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1. Introduction

We detail below the rationale for this companion report, an overview of the evaluation purpose and objectives, the case study method and the structure of the case study summaries.

1.1 Report purpose

The companion report contains descriptive and analytical information that support the principal report: “Evaluating the Department of Internal Affairs’ (the Department) Facilitation of the Central / Local Government Interface in the Community Outcomes Process.”

The companion report details case summaries from eight regions across New Zealand. A case study method was used to elicit how the Department of Internal Affairs (the Department) has facilitated the central / local government interface in the community outcomes process, and to identify the short-term impacts.

We detail below the background to the evaluation, its purpose and objectives, and the case study method.

1.2 Background to the evaluation

The Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) requires local government to identify and promote community outcomes by working collaboratively with their community, businesses, central government agencies and other organisations. In contrast, central government agencies are not legislatively prescribed to do this. However, government policy does encourage them to work with local government to achieve mutually desirable community outcomes.

Cabinet directed the Department to facilitate the central / local government interface on the community outcomes process\(^1\). Commencing in November 2004, the Department’s Local Government and Community Branch under Operations established a number of roles and initiatives to facilitate this interface. This includes an interface team consisting of:

- The Director of Operations offering strategic overview and management
- Four relationship managers brokering and facilitating local and central government, at a local, regional and national level
- One information broker establishing and managing infrastructure to support the flow of up-to-date information between local and central government
- A policy analyst gathering and analysing information about the interface to assist in planning, developing, interpreting and reviewing of relevant policy.

The interface team support the following initiatives:

- A website – [www.localcentral.govt.nz](http://www.localcentral.govt.nz) – containing information and contacts about central and local government

---

\(^1\) Cabinet Policy Committee: Central Government Engagement in Community Outcomes Process; POL MIN (04) 12/15 summarised in section 3.2.1.
An annual workshop facilitating discussions between central and local government on the community outcomes process

A forum of central government agencies - Central Government Interagency Group - discussing engagement with local government on the community outcomes process

Other supporting communication mechanisms encouraging local and central government engagement on community outcomes including newsletters, an e-mail discussion group, and regional seminars.

1.3 Evaluation objectives

Cabinet directed the Department, in conjunction with the State Services Commission and Treasury, to monitor and evaluate the facilitation of the central and local government interface regarding the community outcomes process.

Focusing on the period from 1 January 2005 to 30 June 2006, the three high level evaluation objectives were to:

1. Describe the implementation of the Department’s role in facilitating the central/local government interface regarding the community outcomes process, and central government agencies’ engagement with this initiative

2. Assess the short-term impacts of the Department’s role in facilitating the central/local government interface regarding the community outcomes process

3. Consider the focus of the Department’s facilitation function given the current status of the community outcomes process and the future needs of the sector.

The analytical framework for this evaluation focuses on two levels:

- Services: implementation and effects of the roles and initiatives established by the Department to facilitate the central and local government interface
- Overall function: identifying short-term impacts, attributable to the Department, of local and central government seeking to work together on the identification and promotion of community outcomes.

The case studies focus primarily on the second analysis level describing the Department’s contribution to facilitating central and local government to work together on the community outcomes process.

1.4 Case study method

The evaluation comprised of four key components: 1) internal stakeholder discussions, 2) review of documentation, 3) interviews with central government agencies, and 4) case studies. The case study method is detailed below.

A case study approach was used to gain input from local government and central government staff based locally and regionally focusing on their:

- Interactions with the Department in facilitating central and local government to work together on the community outcomes process over the last 18 months
- Future needs in relation to their community outcomes, and the Department’s role in meeting these needs.
The case summaries also draw from supporting literature on demography, the community outcomes process, and Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Cases were selected to offer:
- A mix of geography, (i.e. urban, provincial and rural)
- Local versus regional community outcomes processes, (i.e. a local authority undertaking the development of their community outcomes independently versus a collective of local and regional authorities developing regional community outcomes)
- Variation in engagement with the Department, (i.e. intense engagement to minimal)
- Size of local authority, (i.e. small, medium, large)
- Spread of relationship managers, (i.e. South Island, lower North Island, central North Island and northern)
- Perceived contribution of the Department to central and local government working together on community outcomes, (i.e. a significant contribution to minimal).

The following eight local government cases were selected:
1. Community Outcomes Bay of Plenty (COBOP)
2. Rangitikei District Council
3. Choosing Futures Waikato
4. Our Way Southland
5. Waitakere City Council
6. Canterbury Community Plans Group
7. Future Taranaki
8. Tomorrow’s Manukau.

Litmus conducted:
- 30 interviews with local government participants across 24 local authorities – representing over a quarter of the 85 local authorities in New Zealand
- 13 interviews with participants from 6 central government agencies based regionally.

Interviews were conducted between 21 August and 12 September 2006, and 3 to 6 people were interviewed per case.

Note: The case studies are not representative of all local government perspectives of the Department’s contribution to the community outcomes process. At a regional level, there are many contributions to the community outcomes process. However, the focus of the case studies is to summarise the process, and to identify the Department’s contribution to facilitate local government and central government’s interaction in the community outcomes process.

Appendix 1 details the recruitment specification and interviews conducted for each case study. Appendix 2 contains the research tools.
1.5 Short-term impact framework

To reiterate, the case study summaries describe the Department’s interaction with local government in facilitating engagement with central government in relation to the community outcomes process, and assesses the Department against the short-term impact framework\(^2\).

Summarised below is the short-term impact framework surfaced for local government on the Department’s contribution in encouraging and supporting central and local government to work together on the community outcomes process. The short-term impacts are:

- **Connecting:** The Department’s interface team identifying opportunities for central and local government to work together on mutually beneficial community outcomes, and bringing the parties together

- **Creating relevance:** The Department’s interface team promoting greater appreciation amongst local government of the contribution central government can bring, as well as their wider roles, responsibilities and constraints in engaging around community outcomes

- **Smoothing engagement:** The Department’s interface team making it easy for local and central government to work together on community outcomes through gentle facilitation of the process, and the supply of resources such as people and money

- **Sharing good practice:** The Department’s interface team:
  - Gathering and disseminating examples of good practice about central and local government engagement around community outcomes
  - Identifying and addressing local government’s information needs or issues relating to community outcomes and/or engagement with central government.

1.6 Case study summary structure

The case study summaries are structured as follows:

- Introduction detailing reasons for selection
- Demographic profile of the case study
- Historical context detailing community and central government engagement in this region before the introduction of the Local Government Act in 2002
- The community outcomes process used
- The Department’s facilitation of central and local government interface in this region
- Assessment of the Department’s contribution summarising what worked using the short-term impact framework of connecting, creating relevance, smoothing engagement, and sharing good practice. It also offers improvement focused suggestions derived from what did not work
- Future directions summarising local government’s needs in relation to community outcomes and the Department’s role in meeting these needs
- Conclusions.

\(^2\) See Appendix 3 for draft intervention logic from which these short-term impacts derive.
Community Outcomes Bay of Plenty (COBOP)

Introduction

COBOP is a regional initiative comprising a group of local and central government representatives whose purpose is to progress community outcomes in the Bay of Plenty region.

COBOP was selected to provide a case study of local and central government working together on a regional community outcomes process. This case study illustrates the Department’s co-ordination and facilitation of central and local government partnerships in COBOP.

This case study draws from interviews with the Department’s relationship manager and individuals from Tauranga City Council, Whakatane District Council, Environment Bay of Plenty, Opotiki District Council, Rotorua District Council, the Ministry of Social Development (regional office) and the Lakes District Health Board, as well as from supporting documentation, such as website information and Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Demographic profile

The Bay of Plenty region covers 12,447 square kilometres and covers the area stretching from Turangi in the south to Katikati in the North, Whakatane and Opotiki in the east and to the town of Tokoroa in the west. There is one regional local authority in the Bay of Plenty and eight territorial local authorities within the region: Western Bay, Whakatane, Kawerau, Opotiki, Rotorua, Taupo and South Waikato District Councils, and the Tauranga City Council.

In 2001, the Bay of Plenty region had a total population of 239,412, of which 78.2% identified as European and 20% of the population live in rural areas.\(^3\)

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-Act

Before the introduction of the Act, community consultation in the Bay of Plenty region tended to be around pre-determined matters (e.g. infrastructure), rather than community engagement to inform strategic planning. An example of the latter is the Western Bay of Plenty District Council, who since 1995, has undertaken this more intensive level of community engagement.

Local government’s engagement with central government, before the Act’s introduction, was infrequent and tended to focus on environment or infrastructural issues on an ‘as-needs-basis’. For smaller local authorities, engagement with central government was particularly infrequent, (e.g. in the aftermath of a natural disaster). Further, there was minimal interaction with central government about social issues, which local government tended to view as matters for central government agencies to address.

\(^3\) Statistics New Zealand. The 2001 census data has been used throughout this report as regional community data available on the Statistics NZ website does not appear as fully for 2006 as compared to 2001.
Examples of the following relationships existed between local and central government:

- **The Bay of Plenty Regional Intersectoral Forum**, facilitated by Te Puni Kokiri, focused on seeking to encourage central and local government to work together. In retrospect, this forum is perceived as lacking clarity of focus and traction as it was not results orientated.

- **Ishare BOP - the Bay of Plenty Monitoring and Reporting Information Forum** - was established in 2002. The focus of this group was information and data management issues, and environmental monitoring.

- The Ministry of Social Development was the main central government agency represented in the region and assisted local government with funding and advice on regional social and economic issues.

The introduction of the Act in 2002 broadened the issues dealt with by local government, and saw regional collaboration in identifying community outcomes. The next section discusses the Bay of Plenty community outcomes process.

**Bay of Plenty community outcomes process**

Between 2003 and mid-2005, local and sub-regional community outcomes were identified by individual local authority’s in conjunction with Environment Bay of Plenty, as well as at a sub-regional level. Examples of sub-regional community outcomes processes include:

- **Eastern Bay Beyond Today** - In 2004, Whakatane, Kawerau and Opotiki District Councils, along with Environment Bay of Plenty, combined resources to develop sub-regional community outcomes with assistance from the Ministry of Social Development. Each of these local authorities then consulted on and refined the sub-regional community outcomes to develop their local district outcomes.

- **Smartgrowth** – Approved in 2004. Tauranga City Council, the Western Bay of Plenty District Council and Environment Bay of Plenty worked together, parallel to the community outcomes process, to develop a sub-regional planning tool to manage growth in the Western Bay. Through this initiative, local government developed strong connections to central government agencies in Wellington with a particular interest in this strategy.

Following the development of local and sub-regional community outcomes, Environment Bay of Plenty developed the regional community outcomes in consultation with the Bay of Plenty community.

Through the community development process, larger local authorities existing relationships with central government were drawn on and enhanced. However, some local authorities (particularly smaller local authorities) continued to struggle to get central government agencies to stakeholder forums about their community outcomes. Further, it was difficult to get some central government agencies with no existing relationships involved. Local authorities began to realise that some central government agencies did not have the resources to liaise directly with individual councils. This was one factor driving the need for the establishment of a regional forum such as COBOP, which is discussed below.
COBOP

In March 2005, COBOP was developed from an initial forum between local and central government representatives in the Bay of Plenty. COBOP was initiated by the Ministry of Social Development. With most local authorities having already identified their community outcomes by this time, COBOP came together to determine how the two sectors could work together to facilitate progress towards community outcomes within the region.

COBOP has representation from all of the local authorities in the Bay of Plenty region: Environment Bay of Plenty, the District Councils of Kawerau, Opotiki, South Waikato, Taupo, Western Bay of Plenty, Whakatane and Rotorua and from the Tauranga City Council. Lakes District Health Board and the Bay of Plenty District Health Board are also members of COBOP, as are at least 20 other central government agencies, for example the Ministry of Social Development, New Zealand Police, Housing New Zealand Corporation, Sport and Recreation New Zealand, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise, Department of Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

COBOP’s Governance Group consists of representatives of Chief Executive Officers, regional commissioners or managers from each local and central government agency. Its purpose is to oversee the direction and activities of COBOP, and to approve action plans put forward by the working group. COBOP’s Governance Group meets three times a year, which aligns with the Act’s prescription of tri-annual regional meetings between local government and central government agencies. Local and central government meet separately on a set day each quarter, and then come together later that day to hold the COBOP governance meeting.

The working group consists of strategic planners with representation from various central government agencies and local government who meet monthly to determine the planning framework and to implement activities.

A number of sub-groups sit under the working group, including a monitoring and reporting group to develop an evidenced-based framework to determine, monitor and assess progress on community outcomes in the region, at both a local and regional level.

In March 2006, COBOP’s ‘Terms of Reference’ was signed by all local authorities and 17 central government agencies. It was developed by the Ministry of Social Development, and set out the purposes, principles and procedures of COBOP. The Ministry of Social Development also managed the signatory process.

COBOP has identified common priority areas for collaboration on community outcomes across the region. The working group currently has initiated sub-projects to realise the community outcomes within the social wellbeing dimension, including:

- Healthy Eating Healthy Action (HEHA)
- Housing
- Safer communities (WHO accreditation).

A start has also been made to identify the focus in the economic wellbeing area and an Economic Transformation subgroup has been established. It is intended that an environmental workstream will start in early 2007.
The Department, through the relationship manager, co-ordinates and facilitates the governance and working party process for COBOP. It is intended that a fulltime administrator/co-ordinator is appointed to COBOP, funded primarily by the Ministry of Social Development. The relationship manager will continue to strategically facilitate central and local government engagement in COBOP and across the region.

The next section discusses the Department’s role in the region and in COBOP.

The Department’s facilitation of central and local government engagement

In late 2004, local authorities in the Bay of Plenty were introduced to the Department’s relationship manager, who was not from the area and was responsible for covering the entire North Island. At this time, this relationship manager assisted some local authorities in the early stages of their community outcomes process, and contributed to local and central government facilitation by:

- Facilitating one of the stakeholder forums for Eastern Bay Beyond Today
- Attending the first and some subsequent meetings of COBOP
- Smoothing relationships and tensions between central and local government in regional forums.

In September 2005, the Department appointed a relationship manager for the central North Island. The relationship manager was well known in the area having worked previously for the Rotorua District Council. Despite the establishment of COBOP six months earlier, the relationship manager had a crucial role in its ongoing success, through:

- Sharing relevant information about the community outcomes process
- Clarifying expectations between central government agencies and local government
- Connecting central and local government through identifying mutually beneficial outcomes, (e.g. bringing a new central government agency into COBOP, bringing Ministers into the region, inviting another central agency to do a road-show in the region, and by talking to central government about developing guidance materials relative to community outcomes).

The different ways the relationship manager has undertaken her role within COBOP are discussed below:

**COBOP co-ordinator**

In the absence of a co-ordinator, the relationship manager has maintained the smooth running of COBOP by acting as an extra resource across both the working and governance groups. The relationship manager develops documents, prepares agendas and attends meetings. She is also recognised as having worked with local government officers to keep the framework for COBOP together at the working party level.
COBOP’s Terms of Reference is symbolic in its representation of a large number of central and local government agencies signing up to work collaboratively. The relationship manager has been involved in encouraging some signatories to commit to the document.

COBOP’s Governance Group

COBOP’s Governance Group meets three times a year and has a short timeframe within which to be informed of matters and to make decisions. Chairing is undertaken by local government Chief Executives. The relationship manager is recognised as making the chairing process manageable through the provision of advice and co-ordination. The relationship manager also co-ordinates information and documentation for the Governance Group about the activities, progress and needs of the working group.

COBOP working group

The relationship manager has managed, co-ordinated and kept the COBOP working group on track. This included taking a firm line and highlighting relevance when things have lost traction.

COBOP workshop

The relationship manager was instrumental in setting up and managing a workshop which resulted in determining central and local government’s mutual interest in the regional community outcomes relating to social development and how to work together on these areas of common interest.

The identification of common interests and goals led to one District Health Board incorporating a community outcome related project, (i.e. Healthy Eating Healthy Action) into its Statement of Intent and work plans. COBOP also received funding from the Ministry of Health to promote the Healthy Eating plan. This funding was used by COBOP’s members to determine initiatives to support and model healthy eating habits with their staff.

Other initiatives involving the Department

The relationship manager regularly attends Zone 2 meetings. Through attendance at these regional meetings the relationship manager has explained and promoted community outcomes and the Department’s role to elected representatives in the region.

Participants are also aware of, and have used to a limited extent, the Department’s other services to facilitate engagement with central government and to view information relevant to community outcomes, including:

- The annual workshops which offer connecting and information sharing opportunities
- Communication materials providing information on the Act. Some local authorities use these materials to provide general information to their community
- Statistics New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminars
The website, www.localcentral.govt.nz, as a general source of information and to obtain central government contact details; used more in the earlier stages of the community outcomes process.

Having described above the Department’s interaction with local government in the Bay of Plenty and in COBOP, the next section below summarises the Department’s effectiveness in this role.

Assessment of the Department’s contribution

Initially, the Department’s facilitation potential in the Bay of Plenty was treated with some scepticism, given their limited resourcing and late arrival in the community outcomes process, (i.e. one relationship manager covering the North Island). There was also a lack of awareness of the extent of the relationship manager role, and the contribution the Department could make in seeking to engage with central government. Perceptions of the Department’s role were further undermined through some initial miscommunication about the Act, and a lack of regional knowledge. For smaller local authorities, there was little direct contact and assistance from the Department at a local level.

Since taking up the role, the relationship manager has been instrumental in maintaining COBOP’s momentum, smoothing engagement between central and local government, coordinating COBOP’s process, as well as initiating the development of future projects based around mutually beneficial outcomes. However, some local authorities currently perceive the relationship manager to be overloaded therefore they are reluctant to approach for assistance with issues arising.

Detailed below are short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region.

**Connecting:** The Department has identified opportunities for central and local government to work together to further community outcomes, and has introduced central government agencies to the region and to COBOP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Providing opportunities for engagement and provision of knowledge to develop relationships with central government agencies</td>
<td>• Continuing to seek ways to connect with ‘harder to reach’ central government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating awareness of the right people to engage with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“By having a connection through to Wellington, through the relationship manager and the Department, you get a fast track service to meeting central government agencies.” (Local authority)

“The relationship manager makes connections between people – she tries to bring others to the table. She tries to see where you might need someone else plugged in, if there’s something in the community outcomes that’s relevant for another agency and she tries and make connections to them.” (Local authority)
Creating relevance: The Department creates relevance for local government in the Bay of Plenty through a better understanding of central government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing local government understanding of central government’s position and processes around community outcomes</td>
<td>Creating relevance for non-regionally based central government agencies to be involved in community outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging reluctant central government agency to remain a member of COBOP</td>
<td>Communicating situations in which the Department could proactively assist in approaching central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying and managing local government’s expectations of central government</td>
<td>Managing potential conflict between differing initiatives seeking central and local government attention, (i.e. COBOP, Smartgrowth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying areas of common interest to develop collaborative activities and projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The Department is educating central and local government about each others processes and how they might fit with each other.” (Local authority)

Smoothing engagement: The Department made easy the process of engaging between central and local government, maintaining commitment and enabling COBOP’s progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating central and local government to work together at an appropriate and comfortable pace</td>
<td>None: Continue making the process easy until interaction and engagement is more embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making easy the potentially complex process of getting people working together on COBOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging some central government agencies to commit to COBOP’s Terms of Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Without the relationship manager, COBOP would not have come together as quickly or as painlessly. She is able to pick up the hot spots and to dampen these down.” (Local authority)

Sharing good practice: The Department’s provision of information about the Act, and other community outcomes processes across New Zealand had limited use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing local government about the Act and other community outcomes processes. Less useful for local authorities more advanced in their community outcomes process</td>
<td>Capturing and sharing best practice after following first round of community outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timely sharing of good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing accurate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working together with agencies, such as Local Government New Zealand, to ensure consistency of message and to avoid duplication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The Department provided guidance on the legislation which was quite good – it helped show councillors what was required.” (Local authority)
Future directions

Over the next 12 months, two specific areas of focus are consistently mentioned for COBOP:

- Seeing success, (e.g. producing results and demonstrating how projects, such as Healthy Eating Healthy Action, contribute to community outcomes)
- Having the right level of people attending COBOP meetings, (e.g. those with the knowledge and authority to make decisions).

Overall, those local and central government agencies interviewed in the Bay of Plenty recognise the importance of continuing COBOP’s success through maintaining relationships, and looking towards the next community outcomes cycle. The continuation of the Department’s facilitative role is therefore required.

There is a common desire for projects to be realised and for successes to be visibly apparent. The Department’s future role is therefore seen in terms of starting the initial facilitation and co-ordination of projects. Specifically, the future focus for the Department is seen as:

- Providing assistance to COBOP by initially co-ordinating new projects to enable it to progress from processes to results
- Capturing and sharing good practice examples from around the county from the first full community outcomes process and identifying priorities and projects
- Maintaining involvement in COBOP and commitment from both central and local government to remain engaged.

Conclusions

The Department’s facilitation has made an important contribution to the success of COBOP, and the engagement of local and central government at a regional level in the Bay of Plenty. The relationship manager is seen as the ‘all essential glue’ that has kept central and local government engaging together and COBOP running smoothly. The Department is seen as less effective in facilitating engagement at a local level.

Going forward, the facilitation role of the Department is needed to maintain the success of COBOP, and also to continue connecting other central government agencies to local government and the community outcomes process. Moving to a project focus and achieving successes in meeting community outcomes is an important drive for the region.
Rangitikei District Council

Introduction

The Rangitikei District Council case study was selected to illustrate the Department’s effectiveness in connecting a small rural local authority with central government agencies based in Wellington. To explore the Department’s interaction through regional forums, and differing engagement needs based on capacity and stage in the community outcomes process, interviews were also conducted with Wanganui District and Palmerston North City Councils.

This case study draws from interviews with the Department’s relationship manager and individuals from Rangitikei District Council, Wanganui District Council, Palmerston North City Council, and the Ministry of Social Development (regional office), as well as supporting documentation such as Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Demographic profile

Rangitikei District Council is part of the Manawatu-Wanganui region, which also includes the districts of Ruapehu, Wanganui, Manawatu, Horowhenua, and Tararua, and Palmerston North City.

The Rangitikei district is a small rural district, in which the Rangitikei River forms the area’s most important geographic landmark. The district consists of 11 main centres of which Marton, Bulls and Taihape are the largest. The district’s governance structure consists of a District Council (Rangitikei District Council), two Community Boards (Ratana and Taihape) and two Community Committees (Bulls and Hunterville).

In 2001, the Rangitikei district had a total population of 15,002, of which 83.7% identified as European. The unemployment rate was 7.1%, and median income $16,3004.

In contrast, Wanganui district and Palmerston North have significantly larger populations. In 2001:

- Wanganui District had a population of 43,266, of which 84.3% identified as European, there was a median income of $14,800, and an unemployment rate of 9.7%
- Palmerston North City had a population of 72,033, of which 85.2% identified as European, there was a median income of $17,200, and an unemployment rate of 8.4%.

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-Act

Before the Act, Rangitikei District Council had no community engagement process, and its interaction with central government was limited.

---

4 Statistics New Zealand
Rangitikei District Council identified the following challenges around engaging with central government:

- Limited internal capacity to connect
- Few central government offices based in Marton
- Few existing channels to contact central government
- Not knowing the right person to contact or how to contact
- Perceived reluctance by central government to engage with them.

In contrast, both Wanganui District and Palmerston North City Councils had undertaken community engagement before 2002:

- Wanganui District Council commenced their ‘Community Priorities’ process in 1997. This involved consulting with the community about its priorities through neighbourhood meetings.
- Palmerston North City Council has developed and monitored community outcomes through their ‘City Vision’ initiative since 1995. This involved extensive community consultation and resident surveys to contribute to the development of a vision for Palmerston North.

The presence of central government agencies in Wanganui and Palmerston North has resulted in relationships and regional networks that pre-date the Act. These relationships are supported by the Regional Interagency Network, a group spearheaded by Palmerston North City Council which also includes Horowhenua and Manawatu District Councils. The Department’s Community Development and Funding Advisors occasionally attend this group.

The Regional Interagency Network brings together central and local government stakeholders to identify collaborative opportunities, (e.g. a region-wide joint initiative around methamphetamine). The Ministry of Social Development was a key early facilitator of this group, providing resources, identifying key stakeholders and encouraging information sharing.

The next section discusses the development of the community outcomes process in Rangitikei.

**Rangitikei District Council’s community outcomes process**

Unlike regions such as Taranaki or Southland, a regional community outcomes process was not adopted by the local authorities across the Manawatu-Wanganui region. This reflects the geographic and demographic diversity, and the presence of two cities in the region. Consequently, local authorities opted to undertake their own community outcomes process.

In late 2004, Rangitikei District Council commenced its community outcomes process. The process was led internally by a policy manager and two policy analysts. Table 1 lists the key stages of this process.
### Table 1: Overview of Rangitikei District Council’s community outcomes process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early 2005</td>
<td>Establishment phase</td>
<td>Steering group, comprising of senior local authority management, Councillor representatives, and a representative of the local authority’s iwi Committee, agreed the community outcomes process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-Mar 2005</td>
<td>Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>Letters sent to key stakeholders seeking their input into the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr 2005</td>
<td>Communications campaign</td>
<td>Comprehensive community campaign about community outcomes and its process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-Jun 2005</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>Series of ten focus groups with key communities including: agricultural, business, elderly, iwi and central government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-Sept 2005</td>
<td>Prioritising outcomes</td>
<td>A district-wide resident survey to prioritise outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2006</td>
<td>Central government forum</td>
<td>Presentation of identified community outcomes to central government in Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>Development of Long-Term Council Community Plan</td>
<td>Release of Long-Term Council Community Plan in June 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At a regional level, information is shared about the community outcomes process through the **Regional Community Outcomes Group**. Strategic policy and planning officers from local authorities across the Manawatu-Wanganui region meet monthly to exchange information and share their practices of community engagement, consultation and community outcomes monitoring.

The next section discusses the Department’s role in Rangitikei District Council’s community outcomes process.

### The Department’s facilitation of central and local government interface

Commencing around June 2005, the Department’s interface team facilitated the engagement of central government agencies with Rangitikei District Council through a number of local and regional mechanisms:

- A central government focus group held in Marton
- A central government forum held in Wellington
- Regional Community Outcomes Group

In contrast, the Department’s interaction with Wanganui District Council and Palmerston North City Council has been more limited. Following initial face-to-face introductions from the
relationship manager on their role, the majority of ongoing contact has been through regional meetings. These local authorities did not perceive a direct need for the Department’s facilitation role, given their:

- Advancement in the community outcomes process
- Internal capacity to manage the process
- Existing relationships with central government based regionally.

However, Wanganui District Council and Palmerston North City Council value the presence of the Department’s relationship manager at the regional forums, in particular their sharing of good practice on community outcomes, and suggestions on engagement with central government.

The different ways the Department’s interface team have assisted Rangitikei District are discussed below. A description of regional interactions then follows.

Central Government Focus Group

In May to June 2005, Rangitikei District Council as part of their community outcomes identification process held a series of key stakeholder focus groups in Marton. As legislatively required, Rangitikei District Council identified central government as one of their key stakeholders. Similar to their other stakeholders, Rangitikei District Council wished to establish relationships with and gain central government agencies’ input into the identification of their community outcomes for Rangitikei.

Reflecting the lack of central government agencies present in Marton, Rangitikei District Council decided to engage with central government at a national level, seeking (and receiving) assistance from the Department’s information broker in this task. As a result, Rangitikei District Council developed a list of central government contacts who were invited to attend a focus group in Marton. It was through this invitation process that the Department became aware that Rangitikei District Council was seeking to engage with central government.

Seeking to showcase their region, Rangitikei District Council invited central government agencies to travel to Marton by train. A policy analyst from Rangitikei District Council met central government agencies attending at Wellington railway station, which offered the opportunity to create connections and establish relationships on the journey to Marton. The Department’s information broker facilitated introductions and initial conversations between the policy analyst and central government representatives on this journey. Around 20 central government people attended this workshop.

Rangitikei District Council note that the focus group was useful in making connections with central government. However, central government agencies who attended were reluctant to be explicit on what they perceived as the appropriate community outcomes for the Rangitikei region. The latter was disappointing for the local authority, given they were in the process of gathering wider stakeholder input to inform their thinking about Rangitikei’s community outcomes.

The focus group concluded with the agreement to conduct another forum in Wellington following Rangitikei District Council’s identification of their community outcomes.
“Our intent was to create a two-way road for our local Council and central government. We wanted to put forward the aspirations of our community.” (Local authority)

Central Government Forum

In early 2006, Rangitikei District Council commenced planning the Wellington forum. Its purpose was to present their community outcomes and elicit how central government agencies would assist in their achievement.

The Department’s relationship manager contributed to the set up and running of this forum:

- Providing advice in the planning phase, (e.g. aligning the workshop date with central government availability, identifying people to invite, encouraging central government agencies who were reluctant to attend.
- Assisting with co-ordination, (e.g. funding and organising the venue, and the catering for the workshop)
- Briefing Rangitikei District Council’s workshop facilitator.

Around 40 people attended this forum.

Similar to the focus group, Rangitikei District Council’s expectations of central government input were not achieved at the forum. Rangitikei District Council perceived central government agencies who attended as reluctant to commit resources to the achievement of Rangitikei’s community outcomes. However, Rangitikei District Council did find the forum useful in continuing to build their central government relationships.

Wanganui District Council also attended the Wellington forum, which resulted in:

- New central government relationships, (e.g. their inclusion in the Department of Labour’s regional Labour Advisory Group)
- Confirmation of the focus of existing central government relationships, (e.g. dealing with The Police at local and not regional or national level).

“We could explain our community outcomes (at the forum), so they (central government) have a better understanding of us. They are aware of our Council and our issues. We got to know new people – started a relationship.” (Local authority)

Although invited by the relationship manager, Palmerston North City Council did not attend this forum. They perceived that the forum offered little benefit given their stage in the community outcomes process, and their established relationships with central government agencies based in Palmerston North.

-----------------------------------------------

5 The relationship manager responsible for the lower North Island was employed mid 2005, and was therefore not present at the earlier focus group.
Regional Community Outcomes Group

To reiterate, the Regional Community Outcomes Group is a regional forum of strategic policy and planning officers from local authorities across the Manawatu-Wanganui region who meet monthly to exchange information about their community outcomes.

The Department’s information broker and the relationship manager introduced their role of facilitating the central and local government interface to local authorities in the Manawatu-Wanganui region through the Regional Community Outcomes Group.

This initial introduction was followed by the ongoing attendance of the relationship manager. As a regular attendee at these meetings, the relationship manager shares relevant information from central government, offers insight into other community outcomes processes being undertaken around New Zealand, and seeks opportunities for engagement with central government. Through this process, the relationship manager invited speakers from the Office of the Auditor-General and Statistics New Zealand to inform local government of the Long-Term Council Community Plan’s audit and monitoring requirements.

The relationship manager has also been actively involved in exploring regional approaches to community outcomes.

Regional Interagency Network

To reiterate, the Regional Interagency Network brings together central and local government stakeholders to identify collaborative opportunities. The relationship manager has presented to this group. The Department’s Community Development and Funding Advisor tends to keep the relationship manager informed about the discussions and activities of this group.

The relationship manager is currently engaged in discussions about forming a similar regional interagency network across Ruapehu, Wanganui and Rangitikei District Councils.

Other initiatives involving the Department

Participants are also aware of, and have used the Department’s other services to facilitate engagement with central government and to glean information relevant to community outcomes, including:

- The annual workshops which offer useful insight into how central government works
- Local Government New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminars. The relationship manager was instrumental in facilitating these seminars, through their collaboration with Local Government New Zealand. Statistics New Zealand provided some support
- The website, www.localcentral.govt.nz, offers useful databases to help find central government contacts. Initial use of password control made it less accessible. The website was not widely used.

Having described the Department’s interaction with local government in the Manawatu-Wanganui region, the Department’s effectiveness in this role is summarised below.

---

6 This meeting is rescheduled for early 2007 following a cancellation due to illness
Assessment of the Department’s contribution

Participants comment they were initially uncertain about the breadth and focus of the Department’s facilitation role. In part, this reflects uncertainty about its ‘fit’ with other organisations that also contribute to central and local government engagement, (e.g. Ministry of Social Development and Local Government New Zealand). Through interaction with the relationship manager, the role has become more defined as facilitating connections and engagement with central government. However, some uncertainty remains amongst local government about when to contact the relationship manager.

Overall, in the Manawatu-Wanganui region, the contribution of the Department’s interface team is dependent on the needs of each local authority, their stage in the community outcomes process, and their existing relationships with central government:

- Rangitikei District Council describe the Department’s interface team as offering significant value in making easy the process of engaging with central government in the identification of their community outcomes
  
  “We probably could’ve done it without them, but they made things much easier.”
  (Local authority)

- Wanganui District Council and Palmerston North City Council have little need for assistance from the Department’s relationship manager. However, they appreciate having access to the relationship manager and the relationship manager’s connections to central government, sharing of information and seeking engagement opportunities through regional forums.
  
  “Relationship managers are the face of local government to central government and our ears to central government.” (Local authority)

The short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region are detailed below.

**Connecting:** The Department connected Rangitikei District Council to central government agencies in Wellington.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Connecting central government with Rangitikei District Council, as the relationship manager and the Department’s website overcame engagement barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>None: Continue seeking ways to connect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“One Ministry refused to engage with us locally saying they focus regionally. The relationship manager was able to persuade them to come to the forum.” (Local authority)
Creating relevance: The Department created relevance for Rangitikei District Council through a better understanding of central government. However, there is a need for the Department to better manage local and central government expectations.

| Worked | Enhancing Rangitikei District Council’s understanding of central government’s intentions and processes around community outcomes through discussions with the relationship manager and direct interaction  
|        | Encouraging central government agencies to engage with Rangitikei District Council at the forum through the relationship manager demonstrating the relevance of being involved at this level |
| Improvements | Better clarification and sharing of objectives and outcomes sought from forums  
|        | Better management of expectations of local and central government in agreeing to future actions at a one-off forum |

“DIA is like a window that provides insight into central government which previously was dirty for us.” (Local authority)

Smoothing engagement: The Department made easy the process of engaging between Rangitikei District Council and central government in Wellington.

| Worked | Making easy the process of central government engagement with Rangitikei District Council at their focus group and forum in Wellington  
|        | Setting up and running Local Government New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminars was made easy |
| Improvements | None: Continue making the process easy until interaction and engagement more embedded |

“DIA’s role encourages reciprocity so that the cost of engaging with central government doesn’t always fall on local government.” (Local authority)

Sharing good practice: The Department’s sharing of information resulted in Rangitikei District, Wanganui District, and Palmerston North City Councils having greater knowledge about other types of community outcomes processes and their queries were addressed.

| Worked | Informing Rangitikei District Council about the Act and the community outcomes process. Less useful for other local authorities given their advancement in the process  
|        | Sharing information about other local government’s community outcomes process through regional forums and annual workshops  
|        | Setting up of seminars to meet current information needs, (e.g. the Local Government New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminar, arranging a presentation by Office of the Auditor-General |
| Improvements | None: Continue sharing information relevant to community outcomes from both local and central government sources |

“The relationship manager offers advice, at the right level. Let’s us get on locally, offering opportunities when the need arises, such as arranging Audit New Zealand to come and present.” (Local authority)

“Useful for reinforcing what we already knew.” (Local authority)
Future directions

Over the next 12 months, Rangitikei District Council, Wanganui District Council, and Palmerston North City Council will focus on the following:

- Developing action plans for prioritised community outcomes. Rangitikei District Council is especially keen to achieve some early successes to demonstrate to the community and wider stakeholders that they are delivering to their needs
- Monitoring and reporting as they continue to develop their indicators of progress
- Communicating to stakeholders their accountability in relation to community outcomes. That is, they are the facilitators of community outcomes, and are not solely responsible for their delivery
- Determining the interrelationship of community outcomes across local, sub-regional and regional levels
- Gaining more involvement by relevant central government agencies, local community groups and businesses in the implementation of initiatives to achieve community outcomes.

Overall, Rangitikei District, Wanganui District, and Palmerston North City Councils agree there is value in the Department continuing in this facilitation role of connecting, creating relevance, smoothing engagement and sharing good practice into the next community outcomes cycle. They specifically note the need for the Department to focus on:

- Capturing learnings across New Zealand from the first full community outcomes process
- Identifying the common community outcomes across New Zealand and as a result developing a directory of indicators
- Undertaking a ‘gap analysis’ between central and local government to identify how and where they can work most effectively together
- Managing future ‘crunch points’, (e.g. when a central government agency has not delivered to assist in the achievement of a community outcomes, such as increasing crime rates)
- Continuing to identify and take local government issues back to central government for consideration.

Conclusions

The Department’s facilitation made it easy for Rangitikei District Council to engage with central government in Wellington to commence the establishment of relationships relating to community outcomes.

Wanganui District Council and Palmerston North City Councils had less need for the Department’s assistance, given their internal capacity, existing relationships with central government, and advancement through the community outcomes process. However, they did benefit from the relationship manager sharing information about other local authorities’ community outcomes process and in seeking appropriate opportunities to connect with central government.

Going forward, the facilitation role of the Department is needed to maintain momentum around community outcomes and continue the connecting and engagement with central government to implement initiatives to achieve community outcomes.
Choosing Futures Waikato

Introduction

Choosing Futures Waikato is a collaborative forum co-ordinated by and comprising the 13 local authorities in the region. It was established to identify and implement regional community outcomes in the Waikato.

The Choosing Futures Waikato case study was selected to explore the Department’s engagement in a regional initiative led by local government, with links to central government.

This case study draws from interviews with the Department’s relationship manager, the co-ordinator of Choosing Futures Waikato and with individuals from Environment Waikato, the South Waikato District Council and the Hauraki District Council, as well as from supporting documentation such as Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Demographic profile

The Waikato region is the fourth largest in the country, covering most of the central North Island and approximately 25,598 square kilometres. The Waikato extends to border the Auckland region to the North, to the Coromandel Peninsula and Kaimai Hills in the east, the central and lower reaches of the Waikato and Lake Taupo to the South.

In 2001, the region had a total population of 357,726, with 81.6% identifying as European and 21.1% as Maori. The unemployment rate was 8% and median income was $18,100.

The Waikato region has 13 local authorities (including one regional local authority), four of which (Franklin, Taupo, Rotorua and Waitomo) are also included in other regions.7

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-Act

The Waikato region has a history of local and central government collaboration and relationships through regional initiatives and forums such as the Waikato Information Forum and Intersect Waikato, established before the introduction of the Act.

The Waikato Information Forum was initially established to bulk purchase aerial photographs of the Waikato region, but was redefined to broaden its scope with the aim of information sharing and integrated monitoring and reporting. It represents all local authorities in the region and Environment Waikato, with representatives from Environment Bay of Plenty, the Waikato District Health Board and the Ministry for the Environment also attending forum meetings.

Intersect Waikato is a central government forum which consists of Chief Executive Officers and regional managers from eight central government organisations with social development

7 Statistics New Zealand
responsibilities who work together on regional issues. The Hamilton City Council and Environment Waikato are also represented. Projects have included working with the District Health Board on school programmes on health and exercise.

Local authorities in the region have a history of engagement with one another at a sub-regional and regional level. Engagement has predominantly been in relation to environmental and infrastructural matters, rather than social issues. Consultation with key organisations and the community was also undertaken in the development of strategic plans. For example:

- In 1997, South Waikato District Council published ‘Tomorrow and You 1997-2012’, its strategic plan devised through workshops and discussions with key partners in the community.
- In 1993, Hamilton City Council sought input from its residents in developing Hamilton’s first strategic plan.

The next section discusses the development of the community outcomes process in the region and the Choosing Futures Waikato initiative.

**Choosing Futures Waikato**

The Waikato Strategic Planners Network was instrumental in developing and establishing the concept that is Choosing Futures Waikato, having first proposed a joint community outcomes process in 2002/2003, concurrent with the development of the Waikato Triennial Agreement.

In 2004/2005, the Choosing Futures Waikato process was initiated to identify regional community outcomes and to work towards achieving those goals. In 2004, the 13 local authorities of the Waikato region agreed to co-operate with each other, to co-ordinate a process to identify regional-level community outcomes.

The Community Outcomes Project Team comprises representatives from all of the local authorities in the region: Environment Waikato, the District Councils of Franklin, Hauraki, Matamata-Piako, Waikato, Otorohonga, South Waikato, Taupo, Thames-Coromandel, Waipa and Waitomo, and Hamilton and Rotorua City Councils.

The Community Outcomes Project Team is charged with the stewardship of Choosing Futures Waikato. While the core group includes representatives from local authorities, central government agencies and others, including the Ministry of Social Development, the Police and the District Health Board, this is not a finite membership. Others, including the Department of Labour and the Ministry of Youth Development, attend from time to time, providing opportunities to share knowledge and information, and to develop greater shared understanding.

The Choosing Futures Waikato regional community outcomes process is funded solely by local government using a population-based formula. A co-ordinator is also funded and was appointed to facilitate the earlier stages of the community outcomes process. More recently and in terms of the adoption of Long-Term Council Community Plans in 2006, a new co-ordinator has been appointed to facilitate the progression of Choosing Futures Waikato towards the regional community outcomes.
During 2004/2005, a draft set of regional community outcomes was identified following consultation with central government agencies, communities, and iwi, which included key stakeholder and nine community workshops to obtain views on the regional outcomes. A pan-tribal hui was held at Hopuhopu and was attended by many Mayors and Chief Executives of local authorities from throughout the region.

In late 2005, the regional community outcomes were finalised after a review by key stakeholders and community feedback was received.

During the same period, the identification of local community outcomes was also undertaken in parallel by each district with involvement from Environment Waikato. This local process recognised that regional outcomes may not take into account specific needs of a community or may be prioritised differently at a local level. The regional outcomes are also seen to be more high level, whereas local outcomes are identified as being ‘more action-orientated’.

The adoption of regional community outcomes through Choosing Futures Waikato is a new formalised process for local government, from which engagement with central government occurs. Regionally, relationships with central government are perceived to have broadened; although this is not the case for some smaller local authorities at a district level.

**Monitoring and Reporting Outcomes group (MARCO)**

MARCO is part of the Choosing Futures Waikato community outcomes process. It is a working group of Waikato strategic planners including planners from the local authorities in the region and the Waikato District Health Board. It was established soon after the introduction of the Act to develop co-ordinated procedures towards the achievement of regional community outcomes and to compile data for a core set of regional indicators, relevant both at a regional and local level. MARCO is affiliated with the Waikato Information Forum.

Some central government agencies, such as the Department of Labour, the Ministry of Social Development and the Waikato District Health Board, are involved in this group.

MARCO has developed a draft resource kit following review of monitoring strategies throughout New Zealand. Its purpose is to assist local government and other organisations across the country to implement an integrated approach to monitoring and reporting.

The Department’s facilitation role in the region is now considered.

**The Department’s facilitation of central and local government engagement**

The Department’s initial involvement in the region was in an introductory capacity, both at a regional and local level:

- Introducing the Act and the community outcomes process
- Running the ‘Know-how’ seminars and materials
- Introducing the role of the Department and the relationship manager appointed to the North Island, in November 2004.

From November 2004, the relationship manager for the North Island took an active role in the Waikato, becoming involved in the Group, which drove the initial Choosing Futures Waikato
work to develop community outcomes. Through this involvement the Department provided both funding and support for workshops, and the relationship manager made presentations about the Local Government Act context.

In September 2005, the Department appointed a relationship manager to the central North Island, including the Waikato region. This was some time after the establishment of the Choosing Futures Waikato process and just two months before the regional community outcomes were finalised. At a local level, most local authorities were in the midst of identifying their community outcomes, or coming to the end of the process, or were immersed in the development of Long-Term Council Community Plans.

The Department’s relationship manager was invited to attend the Community Outcomes Project team. She attends and contributes to the team’s meetings and predominantly works at this regional level. Overall, the Department, through the relationship manager, is seen as contributing to the community outcomes process and facilitating local and central government engagement through:

- Attendance at the Community Outcomes Project Team meetings
- Workshops facilitated by the Department
- The Department’s information broker.

**Choosing Futures Waikato**

The involvement of the relationship manager in Choosing Futures Waikato is very much seen in terms of the relationship manager’s interface with central government, specifically:

- Keeping the Community Outcomes Project team informed of what is occurring at a central government level relevant to the community outcomes process
- Taking issues raised by the Community Outcomes Project Team to the appropriate central government agency
- Providing relevant information from the Department’s Central Government Interagency Group
- Introducing central government agencies where there may be mutual interests that can be discussed.

The relationship manager is seen as providing guidance (rather than direction) and is perceived as maintaining motivation and giving people a positive ‘nudge’ in the right direction when necessary.

**Workshops facilitated by the Department**

The Department’s annual workshops provide local government with examples of good practice about what is occurring across the country and potential future tools to assist in the community outcomes process. This has included information on memorandum of understandings that have been entered into between local government and central government agencies in the community outcomes process.

Further, and related directly to the Waikato region, the Department, through the relationship manager, invited a Tai-ranga-whenua representative from Environment Waikato to address an annual workshop facilitated by the Department. The representative was involved in facilitating iwi input in the community outcomes process in the Waikato region. This address then led to the development of a national good practice guide on iwi consultation.
In conjunction with Statistics New Zealand, the Department also organised monitoring and reporting workshops, where information and resources were shared across local government. This included the provision of a monitoring resource kit, discussions about indicators and what was occurring across the country to meet statutory requirements.

**The Department’s information broker**

The relationship manager introduced MARCO and the Department’s information broker as they had the common aim of linking different resources to avoid duplication and to share the work of the group nationwide.

Having described the Department’s interaction in the Waikato region, the next section summarises its effectiveness in this role.

**Assessment of the Department’s contribution**

Overall, the Department, through the relationship manager, has made a positive contribution to Choosing Futures Waikato and to the central and local government interface in the community outcomes process.

The relationship manager has a key role in supporting the work of Choosing Futures Waikato, and its continued engagement with central government agencies. However, the relationship manager’s role has been of less value in assisting local government to make initial connections with central government agencies, given the pre-established relationships in the region.

There is also perception that the role of the relationship manager lacked clarity, particularly around its breadth.

> “The Department got it right with the relationship manager providing an important connecting role by taking information to central government and in guiding the direction of the group and with relationship management. The relationship manager helps ‘grease the wheels.’” (Local authority)

Detailed below are short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region.

**Connecting:** The Department has had a small role in connecting central and local government agencies in the region, and has identified and furthered opportunities where this might occur. However, many connections between local and central government in the region were pre-existing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introducing central government agencies to the region by inviting to attend regional forums</td>
<td>Potential role to help clarify links between different forums in the region and to formally link central and local government forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying mutually beneficial relationships, (e.g. MARCO and the information broker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having confidence that the relationship manager can assist with making connections, if needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“If we don’t know someone, the relationship manager will know who to go to. She makes connections…She invited the agency to visit Choosing Futures Waikato.” (Local authority)

Creating relevance: The relationship manager has assisted local government gain a better understanding of central government’s engagement in community outcomes. The relationship manager has also kept central government informed of local government matters. However, there is still a lack of clarity about certain central government agencies’ level of potential involvement in the community outcomes process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing local government with information on what is occurring at Central Government Interagency Group and issues raised</td>
<td>Potential to further enhance understanding of central government agencies’ roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating awareness amongst central government agencies of what is occurring in the community outcomes process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing central government of local government issues in the community outcomes process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Creating awareness amongst central government agencies of what is occurring in the community outcomes process” (Local authority)

Smoothing engagement: The Department enhanced engagement at a regional level and between local and central government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying commonalities and mutual benefits</td>
<td>Potential to smooth engagement between players where tensions exist, particularly around the future direction of the Community Outcomes Project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding the direction of Choosing Futures Waikato, (e.g. giving the occasional nudge or reality check when needed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Guiding the direction of Choosing Futures Waikato, (e.g. giving the occasional nudge or reality check when needed)” (Local authority)

Sharing good practice: The Department has shared information about the Act and other types of community outcomes processes across the country and region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing local government about the Act and the community outcomes process</td>
<td>None: continue to share good practice regionally and nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with Statistics New Zealand workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information about other local authorities community outcomes and practices at annual conference and regional forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“In helping local government to share examples of good practice - I think there’s simply a need there and the Department has done a good job, particularly through the workshops.” (Local authority)
Future directions

Over the next 12 months, the future focus of the region relates to the nurturing of relationships between local and central government sectors and the progression of Choosing Futures Waikato, specifically in:

- Maintaining continuity and momentum in terms of relationships and shared understandings with central government
- Encouraging open and transparent communication and commonality of focus between local and central government and ensuring a 'common-space' to work together
- Progressing towards projects and an ability to produce actions and outcomes.

A future facilitation role is seen for the Department. Key to this role is continuing to assist with the future engagement and commitment of central government agencies to community outcomes. Overall, there is also a consensus that the Department will be critical to:

- Highlighting areas of commonality for local and central government to work together and encouraging open lines of communication
- Building relevance and linkages between central and local government, thus ensuring people value these relationships and collaboration
- Keeping community outcomes on central and local government’s agenda
- Formalising the role of the Department and contribution to the Choosing Futures Waikato process
- Ensuring momentum going forward.

Conclusions

The Department has made a positive contribution to engagement between central and local government in the region in the community outcomes process, and has played an important role in strengthening engagement with central government. The impact that the Department has had has been important to the progression of Choosing Futures Waikato.

Going forward, there is a perceived need for the Department, particularly in relation to central government’s engagement and commitment to the community outcomes process. The extent of this role will be shaped by the future activities of Choosing Futures Waikato, as well as the level of connection between central and local government forums in the region.
Our Way Southland

Introduction

Our Way Southland is a regional initiative with the objective of sharing resources to collaboratively respond to the community outcomes requirements of the Act. Established in 2002, Our Way Southland comprises of four local authorities: Gore District Council, Invercargill City Council, Southland District Council and Environment Southland.

The Our Way Southland case study was selected to illustrate the Department’s effectiveness in assisting a well led and co-ordinated regional community outcomes initiative based in the South Island.

This case study draws from interviews with the Department’s relationship manager and individuals from Invercargill City Council, Southland District Council, Environment Southland, and the Ministry of Social Development (regional office) as well as supporting documentation such as Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Demographic profile

Southland is the southern most region in New Zealand and spans the breadth of the lower South Island. The region has a mix of urban and rural areas of which Gore, Invercargill, Riverton, Winton, Southland and Te Anau form the main centres.

In 2001, the region had a total population of 91,002, of which 93.4% identified as European. The unemployment rate was 5.3%, and median income $17,800.8

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-Act

Before the Act and the establishment of the Our Way Southland initiative, individual local authorities identified some community needs through their planning processes. Furthermore, individual local authorities had limited interaction with central government, (e.g. involvement with specific initiatives, funding, and central government consultation on relevant strategies or policies).

The following challenges around engaging with central government were identified:

- Few central government offices based Southland
- Few existing channels to contact central government.

“We were able to have effective conversations with central government around specific issues. However, nothing came close to producing a high level strategy for the region.” (Local authority)

“There aren’t a lot of central government agencies based in Southland. We go between agencies based in Christchurch and Dunedin.” (Local authority)
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The next section discusses the community outcomes process undertaken by Our Way Southland.

Our Way Southland’s Community Outcomes Process

Our Way Southland was initially proposed by Environment Southland through the Shared Services Forum. The latter is a cross-regional group, established in 2000, with the objective of sharing resources to facilitate a common approach to regional issues and services. Reflecting this history of regional cooperation and co-ordination, Our Way Southland adopted a regional community outcomes process.

There was some debate over adopting a regional approach to community outcomes, particularly from local authorities interested in collating localised data across unit areas within their territorial boundaries. However, in the main, it was agreed that undertaking a regional community outcomes process would recognise common issues faced across the region. It was also acknowledged that collectively engaging with central government would increase efficiency and reduce costs, (e.g. regional organisations such as District Health Boards dealing with one contact from the Project Team, rather than with individual staff from each local authority).

“It’s easier to initiate change at a regional level. We have more power to influence central government policy as a regional collective.” (Local authority)

Table 2 outlines the key phases of Our Way Southland’s community outcomes process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 2002</td>
<td>Establishment phase</td>
<td><strong>Steering group</strong> established, comprising of three councillors from each of the four local authorities and one iwi appointee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project team</strong> established, comprising of staff from four local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project team leader</strong> appointed (jointly funded by local authorities to lead and co-ordinate the community outcomes identification process and liaise with key stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Launch Function to which Our Way Southland representatives, CEOs, MPs, Mayors and the media attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community consultation process launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2004</td>
<td>Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>A series of five stakeholder workshops, (around Health and Wellbeing, Education and Training, Economy and Employment, Environment, Lifestyle and Culture) to which 75 agencies (including central government agencies) attended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Overview of Our Way Southland’s community outcomes process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2004</td>
<td>Community consultation</td>
<td>Public mail outs to residents asking about “the kind of Southland they want to live in”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar - Sep 2004</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>Over 80 Community Workshops, totalling more than 1,100 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2004</td>
<td>Prioritising outcomes</td>
<td>A survey sampling 200 people from Gore district, Southland district, and Invercargill City respectively to prioritise community issues and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>Draft community report completed and released to community for comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Transitional Long-Term Council Community Plan</td>
<td>Each local authority prepared a ‘transitional’ plan in 2003-2004, with the intent of contributing to a full identification of Southland-wide community outcomes by July 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘Our Way Southland Community Outcomes Report’ encompassed regional community outcomes and an action plan. Each local authority then prepared their own Long-Term Council Community Plans, detailing the contribution of their own local authority towards achieving the desired outcomes for the region. While Our Way Southland initially wanted to retain local differences in its community outcomes process, the time pressures of responding to the Act’s requirements meant there was strong focus on collecting information that contributed to “the regional picture”.

The release of this formal document marked the accomplishment of Our Way Southland’s primary objective of identifying a regional community outcomes report. Consequently, in late 2005, the Our Way Southland Steering Group was disbanded, and the team leader position was disestablished. Since then, participants comment that the Our Way Southland members have lost momentum, and are awaiting direction from the Shared Services Forum.

At present, individual local authorities are working towards securing agreements from contributing agencies to those commitments outlined in the community outcomes report and their Long-Term Council Community Plans. Our Way Southland is currently developing indicators for use in the monitoring and reporting phase of the community outcomes process.

The interactions between the Department’s interface team and Our Way Southland are described below.
The Department’s facilitation of central and local government interface

Establishing the relationship

In early 2005, the relationship manager established an initial connection with each of the individual local authorities, and was made aware of the Our Way Southland initiative. At that time, Our Way Southland had completed its first round of community consultation and was working towards releasing a draft of ‘Our Way Southland Community Outcomes’ report to the community for further consultation. The relationship manager was invited to attend occasional meetings of the Shared Services Forum and Our Way Southland to gain an understanding of specific issues relating to the region’s community outcomes process.

Launch of community outcomes report

In August 2005, Our Way Southland held a seminar to launch the final ‘Our Way Southland Community Outcomes Report’. The Department provided funding and administrative support for the event, which assisted in bringing together both local and central government stakeholders and the media to celebrate its release.

Information sharing

The relationship manager provided updates on what other local authorities and central government agencies were doing in relation to their community outcomes, and responded to queries. For example:

- Responding to a query for information about monitoring undertaken by other local authorities, the relationship manager shared information about the Canterbury Community Plans Group’s monitoring work. This went on to inform the development of Our Way Southland’s monitoring framework.
  “Sharing the outputs of the monitoring work by the Canterbury Plans Group saved us from re-inventing the wheel.” (Local authority)

- The relationship manager suggested reviewing monitoring work carried out by central government. As the role of the team leader had been discontinued, Our Way Southland was prompted by this suggestion to employ a consultant to review and analyse existing central government monitoring work, and to identify potential linkages to the group’s development of regional indicators.
  “The relationship manager is a source of advice when we are at a crossroads and aren’t sure what to do.” (Local authority)

- The relationship manager notified Our Way Southland when events relevant to the community outcomes process were being held in the region, (e.g. Ministry for Culture and Heritage’s ‘Cultural Wellbeing’ road show, Statistics New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminars).
Other initiatives involving the Department

Participants are also aware of, and have used the Department’s other services to facilitate engagement with central government and to glean information relevant to community outcomes, including:

- The annual workshops are considered valuable in terms of the sharing of best practice and information across other local authorities
- Statistics New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminars
- The website, www.localcentral.govt.nz, is regarded as useful in terms of searching for best practice information. However, it is not widely used to find central government contacts as local authorities tend to go through local contacts.

Having described the Department’s interaction with Our Way Southland, we summarise below the Department’s effectiveness in this role.

Assessment of the Department’s contribution

Given their advancement in the community outcomes process and internal capacity to manage the process, participants note the limited value of the Department’s role in relation to understanding the requirements of the Act, and developing their own community outcomes process.

At the time Our Way Southland was introduced to the Department’s relationship manager, Our Way Southland had already completed its first round of community consultation and was working towards releasing the draft report for further consultation. Having employed a full time team leader to co-ordinate the identification of community outcomes, and liaise with central government stakeholders, Our Way Southland initially perceived little need for the Department’s involvement in their community outcomes process. Consequently the Department’s role was limited to providing general assistance at key milestones of the community outcomes process, (e.g. the launch of the final report, advice around monitoring etc.).

Overall, participants convey that the Department has been ‘moderately’ effective in facilitating central and local government engagement. Participants acknowledge that the Department’s role in sharing good practice across local authorities, and providing access to funding makes the process of engaging with central government easier. However, participants comment that their interaction with central government has not increased as a result of the Department’s presence.

“We were well down the process by the time DIA came in; when we were looking for guidance, they didn’t know much more than we did.” (Local authority)

Detailed below are short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region.

Connecting: Our Way Southland participants value the Department’s relationship manager as a useful ‘connector’ to central government, particularly in relation to connecting Our Way Southland to central government events in the region.
### Worked

- Informing Our Way Southland of central government events in the region
- Reinforcing existing linkages between local and central government through supporting the launch of the Our Way Southland report

### Improvements

- Creating opportunities to connect with central government through the monitoring phase in the absence of a full time Our Way Southland team leader

### Creating relevance:

- The Department contributed to raising the profile of community outcomes by supporting the launch of the Our Way Southland report.

### Worked

- Enhancing the importance and relevance of the community outcomes to local and central government by supporting the launch of the Our Way Southland report

### Improvements

- Creating relevance of community outcomes to central government to assist Our Way Southland in securing commitment from central government stakeholders to achieve community outcomes

### Smoothing engagement:

- The Department made easier the process of engaging between Our Way Southland and central government by providing funding for the launch of the Our Way Southland’s final report.

### Worked

- Engaging with central government was made easier for Our Way Southland through the provision of funding for the launch of their report

### Improvements

- Identify ways in which the Department can facilitate engagement between Our Way Southland and central government in the monitoring phase of the community outcomes process

### Sharing good practice:

- The relationship manager shared monitoring work undertaken by other local authorities and provided advice to guide Our Way Southland’s monitoring process.

### Worked

- Providing updates on what other local authorities were doing in relation to community outcomes
- Responding to specific information requests
- Providing a useful forum via the annual forum for sharing good practice

### Improvements

- Identifying and proactively sharing good practice around prioritising and actioning community outcomes

### Future directions

Over the next 12 months, Our Way Southland will focus on the following:

- Developing an implementation plan in which community outcomes, actions, and processes for monitoring are clearly identified and prioritised
- Monitoring and reporting achievements towards identified community outcomes
- Reflecting on learnings from the current community outcomes process to determine its need and function going forward. More specifically this includes:
- Identifying whether the next cycle should continue with a regional community outcomes approach, or shift to a more localised approach
- Managing potential divergent interests across the four local authorities in the region.

In the main, Our Way Southland agree there is value in the Department continuing in this facilitation role of connecting, creating relevance, smoothing engagement and sharing good practice into the next community outcomes cycle. They specifically note the need for the Department to focus on:

- Assisting the group in analysing current outcomes and developing a strategy to achieve these outcomes
- Sharing good practice, with an emphasis on prioritising and actioning community outcomes for the next community outcomes cycle.

“Maintaining the momentum of the process now that community outcomes have been identified.” (Local authority)

Conclusions

Given their advancement in the community outcomes process and their internal capacity to manage the process, Our Way Southland had little need for the Department’s assistance. However, the Department is acknowledged as contributing to smoothing engagement with central government through the provision of funding for the report launch. To a lesser extent, the Department’s involvement also helped reinforce existing connections with central government, and enhanced the relevance of the community outcomes process at the local and central government level.

Going forward, Our Way Southland is moving towards implementing and monitoring community outcomes, and determining the future of the initiative. The Department’s future role is perceived as maintaining momentum around the community outcomes process, and providing guidance through the prioritisation and monitoring phases.
Waitakere City Council

Introduction

Waitakere City Council has a long history of community and stakeholder engagement to develop its strategic direction, and well established relationships with central government agencies and other community organisations to meet its community’s needs in the broadest sense.

Waitakere City Council’s selection as a case study reflects it is a large city council, and its acknowledged leadership in seeking collaborative working relationships in striving for its community’s wellbeing. Selection is also based on the Department undertaking a joint initiative with Waitakere City Council to develop the ‘Putting Pen to Paper’ resource.

Interviews were conducted with the Department’s relationship manager, and four representatives from Waitakere City Council.

Demographic profile

Waitakere is New Zealand’s fifth largest city and is divided into four main communities of Massey, New Lynn, Henderson and Waitakere. At its western edge are the Waitakere ranges and the beaches of the West Coast, and to the south and east are the Manukau and Waitemata Harbours. The original inhabitants of the area were Te Kawerau a Maki and Ngati Whatua.

In 2001, Waitakere had a total population of 168,750 of which 71.9%, identified as European, 13.4% Maori, 14.5% Pacific peoples and 11% Asian. In 2001, Waitakere had an unemployment rate of 8.3% and a median income of $20,800.

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-Act

Over the last ten years, Waitakere City Council has become well known for the Waitakere Way, an inclusive and collaborative approach encompassing local and central government, and communities to work together to promote and enhance the City’s wellbeing. Waitakere City Council’s community engagement, and establishment of working relationships with other organisations predates the Act. The principles underpinning the Waitakere Way have strongly influenced the development of the Act.

When working with other organisations… “...what we have tried to build is a culture of no surprises… We recognise there are times when we are not going to agree and that’s okay but it doesn’t mean we shouldn’t work together. It sets a culture of saying we need to understand each other’s business more but we also need to understand when something is going to go ‘political’. It is awareness and management through the process rather than trying to stop or falling out from the relationship.” (Local authority)
The table below summarises, at a high level, the phases of the Waitakere Way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Historical overview of the Waitakere Way(^9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Drafted <em>Agenda 21</em> which takes a holistic approach to sustainable development recognising the inter-relationships between people, the environment, and the economy. Waitakere City Council was the first local authority to adopt <em>Agenda 21</em> and become accredited as <strong>Safe Communities</strong> by the World Health Organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Commenced the long-term support and engagement with <strong>Te Taumata Runaga</strong>, a committee that represents the views of Maori in the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Adopted a vision of Waitakere as an ‘Eco City’ with a focus on involving communities and businesses to build a sustainable city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Released the draft of ‘Greenprint’, a set of operational principles to underpin the Council’s vision and guide the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Developed collaborative relationship around social issues through the initiation of the ‘Wellbeing Project’, which involved different groups working on issues such as health, education, children’s safety and community support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Established the <strong>Collaboration Strategy Group</strong> consisting of local and central government representatives, community organisations, and Council staff to identify and work on focus areas around wellbeing. Preparation of the first ‘Wellbeing Strategy’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Held the <strong>Wellbeing Summit</strong> attended by over 170 people from 70 organisations to adopt a collaborative direction for the City. This evolved into the ‘Waitakere Wellbeing Collaboration Project’, which primarily focused on social wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Established the <strong>Inter-sectoral Group</strong> and the <strong>Wellbeing Network</strong> to support the relationships, planning and ongoing implementation of the strategic development of wellbeing in the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Established a joint project with the University of Auckland: “Strengthening Communities through local partnership programme”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waitakere City Council’s Community Outcomes Process**

Waitakere City Council participants note that the introduction of the Act formalised and regulated their existing strategic direction, in particular the need to audit engagement with communities and central government.

“What had been a strategic direction became a regulated direction. We have always had a culture of engagement, now it is regulated, legislated and mandated that we have to do it.” (Local authority)

“We have had to be mindful of a slightly more regimented process that could be audited because we’ve had such good free flowing kind of engagement previously.” (Local authority)

---

In 2003, Waitakere City Council adopted its first Long-Term Council Community Plan. The Plan was structured around 9 Platforms and 5 Priorities developed through a strategic review. The Plan built on the principles of Agenda 21, the Eco City philosophy, and planning and policy documents such as the ‘Greenprint’. Extensive consultation was undertaken:

- Stage 1: 4,000 members of the public were involved
- Stage 2: draft Long-Term Council Community Plan was taken back to the public for feedback.

Since the Long-Term Council Community Plan was adopted in 2003, there has been ongoing community and stakeholder engagement through a variety of formal and informal mechanisms.

The development of the 2006-2016 Long-Term Council Community Plan builds on previous community engagement. In 2005, a series of community workshops were held including citywide workshops, a hui and Pacific Island fono, a youth workshop, ward-based workshops and a business workshop. To produce the final outcomes, two panels of residents were gathered to prioritise them: a general panel with representatives from the wide range of communities and a Maori panel. Through this process the community outcomes were developed with a two world vision, which specifically recognises the provision for partnership in the Treaty of Waitangi.

Having detailed Waitakere City Council’s community outcomes process and existing collaboration with central government, we now describe the Department’s interaction with the Council.

The Department’s facilitation of central and local government interface

The Department’s relationship manager is well known at Waitakere City Council, having previously been an elected representative in the area. The relationship manager had therefore an in-depth understanding of the Waitakere Way and the strategic direction of Waitakere City Council.

Given the level of capability and capacity within Waitakere City Council around their community outcomes process and their advancement in the process, there was little need for intensive assistance from the Department. The Department’s interactions with Waitakere City Council are therefore based on:

- Membership and attendance, by the relationships manager, in the Wellbeing Steering Group and Community Action Planning and Progress of Community Outcomes Group
- Collaboration with the Department to develop the ‘Putting Pen to Paper’ resource.

Attending stakeholder meetings

The Waitakere City Wellbeing Collaboration project is a partnership project between Waitakere City Council, local community organisations and central government agencies. Its aim is to facilitate collaborative projects that will make a difference to the wellbeing of the community of Waitakere City. The Department’s relationship manager is a member of the Wellbeing Steering Group. This group is a collective of Waitakere City Council staff, and central government agencies. The group focuses on issues wider than the community
outcomes process. It seeks to support collaborative projects that enhance the wellbeing of those living in Waitakere City through sharing existing resources and developing partnerships around priority issues such as children’s health.

The Community Action Planning and Progress of Community Outcomes Group is a group consisting of wider community and central government agencies as stakeholders in the identification and realisation of community outcomes.

Through attendance at these forums, the relationship manager:

- Offers advice and information about the Act, community outcomes and wider issues
- Provides strategic guidance, (i.e. the relationship manager is able to assist in the consideration of other options, or facilitate the group when they become ‘stuck’ or disengaged)
- Provides access to central government agencies that are not represented in the groups.

The relationship manager also demonstrated a high level of commitment in participating in Waitakere City Council’s community outcomes workshops.

‘Putting Pen to Paper’

The Department recognised that Waitakere City Council was well advanced in seeking to engage with central government agencies and other organisations in relation to its community’s wellbeing. The Department invited Megan Courtney to be the key note speaker at the first annual workshop, and to present on how local government can collaborate with other agencies and develop partnership agreements. The paper was well received. Given the high level of interest, the Department undertook a joint initiative to develop the presentation into a resource paper.

‘Putting Pen to Paper’ was written by Megan Courtney, and the Department offered financial and communications assistance to publish the paper. ‘Putting Pen to Paper’ was released in mid 2006.

Other initiatives involving the Department

Participants are also aware of, and have used, the Department’s other services including:

- The annual workshops which are described as useful in learning what worked elsewhere, and being able to network with local and central government people involved in the community outcomes process.
- Statistics New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminars were of less relevance to Waitakere City Council as they offered no ‘new’ information. However, participants acknowledge that they are of interest and value to other local authorities.
- www.localcentral.govt.nz is accessible and offers useful databases to help find central government contacts. However, one participant perceived the contact lists to be out-of-date, which undermined the credibility and perceived usefulness of the website.
Having described the Department’s interaction with Waitakere City Council, we summarise below its effectiveness in this role.

Assessment of the Department’s contribution

Waitakere City Council participants note that initially the role of the Department was not clear. Further, the Department appeared to struggle with finding its place in facilitating the community outcomes process and managing the diversity of local government needs. The latter was heightened by the large geographical area the relationship manager had to initially cover. Over time, participants have come to recognise the Department’s role as:

- Offering support and advice on the community outcomes process, and engagement with central government
- Collecting information about the community outcomes processes happening around New Zealand and its dissemination formally and informally to advance practice
- Acting as a ‘troubleshooter’ to address issues in engagement and to take local government issues back to central government.

Overall, Waitakere City Council has not required the Department to facilitate their engagement with central government in relation to the community outcomes as in the main these relationships were already established. Guidance on the community outcomes process has also been limited, due to Waitakere City Council’s advancement in the process.

The Department has, however, contributed in Waitakere City Council’s stakeholder and steering groups. Participants appreciate that the relationship manager offers a differing perspective on the issues discussed, and can encourage refocusing or re-energising around community outcomes.

Participants are, in the main, complimentary of the ‘Putting Pen’ to Paper resource as an example of the Department seeking good practice and ways to disseminate it widely. However, the collaborative process of its development was undermined by the Department’s communication team changing the document without consulting Waitakere City Council. These actions created the perception that the wider Department lacks awareness of the intent of the Act. Consequently, they undermined the relationship manager’s drive to foster positive working relationships between local and central government.

Detailed below are short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region.

Connecting: The Department did not assist Waitakere City Council in connecting with central government, given their pre-existing relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not required – key relationships established. However acknowledged the Department can assist in identifying the ‘right’ people to contact in central government agencies.</td>
<td>Ensure contact list on <a href="http://www.localcentral.govt.nz">www.localcentral.govt.nz</a> is up-to-date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“You can ring them up and say who is the ‘right’ person at the moment. The structures (of central government) are not easy to read from the outside.” (Local authority)
Creating relevance: As needed, the Department creates some relevance through explaining central government agencies’ focus, processes and pressures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Offering reminders of the pressures and constraints of central government agencies that are not always apparent to local government</td>
<td>• None: The Department is seen to be undertaking this role in a mature and professional manner, which is important in seeking to engage and maintain relationships, (i.e. no ‘bagging’ of people or agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offering advice on ‘excuses’ offered by central government agencies for not engaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“DIA make sure that people understand the need for engagement. They also help when agencies say ‘Oh I am sorry but Treasury don’t allow us to enter into a collective contract’, which is utter rubbish. There are a whole lot of excuses given. By having DIA, they can’t snow us. DIA also makes sure we are aware of the stress and strains that are being put on these government offices and how they are responding to it. Good to know as it is really hard to see what is going on inside those offices.” (Local authority)

Smoothing engagement: Waitakere City Council had little direct need for the Department to facilitate engagement with central government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Offering strategic steerage on Waitakere City Council’s stakeholder groups to retain focus on the community outcomes, overcome blockages, or offer suggestions of redirection</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“In the group meeting,… the relationship manager participates. She asked a question around the way we were looking at an issue and it just triggered a conversation shift. It was because she had sat in central government and had a slight separation, she was able to see a different perspective… She will bring information, she will try to clarify the issue, and bring the issue out into the light.” (Local authority)

Sharing good practice: Waitakere City Council appreciated receiving information from the Department, but some was of little relevance. However, there is some disappointed with the Department’s lack of collaborative spirit in the development of ‘Putting Pen to Paper’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Receiving information about other local authorities’ community outcomes and processes is interesting and useful</td>
<td>• Tailor information to assist more advanced local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assisting Statistics New Zealand to understand local government’s need</td>
<td>• Ensure the wider Department embraces the principles of collaboration and partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There were good ideas at the last conference, (SOLGM conference sponsored by the Department), about engaging with councillors around keeping the fire hot, and reminding people about issues. Some really good ideas about working in strategic partnership. Suggestion to develop a ‘How to do’ kits on partnership.” (Local authority)
“We had signed off the ‘Putting Pen to Paper’ document with the relationship manager. It was sent to the Department's communication team for layout and publishing and they rewrote it without consultation as it did not align with their language, policy or style. They watered it down... DIA’s core business is helping local and central government to work together and they haven’t changed. DIA should be leading by example.” (Local authority)

Future directions

In considering the future directions of the local government sector in relation to community outcomes, Waitakere City Council participants note the following:

- Seeking to get the community outcomes embedded into central government agencies via promotion by senior management and inclusion in key performance indicators
- Having determined the community outcomes, there is a need to focus and communicate successes both regionally and nationally.

Going forward, participants perceive a role for the Department. This reflects the Department’s neutrality within the community outcomes process, their knowledge and expertise in this area. As the community outcomes process moves into its next phase of implementation and monitoring, participants perceive the role of the Department as:

- Identifying the common community outcomes across New Zealand and seeking efficiencies for local and central government in realising this outcomes
- Identifying the diversity of needs across local government, and also the commonality of needs, for example developing a strategy for meeting the needs of large urban local authorities versus smaller rural and more isolated local authorities
- Continuing to gather intelligence about community outcomes across New Zealand, and seeking formal and informal mechanisms to share these learnings with local and central government
- Going to the local authorities where there is a need for the Department and where they can make a difference.

“Continuing the conversations of how we can work together so that we're not reinventing the wheel. When you look at the community outcomes and if you actually read them - very few of them are within the mandate or the financial constraints of local government. They are largely the responsibility of central government agencies or their sub-agencies but central government isn't going out seeking community outcomes.” (Local authority)

Conclusions

The Department’s interaction with Waitakere City Council has not changed their relationships with central government, given their extensive networks and advancement in the community outcomes process. However, Waitakere City Council appreciates the Department’s strategic guidance and their sharing of information.

Going forward, the Department needs to develop strategies that address the common needs of local authorities and community outcomes across New Zealand.
Canterbury Community Plans Group

Introduction

This case study centres on the Canterbury Community Plans Group (the Canterbury Group), a regional initiative to developing a co-ordinated approach to identifying community outcomes. This involved the design of a consultation and engagement process with central government and other agencies in the region. The Canterbury Group also recognised the need to initiate a parallel monitoring process, in which indicators would be developed to monitor progress towards achieving desired community outcomes.

This case study was selected to provide an example where the Department offered some assistance around local and central government engagement in relation to monitoring. It also illustrates the operation of the Department within a challenging regional collaboration, (i.e. negotiating differing local authorities’ perspectives on the community outcomes process).

This case study draws from interviews with the Department’s relationship manager and individuals from Hurunui and Waimakariri District Councils, Christchurch City Council, Ministry of Social Development (regional office), Statistics New Zealand (regional office), as well as from supporting documentation, such as website information and Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Demographic profile

The Canterbury region comprises of Christchurch City Council, Ashburton, Mackenzie, Hurunui, Selwyn, Waimate, Timaru, Waitaki, and Waimakariri District Councils and Environment Canterbury.

In 2001, the region had a total population of 481,431, of which 91.8% identified as European. The unemployment rate was 6.0%, and median income $17,600.\(^\text{10}\)

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-Act

Canterbury local authorities had carried out varying degrees of local community engagement before the requirements outlined in the Act. For example, there had been some evidence of community engagement processes at regional level through the Future Path Canterbury initiative. The latter is a collaborative initiative across local authorities in the Canterbury region. Its purpose was to identify regional synergies across common issues that impact on the quality of life in the region. Future Path Canterbury contributed to the development of an overall vision for Canterbury.

Participants indicate a strong history of central government engagement and collaboration in Canterbury before the Act. The Canterbury Social Policy Interagency Network, a group comprised of local and central government representatives, was frequently cited as an

\(^{10}\) Statistics New Zealand
example of well established central and local government working relationships in the region. This interagency network provided a platform for sharing information and co-ordinating efforts across social sector agencies in Christchurch.

Local and central government participants also acknowledge the presence of well established facilitators of central and local government engagement. Examples include the:

- Ministry of Social Development, which regularly engaged with local authorities to collaborate on the development of local community reports about family and community issues
- Department of Internal Affairs’ Local Government and Community Branch, which provided assistance in planning and facilitating community focus groups, (as part of the Canterbury Group’s community consultation phase).

Despite some evidence of central government engagement before the Act, participants note the following challenges of engaging with central government:

- Inconsistent approach to engaging with local government, (i.e. regionally, locally, or not at all)
- Amount of time and financial resources required by local government to effectively engage

The next section discusses the Canterbury Group’s development of a consultation process to identify community outcomes.

**Canterbury Group Community Outcomes**

Commencing in late 2002, the Canterbury Group comprises of representatives from Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, Banks Peninsula (now amalgamated with Christchurch City Council), Selwyn, Waimakariri, Hurunui and Ashburton District Councils. The Canterbury Group is an off-shoot of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum, and built on the work carried out by the Quality of Life Project\(^{11}\) and the Future Path Canterbury initiative.

Upon establishment, the Canterbury Group debated whether or not to proceed with a localised or regional community outcomes identification process. Local authorities expressed mixed views, reflecting their diverse needs, and the challenge of working collaboratively across Canterbury’s large and varied region.

The benefits of adopting a regional approach were noted including sharing resources across the region, and collaboration on common issues, especially for smaller local authorities. However, tensions remained over the prioritisation of issues across the different local authorities. Consequently, the Canterbury Group agreed to a localised approach to develop and co-ordinate a consultation process to identify local community outcomes.

\(^{11}\) The Quality of Life Project was established in 1999 to provide social, economic, and environmental indicators of quality of life in New Zealand’s six largest cities. A two yearly residents’ survey forms a core part of this project. The 2004 Quality of Life Survey was conducted in partnership with the Ministry of Social Development, and saw the development of an indicator set for both a city and national sample.
The key stages of the Canterbury Group’s activities around the community outcomes process between early 2004 to late 2005 include:

- **Establishment phase:** The Canterbury Group jointly funded a staff member from Environment Canterbury to co-ordinate the consultation process to identify community outcomes.

- **Development of Transitional Long-Term Council Community Plans:** Individual local authorities produced these plans following limited engagement with central government. It was intended that the Canterbury Group would design a central government engagement strategy for use in the development of the 2006 Long-Term Council Community Plans.

**Developing a community outcomes identification process for the 2006 Long-Term Council Community Plan**

**Stakeholder identification:** This process included scanning and making contact with identified agencies and organisations. These were central government agencies determined to be regionally significant to the community outcomes process, (i.e. those agencies that were significant to two or more local authorities). The Canterbury Group employed someone part-time to undertake the administration of this task, (e.g. informing central government about the Canterbury Group’s work, writing letters and making phone calls etc.).

**Consultation process:** The Canterbury Group facilitated a series of central government workshops in Christchurch in relation to the four well-beings. The purpose of these workshops was to inform identified agencies and organisations about the community outcomes process, and make connections with key central government stakeholders in the region. These workshops were co-ordinated with assistance from the Department of Internal Affairs’ Local Government and Community Branch, (e.g. sending out invites, providing a venue, and note-taking at the workshop).

Overall, these workshops were regarded as a success, due to the good turnout of central government agencies, and a general willingness of both sectors to work together on identifying community outcomes.

Connections made through these workshops led to Hurunui, Waimakariri and Kaikoura District Council holding a follow-up round of discussions with central government agencies about community outcomes issues arising across their sub-region.

“This was new territory for most of the Councils - we’d never really been in the same room as this collective of central government agencies before.” (Local authority)

**Commencing development and monitoring work:** Recognising the need to assess their progress towards the achievement of community outcomes, the Canterbury Group formed a working party to design a monitoring framework, focusing on the development of a set of regional indicators that could potentially contribute to national level indicators. Statistics New Zealand was a key contributor to this process.

**Reporting to the Mayoral Forum:** In August 2005, the Canterbury Group reported back to the Mayoral Forum. This reporting milestone marked the Canterbury Group’s achievement of its primary objective of developing a consultation process to identify community outcomes.
By late 2005, participants comment that local authorities were busy preparing their 2006 Long-Term Council Community Plans, which resulted in fewer meetings of the Canterbury Group and reduced momentum. The Canterbury Group has not met since December 2005, and has effectively gone into abeyance. The group is currently awaiting guidance from the Mayoral Forum as to its future direction. As the community outcomes process moves into an implementation and monitoring phase, local authorities see a role for the Canterbury Group in progressing its work around monitoring. However, ongoing support from the Mayoral Forum is critical to ensure focus, direction and commitment across local authorities.

"After the initial identification of agencies and organisations, the mechanism for collaboration fell apart." (Local authority)

The next section discusses the Department’s interaction with the Canterbury Group.

**The Department’s facilitation of central and local government engagement**

In early 2005, local authorities on the Canterbury Group were introduced to the Department’s relationship manager. At this time, the relationship manager contributed to the Canterbury Group through:

- Attending Canterbury Group meetings
- Being a member of the Canterbury Group’s monitoring working party
- Co-ordinating and facilitating two central and local government workshops.

Each interaction is described in more detail below.

**Canterbury Group meetings**

The relationship manager was invited to sit in at occasional Canterbury Group meetings. His role within these meetings is largely described in terms of providing updates on central government initiatives and activities, and the activities of other local authorities around community outcomes.

**Monitoring working party**

In 2005, a central focus of the Canterbury Group was developing a monitoring framework to measure progress towards the achievement of community outcomes. More specifically, a working party was formed to develop a set of regional indicators that could potentially inform national indicators. The relationship manager was seen to have a close working relationship with Statistics New Zealand, who were identified as one of the key contributors of the Canterbury Group’s monitoring process.

"Regional indicators worked at a macro level, but we didn’t deal with outcome statements that councils were actually dealing with - the two issues never seemed to meet.” (Local authority)
Central and local government workshops

In mid 2005, the relationship manager proposed two workshops, which were supported by a steering group made up of members of the Canterbury Group. The purpose of the workshops was to explore the ways in which central and local government’s could work together around areas of mutual interest in the community outcomes identified by local authorities on the Canterbury Group. As acknowledged by participants, the workshops were also intended to build momentum within the Canterbury Group.

The objectives of the first workshop, held in July 2005, were to:
- Identify key responses and actions central and local government can contribute to achieving regional outcome themes
- Identify collaboration opportunities to progress the responses and actions.

The objectives of the second workshop, held in August 2005, were to:
- Seek agreement to the community outcomes monitoring and reporting procedures
- Gain commitment to collaborate where joint opportunities for action and responses to regional outcomes present.

The workshops were attended by a mix of central government agencies (regional representatives) and local authorities on the Canterbury Group. The workshops were co-ordinated and facilitated by the relationship manager.

Other initiatives involving the Department

Participants are also aware of, and have used to a limited extent the Department’s other services to facilitate engagement with central government and to view information relevant to community outcomes, including:
- The annual workshops which offered connecting and information sharing opportunities
- Communication materials that provided information on the Act, useful for ‘newcomers’ to the community outcomes process
- The website, www.localcentral.govt.nz as a general source of information, particularly for those local authorities with fewer connections to central government. Some participants comment that the contacts directory listed on the website is not comprehensive, and that the website itself is difficult to navigate.

Having described above the Department’s interaction with local authorities on the Canterbury Group, the effectiveness of the Department’s role is summarised below.

Assessment of the Department’s contribution

Initially, local authorities had a lack of awareness of the extent of the relationship manager role, and the contribution the Department could make to engaging with central government in the community outcomes process. There was also some confusion between the Department’s facilitation role and the Department’s Local Government and Community
Branch, who had provided the Canterbury Group with assistance in earlier community consultation.

In the main, participants comment that the relationship manager’s interaction with the Canterbury Group had limited impact, due to:

- A history of established central and local government working relationships in the region, (e.g. the Canterbury Social Policy Interagency Network with a focus on social issues, some engagement with Housing New Zealand, and Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils holding a consultation meeting with central government agencies). It was noted there was a lack of engagement with central government in the area of the environment
- The presence of other well established facilitators of central and local government engagement, (e.g. the Ministry of Social Development and the Department’s Local Government and Community Branch)
- The Canterbury Group having already undertaken significant engagement with central government stakeholders through their community outcomes identification process in 2004
- The Department’s late arrival and the lagging momentum of the group.

Participants express consistent feedback about the effectiveness of the central and local government workshops co-ordinated and facilitated by the relationship manager. Local authorities acknowledge and support the relationship manager’s underlying intent behind the workshops, (i.e. to encourage central and local government to work together and assist in gathering momentum for the Canterbury Group). However, local authority participants perceive that the workshops did not deliver desired outcomes, because:

- The first workshop was perceived as duplicating the earlier round of central government consultation carried out by the Canterbury Group. It was perceived therefore as a ‘meet and greet’ and did not build on the earlier consultation
- The purpose of second workshop was confusing, even though the Department had distributed an agenda defining its purpose. Participants noted that they did not understand what needed to be done, and were unsure whether this was due to the workshop process or that the wrong people attended
- Local government expressed frustration about central government’s preference to monitor at a regional and not local level. This tension resulted in local authorities challenging the position and role of the Department within this debate.
  
  “It was a talkfest - no one knew why they were there. Police talked about safety, Housing talked about housing but so what? There was no clarity about what needed to be achieved at a local and national level.” (Local authority)
  
  “Central government couldn’t grasp what they needed to do, i.e. to identify further areas for collaboration - either the right people weren’t there or good processes weren’t in place.” (Local authority)

By contrast, some examples were given that this workshop facilitated broader interagency linkages. For example, Statistics New Zealand became aware of the Christchurch Social Policy Interagency Network through this workshop. Furthermore through participating in this workshop, Ashburton District Council invited Statistics New Zealand to present information on how to use indicators in their monitoring process.
“I think the linkages would have happened without the Department, but by giving us an opportunity to raise awareness of what Statistics New Zealand was doing, this made the linkages happen sooner, and in a different context.” (Central government agency)

Local authorities are positive about the relationship manager’s contribution to the Canterbury Group’s monitoring working party. A few participants comment that it is difficult to assess the impact of the Department as the community outcomes process is still in its infancy.

“The community outcomes process is very new territory- it’s early days, and there is still a lot of learning going on.” (Local authority)

The short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region are detailed below.

**Connecting:** The Department had little effect on bringing local and central government to work together to further community outcomes due to pre-existing central government relationships in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Using the website to identify central government contacts, particularly useful for local authorities with few connections to central government</td>
<td>• Build on existing connections between local and central government, and identify any potential gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating some broader intersectoral and interagency linkages through central government workshops, (e.g. between Ashburton District Council and Statistics New Zealand, and Christchurch Social Policy Interagency Group and Statistics New Zealand)</td>
<td>• More comprehensive contacts directory on website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The contacts directory is a little patchy; I prefer to use my own networks.” (Local authority)

“The website has some technical issues; it isn’t easy to navigate.” (Local authority)

**Creating relevance:** The Department’s relationship manager created some relevance via communicating Canterbury Group’s monitoring work to central government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting the importance of the Canterbury Group’s indicator work to central government</td>
<td>• Better clarification of the purpose for bringing central and local government together to work on community outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clearly communicate to central government their role in the community outcomes process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider needs at both local and regional level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The Department is educating central and local government about each others processes and how they might fit with each other.” (Local authority)

**Smoothing engagement:** The Department had little effect on enhancing engagement between central and local government in the Canterbury Group due to the history of working collaboratively in the region, and the presence of other facilitators of central and local engagement.
Worked
- Building good working relationships with central government stakeholders in the monitoring phase, (e.g. Statistics New Zealand)

Improvements
- Better understanding of the needs of both central and local government in the community outcomes process, and building on existing work and relationships
- Create tangible opportunities for local and central government to work together, (e.g. project work)
- Work alongside local authorities in the Canterbury Group to ‘resurrect’ the group and address any internal tensions

“We can’t say that we have a better relationship with central government because of the Department – the same challenges of relating to central government still exist.” (Local authority)

Sharing good practice: The Department’s provision of information about the Act, and other community outcomes processes across New Zealand had limited use.

Worked
- Informing local government about the Act and the community outcomes processes. Very useful for people in local government who were new to the community outcomes process
- Sharing information about other local government’s community outcomes processes through informal updates and annual workshops, (e.g. Southland collaboration, Waitakere community outcomes project)

Improvements
- Share best practice following first round of community outcomes

Future directions

Over the next 12 months, individual local authorities and the Canterbury Group will focus on the following:
- Individual local authorities progressing community outcomes through defining priorities, action plans, and monitoring processes
- Individual local authorities securing agreements from identified agencies and organisations to contribute to the promotion of community outcomes
- Determining the future direction and role of the Canterbury Group in the community outcomes process
- Identifying opportunities for regional collaboration across community outcomes.

Overall, those local and central government agencies interviewed in Canterbury recognise the potential of the Department to add greater value to the community outcomes process in the future. Specifically, the future focus for the Department is seen as:
- Assisting local authorities to prioritise their community outcomes
- Identifying and actioning collaborative project work, (at local, sub-regional and regional levels)
- Lobbying and increasing the relevancy of the community outcomes process to central government, in order to embed the community outcomes process in central government work programmes
Advocating collective local government issues to the wider Department and central government.

Conclusions

The Department contributed to the Canterbury Group’s monitoring project. The Department’s ability to further assist the Canterbury Group was limited by a lack of need given their advancement in the process, and the lagging momentum of the group. The Canterbury Group support the continuation of the Department’s facilitation into the next community outcomes cycle.

Going forward, the Canterbury Group sees the Department’s facilitation role in terms of sharing learnings from the current cycle, and bringing local and central government together to work on projects to further the community outcomes process. The future of the Canterbury Group is dependent on direction from the Mayoral Forum and agreement of how to proceed from the diverse range of local authorities currently in the group.

“The Department is an enthusiastic participant in facilitating central and local government to work together.” (Local authority)

“The Department has made some modest future investments for the local government sector.” (Local authority)
Future Taranaki

Introduction

Future Taranaki is a collective of local and central government agencies, and sector and service groups from the Taranaki region. It is a regional forum initiated by local government in Taranaki to work together around community outcomes.

The Future Taranaki case study was selected to explore the Department’s involvement in an advanced local government led regional community outcomes process.

This case study draws from interviews with the Department’s relationship manager and individuals from the Ministry of Social Development (regional office) and from all of the local authorities in the region: the Taranaki Regional Council, the South Taranaki District Council, New Plymouth District Council and the Stratford District Council, as well as from supporting documentation such as website information and Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Demographic profile

Taranaki is one of the country’s smallest region’s covering 7,273 square kilometres and extending from the West Coast of the North Island to the Tasman Sea. The Mohokatino river catchment forms the northern boundary of the region and the Waitotara river catchment forms the southern boundary. Mount Taranaki is a significant character of the region.

In 2001, the Taranaki region had a total population of 102,858, of which 90.1% identified as European. The unemployment rate was 7.8%, and median income was $17,300.¹²

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-
Local Government Act 2002

Before the introduction of the Act, there was a good culture of co-operation across the local authorities in the region and a history of collaboration on various projects. Consultation did occur with the community, but not to the extent prescribed by the Act.

Engagement between individual local authorities and central government agencies tended to be around core business needs, at which time good working relationships developed with central government agencies within the region. Engagement between central and local government agencies also occurred at a higher level through the Mayoral Task Force.

Before the Act’s introduction, a Central Government Heads Group also existed in the region, previously chaired by the Ministry of Social Development, but then later by Te Puni Kokiri (both of whom were based in the region). Its focus was expanded beyond its initial framework following the Cabinet mandate ‘Closing the Gaps’.

¹² Statistics New Zealand
The next section discusses the development of the community outcomes process in the region and the Future Taranaki forum.

**Future Taranaki’s community outcomes process**

Taranaki was one of the first regions in New Zealand to begin its community outcomes process.

In 2003, the four local authorities in the region agreed to carry out a joint approach to identifying regional community outcomes and priorities. This was in addition to identifying community outcomes at a district level to ensure the variation and needs specific to each local community was captured.

Drawing upon the history of co-operation across the local authorities, the regional approach was adopted due to:

- Central government and service delivery agencies explicitly indicating a preference to work regionally and to engage in a single process
- The commonly held values and issues faced across the region
- The desire for efficiency through the pooling of budgets and expertise.

It was also able to draw upon the history of co-operation across the local authorities.

A community outcomes project team was established to determine the community outcomes process, comprising Chief Executive Officers/corporate policy managers and officers from each local authority.

The identification of community outcomes involved wide community consultation and was tailored to enable community outcomes also to be identified at a local level.

Stakeholder consultation involved invitations to a large number of crown agencies to attend meetings. It was felt that there was good input from central government at these earlier stakeholder meetings. This was mainly from central government agencies at a regional level, but there also was some representation from central government agencies based in Wellington. On the other hand, it was clear to some that a few central government agencies were not ready to engage.

By March 2004, the identification of community outcomes was complete and a community outcomes report published: ‘Future Taranaki. A report on community outcomes for Taranaki’.

Taranaki’s four local authorities then determined a regional partnership structure to enable regional stakeholders to work towards the achievement of the community outcomes.

This began with the larger Future Taranaki Partners Group comprising a broad grouping of government agencies, sector and service groups and local government. Its purpose being to co-ordinate and collaborate in the delivery of the seven community outcomes identified.

The Future Taranaki Facilitation Group was then established as the core group and is guided by an agreed ‘Terms of Reference’ and mode of operation. It comprises: Chief Executive Officers of the four local authorities, the District Health Board, the Ministry of Social Development, Te Puni Kokiri, and the Venture Taranaki Trust. The group was originally
chaired by the Chief Executive Officer of the Taranaki Regional Council, and is currently chaired by the Regional Commissioner of the Ministry of Social Development.

In mid 2006, Future Taranaki launched ‘Future Taranaki: Progress report on community outcomes for Taranaki’ which outlines the community outcomes, the monitoring and reporting indicators developed to assess progress towards achieving community outcomes, and progress to date.

The work of Future Taranaki is viewed positively, particularly in the context that this region has been ‘ahead of the game’ in the community outcomes process, relationships between central and local government are strong and a number of collaborative ventures are underway.

Some tensions exist at a regional level between the players given the different roles, personalities and competing priorities. There is also a shared view that engagement with central government does not include all relevant agencies, as some are unable or unwilling to embrace collaboration. At the earlier stage of the community outcomes process, it was also felt that a lot of time had to be spent educating central government agencies about the community outcomes process due to limited knowledge of the provisions of the Act.

The Department’s facilitation role in the region is now discussed.

The Department’s facilitation of central and local government engagement

In June 2005, the Department appointed a relationship manager to cover the lower North Island, including the Taranaki region.

The Department’s interaction with Future Taranaki in the community outcomes process is seen distinctly in two stages – firstly the Department’s initial involvement, and second, its later involvement after the relationship manager was appointed to the region. This interaction has been through:

- Introductory advice
- Minimal feedback from Wellington
- Regional forums
- Central government workshops
- The launch of the community outcomes report.

Introductory advice

The Department provided introductory information about the Act and its role by visiting local authorities in the region and through attending the local government Zone 3 meeting. The Department also held a workshop early on in Wellington for central government agencies. Participants also referred to attending the Department’s ‘Know-how’ conferences and receiving guidance materials.

Minimal feedback from Wellington

Having commenced its community outcomes process at an early stage, local government in the region wished to receive feedback from the Department on the process adopted. In the
absence of a regional presence from the Department, the region took its initial report to Wellington for feedback. The Department provided minimal feedback which related to the timeframes proposed, indicating it was for local government to determine its own processes.

Regional forums

The Future Taranaki Facilitation Group meets approximately every two or three months. The relationship manager, following her appointment, actively sought agreement to attend these meetings and attends each meeting as its guest.

In attending these meetings, the relationship manager offers the Future Taranaki Facilitation Group:
- Assistance with engaging central government
- Encouragement, support and the assistance with activities.

The relationship manager is also noted for her attendance at local government Zone Meetings for the region, which she has also addressed.

Launch of community outcomes report

The Future Taranaki Facilitation Group wished an appropriate launch of its community outcomes progress report in 2006, in recognition of it being one of the first of such reports to be produced in New Zealand.

The Department helped to fund the launch of the report, as well as seeking agreement for the Minister of Local Government to attend the launch.

Other initiatives involving the Department

Participants are also aware of the Department’s other services to facilitate engagement with central government and to obtain information relevant to community outcomes, including:
- The website, www.localcentral.govt.nz, which has been used to obtain information about the Act, community outcomes process and central government contact details
- The Central Government Interagency Group which meets regularly to exchange views about community outcomes and the Act
- Local Government New Zealand’s monitoring and reporting seminars. The relationship manager was instrumental in facilitating these seminars, through their collaboration with Local Government New Zealand. Statistics New Zealand provided some support.

Having described the Department’s interaction in the Taranaki region, the section below summarises its effectiveness in this role.

Assessment of the Department’s contribution

Overall, participants found the initial involvement of the Department to be a ‘mixed bag’. While initial contact from the Department was appreciated, there was also a perception that the Department was dictating its role and what should be done, rather than seeking input from the region. Further, the Department was only able to provide minimal information to assist the region in developing its community outcomes process.
“The Department organised an initial conference and there was some initial activities and information, but we were pretty much on our own after that. I mean no-one had done it and we were one of the first…we had to do our own research and we looked overseas…” (Local authority)

In June 2005, the relationship manager’s appointment to the region is seen as the first substantial contact with the Department. By then local and regional community outcomes had been identified, regional monitoring indicators were in the process of being determined, and Future Taranaki was well established. As a result there was no clearly defined role for the Department’s relationship manager. Nevertheless, the attributes that the relationship manager brings to the region are viewed positively by participants as:

- Being very keen to be part of the process
- Extremely active, enthusiastic and encouraging
- Aware of what is happening in Wellington
- Pragmatic and quick to pick up issues
- A participator and a ‘networker’.

Overall, the Department is seen to have had a minimal impact, given the region’s advancement in the community outcomes process.

“We got on with this job well before the Department of Internal Affairs appointed these fantastic people to come out and so their role in the community outcomes process here was not significant.” (Local authority)

“I don’t think that there would be any difference without the Department’s involvement. However, having said that, they could not have sent a better person into this region and I still rate the relationship manager as a very good link between our region and central government.” (Local authority)

Detailed below are short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region.

**Connecting:** The Department has offered to connect central government agencies to the region and has assisted to introduce representatives from central government. However, often there is not perceived a need for this role, as connections have already been made or can be made without the Department’s assistance.

| Worked                          | Obtaining the Minister’s agreement to launch community outcomes report  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listing central government contact details on the Department’s website, <a href="http://www.localcentral.co.nz">www.localcentral.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Improvements                    | Potential to assist in connecting central government agencies that remain unengaged |

“The relationship manager said she could talk to our Minister and get the Minister along to officially launch the report…we had thought about inviting the Minister in any event because of its significance.” (Local authority)

“The relationship manager offered to help as far as she could with talking to central government departments, like Statistics New Zealand, but we had already done that anyway.” (Local authority)
Creating relevance: Participants did not offer explicit examples of the Department creating relevance for local government to gain a better understanding of central government. However, examples of the Department assisting central government agencies to understand local government process were provided. Overall, participants perceive that some central government agencies do not understand or see the relevance in engaging with local government in community outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing central government’s understanding of community outcomes process through the Department’s website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing central government’s understanding of what is occurring at a regional level through Central Government Interagency Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential to assist central government to understand local government and to create relevance when opportunities present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“What I think has been useful is the Department’s central government grouping in Wellington that meets regularly to exchange views about community outcomes...It helps a lot if central government departments know about the philosophy of the Act and partnership.” (Local authority)

“What some central government agencies have a real willingness to engage, but others don’t quite understand what goes on locally – they’re not as well informed of local issues and how councils are dealing with them.” (Local authority)

Smoothing engagement: The Department made easy or enhanced the process of engaging between local and central government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining the agreement of the Minister to attend the launch of the community outcomes report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with central government agencies to ensure attendance in the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoothing engagement between central and local government players where tensions exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sharing good practice: The Department has shared information resulting in local government being provided with knowledge about Act and other types of community outcomes processes across the country and region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting to launch community outcomes report to share Taranaki’s community outcomes process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing local government about the Act and the community outcomes process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with Statistics New Zealand workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information about other local government’s community outcomes helped local government to reflect on own processes adopted and reinforced what they knew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely sharing of good practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future directions

Over the next 12 months, two key needs were commonly identified as the future focus of Future Taranaki:

- Undertaking significant or tangible activities that work across all of the local authorities
- Keeping central government engaged and securing their commitment to collaboration and understanding of the community outcomes process.

A future facilitation role is seen for the Department in terms of a wider role across the country and also in relation to the above areas. Specifically, the future role of the Department is seen as:

- Providing funding
- Remaining as a lead agency to ensure community outcomes continue to be seen as important to central and local government
- Encouraging innovation
- Helping to match local and central government mandates.

The key challenge for the Department is a perceived lack power to make things happen, and to be taken seriously at a central government level.

Conclusions

The Taranaki region was far advanced in the community outcomes process, therefore it had little need for the Department’s facilitation role. Consequently, the Department’s role is perceived to have had little impact in the region’s community outcomes process, and Future Taranaki’s engagement with central government.

Going forward, there is a potential role for the Department to connect and create relevance for central government agencies not engaged in the community outcomes process, to smooth engagement within the region, and to continue supporting Future Taranaki going forward.
Tomorrow’s Manukau

Introduction

Since 2001, Tomorrow’s Manukau – Manukau Apopo, developed by the Manukau City Council, has captured the aspirations of the City’s communities. This document sets out the long-term vision and strategy for Manukau, and acts as a guide to local and central government in providing services to the City.

Manukau City Council was selected as a case study, as it is a large well-resourced city local authority, has a long history of community engagement to identify the City’s strategic direction and collaboration with central government agencies to realise its communities’ aspirations. At the outset, it was acknowledged that the Department had limited engagement with Manukau City Council, given its knowledge and progress in identifying and promoting community outcomes. The case study therefore focuses on identifying the Department’s interaction and its effectiveness, and explores potential future interactions with Manukau City Council.

This case study draws from interviews with the Department’s relationship manager, and three representatives from Manukau City Council, as well as supporting documentation such as website information and Long-Term Council Community Plans.

Demographic Profile

Manukau dominates the southern part of the Auckland region, and is divided into eight communities of Botany, Clevedon, Howick, Mangere, Manurewa, Otara, Pakauranga and Papatoetoe. It covers an area of 55,200 hectares.

Manukau is New Zealand’s third largest city, and has the fastest growing population. In 2001, the region had a total population of 283,197. Manukau’s population is made of approximately 165 different ethnic communities: 42% identified as European, 16.5% Maori; and 23% Pacific peoples. Manukau has the largest Maori and Pacific population in New Zealand. In June 2005, the unemployment rate was 5.8%. In June 2001, the median income was $19,000.13

Historical context: community and central government engagement pre-Act

Manukau City Council has a long and proud history of collaborating with its communities to develop its strategic direction. Over the last ten years, Manukau City Council has initiated and fostered collaborative working relationships across local and central government and with community organisations around the strategic vision and direction for the City.

In 1996, Manukau City Council realised there was little overarching co-ordination of resources coming into Manukau City and so it drove a strategic co-ordination process which

13 Statistics New Zealand
brought together senior staff from local and central government organisations represented in Counties Manukau to form a Strategic Co-ordination Group led by Manukau City Council's Chief Executive Officer. This group (42 members) continues to meet on a bi-monthly basis to share information, provide robust feedback on new initiatives/policy and align planning and activity.

In 1999, a review of ‘Council’s Strategic Direction 1996-2010’ identified the need for a long-term strategic direction which was representative of Manukau’s diverse community stakeholders, and fostered collaborative relationships working towards a common goal. The aspirations of Manukau’s diverse communities were identified through extensive community consultation with communities and key stakeholders, including a tailor made process of engaging with Maori.

In 2001, Manukau City Council produced the document ‘Tomorrow’s Manukau (2001)’. This document details the community’s vision of ‘Tomorrow’s Manukau - progressive, proud, and prosperous’, as well as the values and collaborative ways of working between communities and implementing organisations. Tomorrow’s Manukau determined the community outcomes for Manukau as a City, which is the responsibility of many organisations and individuals including Manukau City Council. Tomorrow’s Manukau’s collaborative approach to community well-being strongly influenced the development of the Act.

Since its inception in 2001, over 70 organisations, including central government agencies, in Manukau have worked towards the realisation of the shared vision of Tomorrow’s Manukau. They are represented on “outcome groups” based around the seven themes identified in Tomorrow’s Manukau (e.g. Safe Communities) to identify collaborative action that will work towards achieving the community outcomes. This collaboration has resulted in a number of notable successes including:

- The collaborative action plan to reduce child poverty (2004)
- Greater support for community based crime prevention programmes, and safer by design principles informing development
- Family literacy programmes co-ordinated in Manukau schools.

Manukau City Council’s connection with central government and other city stakeholders can also be seen in the membership of Tomorrow’s Manukau Steering Group. This governance group provides strategic direction and leadership for the management of Tomorrow’s Manukau. The group is comprised of Mana Whenua representatives and senior people from key stakeholder organisations, including central government agencies, (e.g. Ministry of Social Development, with whom Manukau City Council has had a long-established relationship).

Tomorrow’s Manukau community outcomes process (post-Act)

In 2003, Manukau City Council developed an interim Long-Term Council Community Plan which set out what the Council itself would do to fulfil its role in relation to realising Tomorrow’s Manukau’s shared vision.

In 2004, Tomorrow’s Manukau outcomes and targets were reviewed due to the achievement of a number of targets. The review also sought better representation of Manukau’s diverse communities in the identification and implementation of community outcomes, and to strengthen interagency collaboration. In 2005, the new ‘Tomorrow’s Manukau 2006-2016’
was released with the visions and priorities identified by the Manukau’s ward-based communities.

In 2006, ‘Tomorrow’s Manukau Workbook August 2006-07’ was released, as a companion document, detailing the manner in which 42 service providers will work to achieve the community outcomes. The workbook is described as a living document that will evolve over time to meet the needs of both the community and service providers.

In 2006, as prescribed in the Act, Manukau City Council released their Long-Term Council Community Plan, which detailed the services and activities to be undertaken by the Council to achieve identified community outcomes in Tomorrow’s Manukau (2006).

Manukau City Council has taken a very specific approach in its identification, implementation and monitoring of community outcomes as summarised below:

2004: Consultation process:
- Manukau City Council conducted extensive community consultation to identify community outcomes, including a city-wide survey, tailored consultation with Maori, focus groups with special interest community groups, and geographic communities
- Stakeholder workshops were also held with central government, business and voluntary sectors.

2005: Identification and development of community outcomes, actions and targets:
- Outcomes were identified across seven key themes: Educated and Knowledgeable People; Healthy People; Moving Manukau; Safe Communities; Sustainable Environment and Heritage; Thriving Economy; Vibrant and Strong Communities. These are presented in Tomorrow’s Manukau 2006-2016.

2006: Continued development of implementation processes:
- Tomorrow’s Manukau Steering and Outcome Groups oversee implementation under each of the seven themes. These groups were established in 2001 to co-ordinate activities towards achieving their specific outcomes
- Tomorrow’s Manukau Workbook was developed to accompany the main document. Action Leaders were listed with whom Manukau City Council had secured informal and formal agreements to undertake activities towards outcomes. Action Leaders are accountable to their own organisation, but have a collective accountability to the wider community to work towards achieving the outcomes.

Reviewing and Monitoring:
- Tomorrow’s Manukau Steering and Outcomes Groups report on progress towards community vision and outcomes every three years in the ‘Changing Face of Manukau’ report
- The progress of Action Leaders towards their outputs is updated annually in the Tomorrow’s Manukau Workbook.

Having detailed Manukau City Council’s community outcomes process and existing collaboration with central government, the Department’s interaction with the Council is described below.
The Department’s facilitation of central and local government interface

Around 2005, the relationship manager touched base with Manukau City Council to see how they were progressing in their community outcomes process and to introduce the Department’s role. Manukau City Council’s participants describe the role as connecting and facilitating central and local government around community outcomes, and having an overview of the community outcomes processes across New Zealand as well as dealing with any issues arising from the processes.

“DIA is tasked to provide support to bring central government to the table with local government to work together to achieve the community outcomes.” (Local authority)

Given the advancement of Tomorrow’s Manukau and their existing relationships, Manukau City Council perceived little need for the Department’s role. Consequently, interaction with the Department’s relationship manager has been limited to their presence on:

- The Strategic Co-ordination Group for Counties Manukau, whose focus is to debate new strategy and policy on issues wider than community outcomes
- The Reference Group for the review of Tomorrow’s Manukau Outcomes Groups’ structure. This group is exploring the barriers that stop agencies engaging in relation to identified outcomes. Note: this group has only met once.

Other contact with the Department is via initiatives to facilitate central and local government engagement in the community outcomes process, specifically:

- Attending Statistics New Zealand’s monitoring outcomes workshop, and the annual workshop in Wellington
- Receiving printed resources developed and distributed by the Department including the ‘Putting Pen to Paper’ resource.

Over the last two years, Manukau City Council has also been in contact with the Local Government and Community Branch of the Department in relation to:

- Exploring the funds that are coming into Manukau City. The Council wishes to promote, to identified funding bodies, the importance of considering community outcomes priorities in the allocation of financial resources to the City
- A potential policy project led by the Department on sustainable cities. Note: This project did not proceed.

Having described the Department’s interaction with Tomorrow’s Manukau, the Department’s effectiveness in the role is described below.

Assessment of the Department’s contribution

Overall, Manukau City Council has had limited involvement with the Department, due to its well established community outcomes, existing collaborative relationships with central government agencies, a strong relationship with the Department’s Local Government and Community Branch, and a well resourced strategy and policy division. In this context, Manukau City Council participants comment that the Department’s role had minimal impact on their community outcomes process, and their relationships with central government agencies.
Manukau City Council participants are aware that the Department has assisted smaller and less well resourced local authorities in Auckland with their community outcomes process and has facilitated their engagement with central government agencies, as needed. In this context, Manukau City Council perceives the Department’s role as having value.

Manukau City Council comment that the Department’s role is not clearly defined and communicated. It is challenging therefore to identify how the Department may assist. Conversely, Manukau City Council acknowledges that little consideration has been given to how the Department could assist in facilitating relationships with central government to realise community outcomes.

“DIA seemed to struggle with the role in bringing together local and central government as all are at different stages of the process” (Local authority)

Manukau City Council participants note the following challenges for the Department, specifically:

- Relationship managers’ limited capacity to cover a large geographical region, encompassing a diverse range of local authorities and needs
- The lack of levers to compel reluctant central government agencies to engage in community outcomes. One participant commented on their preference to contact the State Services Commission if a central government agency is reluctant to engage
- The presence of other facilitators with strong relationships across both central and local government sectors, extensive regional and local networks, in-depth local knowledge, and discretionary funding, (e.g. the Ministry of Social Development).

The short-term impacts from the Department’s facilitation of the interface in this region are detailed below.

**Connecting:** The Department did not assist Manukau City Council in connecting with central government, given their pre-existing relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>None: due to limited engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>Potential to identify how the Department may assist in connecting agencies to activities detailed in <em>Tomorrow’s Manukau Workbook</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Not used the role at all in relation to Tomorrow’s Manukau. We have not had much to do with DIA as we have a long history of central government engagement – no need.” (Local authority)

**Creating relevance:** Manukau City Council had little need for the Department to create a better understanding between central and local government stakeholders of each other and community outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Little need as there is already buy-in from key central government agencies in Tomorrow’s Manukau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Smoothing engagement:** Manukau City Council had little need for the Department to facilitate engagement with central government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worked</th>
<th>Little need due to internal capacity, and a strong history of central government engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Improvements

- None for Manukau City Council, but keep assisting smaller local authorities

Sharing good practice: Manukau City Council appreciated receiving information from the Department.

Working

- Interesting to receive information about other local authorities’ community outcomes, monitoring and reporting, and developing Memorandums of Understanding, but information of limited value

Improvements

- Information tailored to assist more advanced local authorities

“DIA is leading practice in monitoring outcomes. But the seminar was useless for us as it lacked relevant subject matter given where we are at with monitoring.” (Local authority)

Future directions

Going forward, Manukau City Council is focused on working with central government and other organisations to implement actions to realise outcomes, and to measure progress towards achieving desired community outcomes, as defined in Tomorrow’s Manukau and its Workbook.

Over the next 12 months, Manukau City Council participants note the following future needs in relation to community outcomes:

- Identify opportunities to create linkages and alignment between local and regional authorities and their community outcomes
- Deliver action on the community outcomes via central government agencies and other community and business organisations working together in a meaningful way around a common goal
- Embed relevant community outcomes into central government agencies’ business planning.

“We have a good relationship with central government, but community outcomes are not being driven down in their organisations. For example, does the local service centre of a central government agency know about Tomorrow’s Manukau? Community outcomes need to be written into Performance Agreements and Business Plans.” (Local authority)

Manukau City Council does not have a defined need for assistance from the Department. However, they acknowledge that the Department’s facilitation role is important for other local authorities. To be effective, the Department’s role needs to be more clearly defined and communicated to local authorities. The Department’s service offer should acknowledge that local authorities are at different stages in relation to their community outcomes and relationships with central government agencies.

“DIA needs to help smaller local authorities and help them with the doing. Staff tend to be operationally focused and may have little strategic capacity beyond core business. Some have little resources for community outcomes.” (Local authority)

Manukau City Council participants suggest that over the next 12 months the Department focuses on:
Creating a more consistent approach to progressing the community outcomes process across local and regional authorities, and central government agencies and other relevant organisations

- Identifying relationship gaps between local and central government
- Fostering and facilitating local and central government relationships by bringing relevant agencies together to work on realising community outcomes
- Sharing central government agencies' best practice framework on common issues, (e.g. domestic violence), to increase local government knowledge and to identify opportunities for intersectorial policy work
- Identifying collective issues of concern across local authorities to inform central government thinking
- Sharing relevant information tailored to local authorities' experience in the community outcomes process, and their central government relationships
- Developing resource packages that encompass common themes for both central and local government, and include examples of effective local, regional, national and international practice relating to community outcomes.

“DIA can pull people together around a project or action group to move forward on community outcomes…Achieving the relationship is not the end the game. There needs to be a focus on what can be achieved through this interaction.”
(Local authority)

Conclusions

Overall, the Department’s facilitation role has had little impact on Manukau City Council’s community outcomes process or its relationships with central government. This reflects that Manukau City Council is well advanced in the process of identifying and realising their communities’ outcomes. However, Manukau City Council does perceive a role for the Department in helping smaller local authorities needing assistance in their community outcomes processes.
## Appendix

### 1. Case study selection

The following table details cases selected against case study selection criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Activity or regional focus</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>1:1: many</th>
<th>Engage DIA</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>RM Region</th>
<th>Engage COPs</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Way Southland</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Well led cooperation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Community</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>Medium to high</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Challenges local politics</td>
<td>DIA role to manage this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Lower central</td>
<td>High: Wgtn engagement CG</td>
<td>Clear role DIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Taranaki</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Rural/provincial</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Lower central</td>
<td>Advanced COP</td>
<td>Future focus of interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing Futures</td>
<td>Region/activity</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Upper central</td>
<td>High: e.g. of LG and CG working tog on COP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBOP</td>
<td>Activity/region</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Upper central</td>
<td>High: e.g. of LG and CG working tog on COP</td>
<td>Future focus of interface function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau City Council</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere City Council</td>
<td>Activity/local</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1 to many</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cases by interviews conducted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Participants within same local authority</th>
<th>Participants across local authority</th>
<th>Regionally based central government people</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Way Southland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Community Plans Group</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitikei District Council</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Taranaki</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing Futures Waikato</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBOP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau City Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere City Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of interviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local government cases</th>
<th>Local government coverage</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Way Southland</td>
<td>Southland District Council Environment Southland Invercargill City Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Community Plans Group</td>
<td>Christchurch City Council Waimakariri District Council Hurunui District Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitikei District Council</td>
<td>Palmerston North City Council Rangitikei District Council Wanganui District Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Taranaki</td>
<td>Taranaki Regional Council Stratford District Council New Plymouth District Council South Taranaki District Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing Futures Waikato</td>
<td>Hauraki District Council South Waikato District Council Hamilton City Council Choosing Futures Waikato</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBOP Working Group and Monitoring and Reporting Group</td>
<td>Tauranga City Council Whakatane District Council Rotorua City Council Opotiki District Council Environment Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau City Council</td>
<td>Manukau City Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere City Council</td>
<td>Waitakere City Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Draft intervention logic

An Evaluation Design Workshop was held on 12 July 2006 with representatives from the Department’s Research and Evaluation Team, the interface team, and Local Government and Community Branch policy team. The purpose of the workshop was to surface the draft intervention logic detailed below:

---

**Draft intervention logic: DIA’s Facilitation Function**  
**12/07/06**

**Purpose of the logic:**
- This is the framework against which we will assess objective 2: To assess the effectiveness of DIA’s role in facilitating the CG/LG interface regarding COPs

**Interpretation of logic**
Working from the bottom of the intervention logic in an upwards direction:
- DIA’s facilitation function: lists the activities of the function (yellow boxes)
- Short term outcomes likely to have emerged over the last 18 months are for:
  - Central government department (CG) in green. Note: for CG we will assess the outcomes at both a regional and national level
  - DIA’s facilitation function in blue
  - Local Government (LG) in orange: Note: there are three boxes in this column that are lighter, which require particular consideration as Litmus has added after the workshop. Do they make sense? Are they needed?
- Longer term outcomes likely to emerge over the next 6-12 years are in red above the line

**Task:**
In reviewing the logic consider:
- Does it make sense? Is the language meaningful?
- What, if anything is missing?
- Is it likely the short term outcomes will have emerged to varying extents over the last 18 months

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term outcomes</th>
<th>Enhanced community wellbeing</th>
<th>Reduced costs</th>
<th>Efficient use of CG &amp; LG Resources</th>
<th>Improved policy LG/CG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG uses info from COPs to inform their SOI</td>
<td>Ongoing partnership CG/LG &amp; COPs/wider</td>
<td>LG/COP activities/info sharing COPS &amp; LTCCPs</td>
<td>LG understands CG processes/frameworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Better co-ordination of CG engagement (sharing good practice)</th>
<th>Leadership via facilitation function (role definition for DIA)</th>
<th>Better co-ordination of LG engagement with CG (sharing of good practice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG undertakes activities to enable COPs &amp; their engagement</td>
<td>Identifying issues and facilitating a response including advice to DIA, CG, LG</td>
<td>LG can access CG info/help for COPs</td>
<td>LG is aware of who to find info from CG to enable COPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG appreciates opportunities of COPs to their dept</td>
<td>CG &amp; LG partnership enabled by DIA</td>
<td>LG is seeks opportunities to engage with CG to enable COPs</td>
<td>LG appreciates the participative role that CG brings to COPs. LG appreciates opportunities roles CG can make to COPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG appreciates relevance of COPs for their dept/role</td>
<td>CG &amp; LG access DIA’s assistance when needed for COPs</td>
<td>LG aware of &amp; understand LGA, COP &amp; CG sector</td>
<td>LG aware of &amp; understand LGA, COP &amp; CG sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG understands their responsibility to COP process</td>
<td>CG/LG aware of &amp; understand DIA’s facilitation role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG aware of &amp; understand LGA, COP &amp; CG sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CENTRAL GOVT: national and regional level**

- Draft intervention logic: DIA’s Facilitation Function 12/07/06

**DIA’s Facilitation Function**
- Website
- CGDG & SEECS
- Workshops
- Formal meetings
- Interface team
- Information broker
- Research & analysis - information development

**Linkages / advice to DIA**
- Core Contacts Group
- Regional presentations
- DSG
- Sharing good practice
- Newsletters; brochures
- Information development
3. Research tools

Informed Consent Form

I (insert name) ……………………………………………………………………………………………….

of (insert address) …………………………………………………………………………………agree to participate
in the evaluation of Department of Internal Affairs’ role in facilitating engagement between
central and local government on the community outcomes process, as outlined in the
information sheet given to me by the Department of Internal Affairs and Litmus.

I understand that:

- My participation in the evaluation is voluntary and I can withdraw at any time up until
  the reporting stage. If I withdraw, I can request that any data collected from me be
  returned or destroyed.

- Whether or not I participate will not affect my relationship with the Department of
  Internal Affairs, or other central and local government departments or agencies in any
  way.

- The evaluation process followed by Litmus will seek to keep my information
  anonymous. That is, I will not be named in the evaluation report.

- The interview with my permission will be taped, and may be transcribed.

- Tapes, transcripts, notes, and summaries will be stored securely at Litmus.

I have read this consent form, and been given the opportunity to ask questions. I give my
consent to participate in this evaluation.

Participant’s signature: __________________________

Date: __________________
Evaluating the Department’s Role in Facilitating the CG/LG Interface re COP

Interview Guide – Local Government

This interview guide is indicative of the relevant subject matter to be covered. It is designed to allow freedom of any additional relevant topics, which may arise during the interview to be discussed. (Note: Acronyms will not be used in discussions)

For interviewer: evaluation objectives
1. Describe the implementation of The Department’s role in facilitating the CG/LG interface, and CG’s engagement (i.e. what The Department has done?)
2. Assess the effectiveness of the role? (i.e. what was the effect?)
3. Consider the future focus of The Department’s role? (i.e. what is the future focus?)

Introduction
- Introduce self/Litmus
  - Purpose: Evaluate the Department of Internal Affairs’ role in encouraging central and local government to work together on the community outcomes process (COP)
  - Interview has three sections: 1) your perceptions of the benefits and challenges of working with central government, 2) your local authority’s interactions with The Department in seeking to work with central government on COPs and its effectiveness over the last 18 months; and 3) the future needs of the sector and The Department’s future role
- Informed consent
- Time: around one hour
- Outcomes – letter of thanks

1. Context: Perceptions of CG and LG working together

As you are aware one of the intents of the Local Government Act (LGA) is to encourage local and central government to work together on the community outcomes. Before the introduction of the LGA, to what extent did you council work with central government on local and regional issues?

- How has this changed with the introduction of LGA?
- What are the benefits of working with central government?
- What are the challenges of working with central government?
- What is your role in relation to working with central government?

2. Use of The Department and Effectiveness

In your own words, describe the Department of Internal Affairs’ role in the community outcomes process.

- What are the benefits of role?
- What are the challenges of role?
Network map

On this page, placing your council at the centre, draw the central government departments your council has had dealings with about community outcomes in the last 18 months?

- What, if anything, was The Department’s role in establishing or fostering these connections?
- (Probes as below)

Over the last 18 months, what other involvement has your council had with The Department around LGA, COP, and in working with central government on the community outcomes process.

For each interaction ask:

- What prompted this?
- What was the purpose or aim of this interaction?
- What worked?
- What didn’t work?
- Overall, how would you rate The Department on service delivery? (i.e. availability, accessibility, being timely, quality, efficiency)
- What happened as a result of working with The Department?
  - For the event/issue?
  - For your council?
  - For engagement with central government on COPs?
  - What, if anything else happened that you didn’t expect?

What other initiatives have The Department implemented to encourage and support local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process? (SHOWCARD A)

- Purpose of initiative?
- Working? Not working?

Reflecting back over the last 18 months, how has the Department’s role changed in encouraging local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process?

Using this scale (Showcard B), how would you rate the overall usefulness of the Department of Internal Affairs’ role in encouraging local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process, and on the attributes listed below.

For each attribute probe out:

- For what reasons did you give this rating?
3. Future needs of the sector

Over the next 12 months, what are the needs of local and central government in seeking to work together on the community outcomes? Needs over the next 6 years as COP come around again?

- What will enable local and central government to work together around the implementation of the LTCCPS, and community outcomes?

- What will hinder it?

- What is The Department’s role in meeting these future needs?

Close: Other comments/feedback? Thanks and next steps
### A: The Department of Internal Affairs’ initiatives to encourage local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Aware (please tick)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Government Interagency Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEC5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.localcentral.govt.nz">www.localcentral.govt.nz</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC electronic discussion group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual local and central government workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications materials: At the Interface newsletter, brochures on their role, LGA and community outcomes process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and reporting training seminars and workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B: Rate the Department of Internal Affairs’ usefulness on a scale from....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>So so</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating of The Department’s usefulness in this role

- Providing information about the LGA to local government
- Providing information about COP to local government
- Providing information about the central government sector to local government
- Creating an understanding of what central government can bring to COP
- Helping local government to access central government information
- Helping local government to access the ‘right’ people in central government departments
- Encouraging central and local government to work together on COP
- Offering support and advice on issues arising when working with central government on COP
- Helping local government to share examples of good practice on engaging with central government
Evaluating The Department’s Role in Facilitating the CG/LG Interface re COP

Interview Guide – Central Government

This interview guide is indicative of the relevant subject matter to be covered. It is designed to allow freedom of any additional relevant topics, which may arise during the interview to be discussed. (Note: acronyms will not be used in discussions)

High level overview of objectives
1. Describe the implementation of DIA’s role in facilitating the CG/LG interface, and CG’s engagement (i.e. what DIA has done?)
2. Assess the effectiveness of the role? (i.e. what was the effect?)
3. Consider the future focus of DIA’s role? (i.e. what is the future focus?)

Introduction
- Introduce self/Litmus
- Purpose:
  - Evaluate the Department of Internal Affairs’ role in encouraging central and local government to work together on the community outcomes process (COP)
  - Understand central government actions to inform their staff about LGA, and inform DIA about their involvement with COP
  - Interview will cover 3 areas: 1) understanding your dept and role re LGA and COPs, 2) your department interactions with DIA and its effectiveness over the last 18 months; and 3) the future needs of the sector and DIA’s future role
- Informed consent
- Time: around one hour
- Outcomes – letter of thanks

4. Context: Perceptions of CG and LG working together

Describe at a high level how the Local Government Act (LGA) and its intent of local and central government working together on the community outcomes process fits with your department.

- What are the benefits?
- What are the challenges?
- What is your role in relation to the LGA and COP?

5. Use of DIA and Effectiveness

In your own words, describe the Department of Internal Affairs’ role on the Community outcomes process.

- Benefits of role?
- Challenges of role?
Over the last 18 months, what has been your department’s involvement with DIA around LGA, COP, and in working with local government on the community outcomes process.

For each interaction ask:

- What prompted this?
- What was the purpose or aim of this interaction?
- What worked?
- What didn’t work?
- Overall, how would you rate DIA on service delivery? (i.e. availability, accessibility, being timely, quality, efficiency)
- What happened as a result of working with DIA?
  - For the event/issue?
  - For your department?
  - For engagement with local government on COPs?
  - What, if anything else happened that you didn’t expect?

What other initiatives have DIA implemented to encourage and support local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process? (SHOWCARD A)

- Purpose of initiative?
- Working? Not working?

Reflecting back over the last 18 months, how has the Department’s role changed in encouraging local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process?

Using this scale (Showcard B), how would you rate the overall usefulness of the Department of Internal Affairs’ role in encouraging local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process, and the attributes listed below.

For each attribute probe out:

- For what reasons did you give this rating?

6. CG delivery to Cab Paper

In what other ways, not already mentioned, does your department provide information to DIA on its involvement around COP and engagement with local government on COs.

We have discussed that DIA provides information about LGA, COP, and local government to central government department. How is this information passed on to relevant staff in your department?

- How do staff use this information? How does it fit with their roles?
7. Future needs of the sector

Over the next 12 months, what are the needs of local and central government in seeking to work together on the community outcomes? Needs over the next 6 years as COP come around again?

- What will enable local and central government to work together around the implementation of the LTCCPS, and community outcomes?
- What will hinder it?
- What is DIA’s role in meeting these future needs?

Close: Other comments/feedback? Thanks and next steps
A: The Department of Internal Affairs’ Initiatives to encourage local and central government to work together on the community outcomes process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Aware (please tick)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Government Interagency Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEC5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.localcentral.govt.nz">www.localcentral.govt.nz</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC electronic discussion group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual local and central government workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications materials: At the Interface newsletter, brochures on their role, LGA and community outcomes process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and reporting training seminars and workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B: Rate the Department of Internal Affairs’ usefulness on a scale from....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>So so</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating of DIA’s usefulness in this role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing information about the LGA to central government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing information about COP to central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information about the local government sector to central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an understanding of how COP relates to central government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging central and local government to work together on COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering support and advice on issues arising when working with local government on COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collating information from central government departments on their involvement in COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping central government departments to share examples of good practice on engaging with local government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glossary:
- DIA = Department of Internal Affairs
- LGA = Local Government Act 2002
- COP = the community outcomes process