONCERNS  Clear limitations are needed about what education should be paid for by a LG. Education allowances cannot be used for rorting public
	Shadinon available to dicolor members.	money to provide generalist skills

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<ul> <li>Any allowance would only be able to be used for tuition fees for courses, such as training programs, diplomas, and university studies, which relate to local government.</li> <li>Where it is made available, this allowance will help councillors further develop skills to assist with making informed decisions on important questions before council, and also provide professional development opportunities for councillors.</li> </ul>	and experience to assist the elected member to secure paid employment or positions elsewhere, during or after a council term.
5.6 Standardised Election Caretaker period		
<ul> <li>There is currently no requirement for a formal caretaker period, with individual councils operating under their own policies and procedures.</li> <li>This is commonly a point of public confusion.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A statewide caretaker period for local governments is proposed.</li> <li>All local governments across the State would have the same clearly defined election period, during which:         <ul> <li>Councils do not make major decisions with criteria to be developed defining 'major'</li> <li>Incumbent councillors who nominate for re-election are not to represent the local government, act on behalf of the council, or use local government resources to support campaigning activities.</li> <li>There are consistent election conduct rules for all candidates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	CONCERN  The statement that "Incumbent councillors who nominate for reelection are not to represent the local government or act on behalf of the council" should not be maintained if it is intended to mean that a Mayor or Deputy Mayor are unable to perform their statutory roles under the Act during the caretaker period. That would be contrary to the legislative scheme.
5.7 Remove WALGA from the Act		
<ul> <li>The Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) is constituted under the Local Government Act 1995.</li> <li>The Local Government Panel Report and the Select Committee Report included this recommendation.</li> </ul>	WALGA not be constituted under the Local Government Act 1995.	SUPPORT  WALGA is a voluntary professional association for the sector. There is no apparent reason why WALGA should be included the LG Act.

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
5.8 CEO Recruitment		
<ul> <li>Recent amendments introduced provisions to standardise CEO recruitment.</li> <li>The recruitment of a CEO is a very important decision by a local government.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is proposed that DLGSC establishes a panel of approved panel members to perform the role of the independent person on CEO recruitment panels.</li> <li>Councils will be able to select an independent person from the approved list.</li> <li>Councils will still be able to appoint people outside of the panel with the approval of the Inspector.</li> </ul>	I support the appointment of an independent person on CEO recruitment committees/panels.  OPPOSE  The establishment of panels by the DLG is unnecessary regulation of the sector, and likely to be costly. LGs can recruit independent members in the usual way by public advertising.

Theme 6: Improved Financial Management and Reporting

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS	
6.1 Model Financial Statements and Tiered Fi	6.1 Model Financial Statements and Tiered Financial Reporting		
<ul> <li>The financial statements published in the Annual Report is the main financial reporting currently published by local governments.</li> <li>Reporting obligations are the same for large (Stirling, Perth, Fremantle) and small (Sandstone, Wiluna, Dalwallinu) local governments, even though they vary significantly in complexity.</li> <li>The Office of the Auditor General has said that some existing reporting requirements are unnecessary or onerous - for instance, information that is not relevant to certain local governments, or that is a duplicate of other published information.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>accountability in local government. The public rightly expects the highest standards of integrity, good governance, and prudent financial management in local government.</li> <li>It is critically important that clear information about the financial position of local governments is openly available to ratepayers. Financial information also supports community decision-making about local government services and projects.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT	

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	Simpler Strategic and Financial Planning (item 6.2) would also improve the budgeting process.	
6.2 Simplify Strategic and Financial Planning		
<ul> <li>Requirements for plans are outlined in the Local Government Financial Management and Administration Regulations.</li> <li>There is also the Integrated Planning and Reporting (IPR) framework.</li> <li>While many councils successfully apply IPR to their budgeting and reporting, IPR may seem complicated or difficult, especially for smaller local governments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Having clear information about the finances of local government is an important part of enabling informed public and ratepayer engagement and input to decision-making.</li> <li>The framework for financial planning should be based around information being clear, transparent, and easy to understand for all ratepayers and members of the public.</li> <li>In order to provide more consistency and clarity across the State, it is proposed that greater use of templates is introduced to make planning and reporting clearer and simpler, providing greater transparency for ratepayers.</li> <li>Local governments would be required to adopt a standard set of plans, and there will be templates published by the DLGSC for use or adaption by local governments.</li> <li>It is proposed that the plans that are required are:         <ul> <li>Simplified Council Plans that replace existing Strategic Community Plans and set high-level objectives, with a new plan required at least every eight years. These will be short-form plans, with a template available from the DLGSC</li> <li>Simplified Asset Management Plans to consistently forecast costs of maintaining the local government's assets. A new plan will be required at least every ten years, though local government gains or disposes of major assets (e.g. land, buildings, or roads). A template will be provided, and methods of valuations will be simplified to reduce red tape</li> <li>Simplified Long Term Financial Plans will outline any long term financial management and sustainability</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SUPPORT

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	issues, and any investments and debts. A template will be provided, and these plans will be required to be reviewed in detail at least every four years  A new Rates and Revenue Policy (see item 6.3) that identifies the approximate value of rates that will need to be collected in future years (referencing the Asset Management Plan and Long Term Financial Plan) – providing a forecast to ratepayers (updated at least every four years)  The use of simple, one-page Service Proposals and Project Proposals that outline what proposed services or initiatives will cost, to be made available through council meetings. These will become Service Plans and Project Plans added to the yearly budget if approved by council. This provides clear transparency for what the functions and initiatives of the local government cost to deliver. Templates will be available for use by local governments.	
6.3 Rates and Revenue Policy		
<ul> <li>Local governments are not required to have a rates and revenue policy.</li> <li>Some councils defer rate rises, resulting in the eventual need to drastically raise rates to cover unavoidable costs – especially for the repair of infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The Rates and Revenue Policy is proposed to increase transparency for ratepayers by linking rates to basic operating costs and the minimum costs for maintaining essential infrastructure.</li> <li>A Rates and Revenue Policy would be required to provide ratepayers with a forecast of future costs of providing local government services.</li> <li>The Policy would need to reflect the Asset Management Plan and the Long Term Financial Plan (see item 6.2), providing a forecast of what rates would need to be, to cover unavoidable costs.</li> <li>A template would be published for use or adaption by all local governments.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	• The <u>Local Government Panel Report</u> included this recommendation.	
6.4 Monthly Reporting of Credit Card Stateme	ents	
<ul> <li>No legislative requirement.</li> <li>Disclosure requirements brought in by individual councils have shown significant reduction of expenditure of funds.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The statements of a local government's credit cards used by local government employees will be required to be tabled at council at meetings on a monthly basis.</li> <li>This provides oversight of incidental local government spending.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT
6.5 Amended Financial Ratios		
<ul> <li>Local governments are required to report seven ratios in their ann</li> <li>ual financial statements.</li> <li>These are reported on the MyCouncil website.</li> <li>These ratios are intended to provide an indication of the financial health of every local government.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Financial ratios will be reviewed in detail, building on work already underway by the DLGSC.</li> <li>The methods of calculating ratios and indicators will be reviewed to ensure that the results are accurate and useful.</li> </ul>	SUPPORT
6.6 Audit Committees		
<ul> <li>Local governments must establish an Audit Committee that has three or more persons, with the majority to be council members.</li> <li>The Audit Committee is to guide and assist the local government in carrying out the local government's functions in relation to audits conducted under the Act.</li> <li>The Panel Report identified that Audit Committees should be expanded, including to provide improved risk management.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>To ensure independent oversight, it is proposed the Chair of any Audit Committee be required to be an independent person who is not on council or an employee of the local government.</li> <li>Audit Committees would also need to consider proactive risk management.</li> <li>To reduce costs, it is proposed that local governments should be able to establish shared Regional Audit Committees.</li> <li>The Committees would be able to include council members but would be required to include a majority of independent members and an independent chairperson.</li> </ul>	An independent Chair of Audit is appropriate.  OPPOSE  DO NOT support a requirement for a majority of independent committee members because:  1. the Act makes Councillors responsible for oversight of the allocation of financial resources and

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
6.7 Building Upgrade Finance		performance of the LG's functions so this would result in an abdication of that statutory responsibility by elected members;  2. independent members are not elected so no obligations to the community;  3. independent members will never be privy to all the workings of the LG the way elected members are, and therefore have less information and less understanding on which to base their decisions.
<ul> <li>The local government sector has sought reforms that would enable local governments to provide loans to property owners to finance for building improvements.</li> <li>This is not currently provided for under the Act.</li> <li>The Local Government Panel Report included this recommendation.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>third parties for specific building improvements - such as cladding, heritage and green energy fixtures.</li> <li>This would allow local governments to lend funds to improve buildings within their district.</li> </ul>	OPPOSE  This would be an inappropriate use of public money and involved LGs in the financial services market, without sufficient evidence of benefits to the community at large.
<ul> <li>6.8 Cost of Waste Service to be Specified on</li> <li>No requirement for separation of waste changes on rates notice.</li> <li>Disclosure will increase ratepayer awareness of waste costs.</li> <li>The Review Panel Report included this recommendation.</li> </ul>		SUPPORT