

STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT – HOW STRATEGIC REALLY ARE WE?

Grant Holland, Senior Consultant, Waugh Infrastructure Management Ltd

Abstract

In this paper I will discuss the range of directions Local Authorities have before them, and the responses available. Particular reference will be made to the New Zealand strategic planning regime established through the 2002 Local Government Act, and the New Zealand experience since then.

The paper will raise and debate a number of infrastructure management issues in the context of the wider community interest.

Structure of the paper

1. Introduction
What is your strategy? What does the Council or Local Authority wish to achieve?
2. What is strategy? Overview of comments by Michael Porter and Henry Mintzberg and purpose as discussed by Nikos Mourkogiannis
3. Whose view is it anyway? The politicians or the community at large?
4. What is the organisation's focus?
Are we taking a four-well-beings approach – or just focussing on one of them at a time?
5. Where are we heading? Are the raft of activities the authority is involved in taking us there? Is there integrated Asset Management planning behind this – or is it disparate?
6. What is the Role of the Authority to make it happen?
7. The New Zealand experience
The intent of the Local Government Act 2002, integrated planning and the LTCCP approach, is it getting us there?
8. What about 'business as usual'?
9. Concluding remarks

Key Words: infrastructure, asset management, local government, strategy, purpose, New Zealand Local Government Act 2002

Introduction

Global challenges, local solutions, delivering for the next generation. Today we have a number of challenges before us, and I intend to challenge you and your idea of strategic asset management.

What is your strategy? – What does the Council/Local Authority wish to achieve?

Do you have a mission statement, a vision or a purpose? What is the authority's tag-line? Are Infrastructure Managers supporting it across the authority's activities?

What if I was to pose the following questions on Strategic Direction and Organisational Strategy.

1. Do you know what your organisation's key strategic objectives are? What are they? If you asked a random fellow employee the same question at the next corporate function, would they be likely to answer the same?

2. Has your Council developed a clear statement of its role in promoting the present and future well-being of the Community?

3. Is your Councils' statement of the role it intends (to) take in promoting the Community Outcomes specific? (or is it of a more general nature such as 'we will work with the Community to promote these outcomes etc').

4. Are there other strategies of a more specific nature within your organisation e.g. Recreation Strategy, Regional Land Transport Strategy etc?

5. Is the purpose of the strategy clear? (or does it exist because someone said 'lets have an xxxx strategy'?)

These are real questions! They are part of the SOLGM/NAMS Guide to Performance Management in Local Government (2007).

New Zealand Examples

Looking around New Zealand, we find the following.

Waitakere City (the 'EcoCity') is one that stands out.

The EcoCity is: A network of resilient, productive and prosperous communities, living in compact towns and neighbourhoods, nourishing the environment, and celebrating our diverse and creative lifestyles. (<http://www.waitakere.govt.nz>, Retrieved 1 June 2009)

Also in Auckland, but over the harbour, in North Shore City we find -

North Shore - City Vision

Our City is prosperous, dynamic and diverse, and

- offers a range of quality lifestyles;
- has an abundance of education and employment opportunities;
- has an abundance of leisure, entertainment and cultural opportunities;
- is easy to move around;
- is safe;
- values and protects our environment

(<http://www.northshorecity.govt.nz/>, Retrieved 1 June 2009)

Australian Examples

Brisbane's vision is outlined in 'Our shared vision - Living in Brisbane 2026'

Brisbane is a youthful and enthusiastic city – spanning city to bay and hills to bush. It is appreciated by residents and visitors for its friendliness and optimism, and respected for its leadership and achievements. In order to realise our Vision, we have developed 20 goals called city-wide outcomes. They allow us to track our tangible progress towards the vision while providing focus areas to work towards. (Brisbane City Council, 2008)

Melbourne has plenty of direction – Vision, mission and goals, perhaps this may be too many directions!

Vision

The City of Melbourne will strive to achieve the Community's vision of a bold inspirational and sustainable City.

Mission

The City of Melbourne will strive to achieve the Community's vision of a bold inspirational and sustainable City by:

- making Melbourne great for people to live in and visit;
- achieving the creative potential of the city;

- protecting and strengthening the City's economic prosperity;
- making Melbourne a recognised knowledge City that supports innovation and technology;
- demonstrating leadership in ecological sustainability;
- working vigorously for a connected city which is safe and supports the efficient movement of people and freight;
- leading by example and managing resources well

These seem well integrated with the Future Melbourne Community Plan.

The Future Melbourne Community Plan was endorsed by Melbourne City Council in September 2008. It provides the overarching structure for the Council's special committees and the framework for this Council Plan.

The six goals of Future Melbourne are:

- A city for people;
- A creative city;
- A prosperous city;
- A knowledge city;
- An EcoCity;
- A connected city

(Melbourne City Council, 2009)

Other Examples

Looking further afield at two of the largest world cities, we find the London Plan and plaNYC.

The Mayor is responsible for strategic planning in London -

The Mayor's vision is to develop London as an exemplary sustainable world city, based on three interwoven themes:

- Strong, diverse long term economic growth;
- Social inclusivity to give all Londoners the opportunity to share in London's future success;
- Fundamental improvements in London's environment and use of resources

(Greater London Authority. February 2008).

New York City, through its plaNYC, has one succinct vision - Our plan for a greener, greater New York - plaNYC. The plan outlines the goals in terms of land, water, transportation, energy air and climate change.

Strategy and Purpose

So let's agree, it's useful to know where you are heading and to have some vision or goal.

So what is strategy?

Strategy is the creation of a unique and valuable position, involving a different set of activities. (Porter 2000)

Michael Porter's writings about strategy focus on competitive strategy and gaining advantage in the business world – not really what we are about in Local Government and infrastructural asset management.

Strategy formation is a planning process, designed or supported by planners, to plan in order to produce plans. (Mintzberg, 1994)

Taking the comments of Porter and others on-board, we should consider strategy as a process not an output.

What does this mean for Strategic Infrastructural Asset Management? The last three words are about the management of infrastructural assets. We are comfortable with that. But strategy ... isn't that someone else's job? Some commentators and papers seem to be struggling with the 'strategic' bit. Is Strategic Asset Management the new buzz word? Is it just the same with some extra words? Let's make sure we understand the words that we are using.

Collins Dictionary 2006 defines strategy as a long term plan for success... and strategic as planned to achieve an advantage.

And Planning as a method thought out for doing or achieving something.

And how about Management – Manage is to succeed at doing something.

Finally, Purpose is defined as the reason for which anything is done...a fixed design or idea that is the object of an action.

All of these terms are very positive; they are about achieving something, taking action and going after the goal.

This is all great and I'm sure you may say 'so what?' The question I have is – what is success? What is the objective, the goal, the purpose? Is it defined? Is your management of infrastructure geared towards it?

So what is Purpose?

Nikos Mourkogiannis 2006 book about purpose reinforces the importance of knowing what you want to achieve. I would recommend it highly.

Purpose is preparation for doing what is right and what is worthwhile. As such it creates a sense of obligation...it's a way of knowing

what you can and can't do (Mourkogiannis 2006).

Our long term thinking is not the same as our purpose but it should reflect it. Purpose creates a direction...but not necessarily a snapshot of the destination. Nor is it our mission statement, these are usually a 'we will do something to achieve something else' type of phrase.

The New Zealand Society of Local Government Managers (SOLGM) produced a helpful suite of guides in 2007 to assist Local Government Managers with their response to their requirement to plan strategically.

What Strategic Direction-setting is All About?

The term strategy is often used interchangeably with terms such as policy, policy statement, plan, and often to describe much the same process and product. The term is applied variably across the Local Government sector, depending on the legislation being applied, the issues faced and your Local Authorities own preferences.

Regardless of whether a document that outlines where we want to be and how we're going to get there is called a strategy, a policy or a plan, there is a very clear need for a strategic approach in order to reach your Local Authorities desired goals, objectives or outcomes. (New Zealand Society of Local Government Managers (SOLGM), 2007)

Who sets the direction?

In managing the affairs of a local body, it is likely there will be a tension between the parties involved; staff, politicians and the public at large. Both the view and the direction may differ. Ultimately the community sets it's own direction for the future and the organisation will consult to facilitate this. This will become difficult as long term views and short term gains mixed with unexpected events come into play. This has been illustrated this year with the intent of many long terms plans delayed as organisations cope with the impacts of worldwide financial events.

It is easy to get lost in the details and lose sight of the intended direction. As the New Zealand Auditor General said in his review of the 2006-16 Long Term Community Plans; as financial estimates were aggregated from Group of Activities Statements to the financial statements as a whole, we observed that local authorities often failed to stand back

and consider what the financial statements were depicting.

What is the organisation's focus?

While New Zealand Local Authorities are able to become involved in a range of activities, legislation identifies the well-being of the community as the focus of the organisation. The well-being of the community encompasses the cultural, economic, environmental and social aspects of the community.

Understanding these aspects and maintaining some form of balance is a challenge. While we all purport to understand our community, few have defined what these well-beings mean to them. Environment Canterbury, which has regional responsibilities in the South Island of New Zealand, is one organisation that has.

Social well-being - 'Living the good life in Canterbury.' Those factors that enable individuals, their families, hapu and communities to set goals and achieve them – such as education, health, the strength of community networks, financial and personal security, rights and freedoms and levels of equity. (hapu is the Māori word for descent group or clan)

Economic well-being - 'Prospering in Canterbury.' Those factors relating to the capacity of the economy to generate the employment and wealth necessary to provide many of the prerequisites for social well-being, such as health services.

Environmental well-being - 'Caring for Canterbury.' Those factors that relate ultimately to the capacity of the natural environment to support, in a sustainable way, the activities that constitute community life.

Cultural well-being - 'Vibrant, exciting Canterbury.' Those factors that encompass the shared beliefs, values, customs, behaviours and identities reflected through language, stories, experiences, visual and performing arts, ceremonies and heritage. (Environment Canterbury, 2009)

Are we taking a four well-beings approach – or just focussing on one of them at a time?
How do you maintain some sort of balance?

Where are we heading?

As we head off towards our goal, understanding the direction our Community desires, as Infrastructure Managers another

question comes to mind. Is the raft of activities the Authority is involved in taking us there?

We need to keep a check on where we are heading and how our progress is.

A Council that is willing to put both the aspirational goal and the current state of affairs on the main wall of their entry foyer seems to me to have a good chance of achieving what they aim at. (Burns, P, 2009)

This is highlighted in the NAMS.AU policy: Delivering the right outcomes from the Asset management planning process is critical to the success of the organisation in meeting its strategic goals. Success in asset management requires that the following issues be addressed at the beginning: establishing clear corporate asset management policy, strategy, goals and objectives. (IPWEA, 2009)

What is the Role of the Authority to make it happen?

Earlier we discussed purpose and that it's a way of knowing what you can and can't do. Understanding your organisations' role is a vital step towards success.

As Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd said in his Opening Address to the Australian Council of Local Government:

The role of Local Government has never been clearly defined. Councils that plan and manage their assets effectively are Councils that can deliver value for money to their communities. We need to know what we've got, what condition it's in, whether it needs to be repaired and how much it costs to maintain. That is the most basic level of information. All States and Territories have agreed to adopt and implement nationally financial and asset management and planning frameworks for Local Government developed by the Local Government and Planning Ministers Council.

Often Local Authorities wear many hats, performing a variety of roles in supporting the Community.

While Local Authorities are typically seen as service providers, the role in promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, in the present and for the future is much broader. As well as Provider, a Local Authority may be the Funder, the Regulator, the

Promoter/Facilitator or may Advocate on behalf of the Community

The New Zealand experience

In 2002 the new Local Government Act (LGA 2002) introduced a new planning regime for all Local Authorities. Along with the objective of integrated planning underpinned by robust asset management and financial management, Local Authorities were given a more enabling approach with broader powers than before. The preparation of the Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) as a key strategic planning document and consultation with the Community over the direction of the LTCCP were central to the new regime. The LTCCP includes a forecast of at least ten years, and a review and community consultation was required every three years. During the first half of this year Councils completed their third iteration of the LTCCP.

Is this regime the answer if our objective is an effective strategy supporting our communities?

Is it a strategy – a long term plan for success? On the face of it with the LTCCP requirement, it would appear so.

Do we understand the purpose of the organisation? The LGA 2002 in section 10 defines this for us clearly:

The purpose of Local Government is - (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and (b) to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, in the present and for the future.

Is there a direction, which is set by the Community? Do we understand the expectations of the Community? This would appear to be the reasons for the Community Outcomes process.

The identification of 'Community Outcomes' is a prescribed process in the LGA 2002 (section 91) that endeavours to allow the Community to identify its priorities, whether these are within the realm of the Council's operations or not. This process is repeated every six years.

So is it getting us there?

In my view, yes and no.

There is no doubt there is greater focus, community engagement and decision-making

is more robust, with a longer term view. Councils are working hard to balance the four well-beings and the needs of both current and future generations.

While providing a new platform of integrated planning and broader powers, the combination of Local Government legislation, with the LGA 2002 as centrepiece is a complex regime. While the ideals of strategy, purpose and direction are evident, the raft of legislation means there are many conflicting objectives and requirements to meet. Authorities may be pulled in so many different ways that they either fail to deliver or they keep applying more resources (and therefore the community's money) in order to succeed.

The Panel recognises that the planning processes contained in the LGA 2002 have considerable merit in bringing a strategic focus to Local Authority decision-making, highlighting the need for decision-making to take account of the views of citizens, and enhancing the transparency of Council decision-making. However, significant dissatisfaction with the current policy and statutory framework for planning and accountability was expressed by elected members, Council staff, and citizens and Community groups in submissions and comments to the Panel. The current statutory provisions on consultation and planning are onerous, complex, and confusing. They are sometimes implemented in a compliance-based way. (Local Government Rates Inquiry Panel, 2007)

Through the identification of Community Outcomes, there is an expectation of commensurate action. The action deemed appropriate by one sector of the Community may be the last thing another wanted to see. This is illustrated where improved roading networks are proposed to support the economic well-being of the Community; meanwhile others will promote public transport and cycling in order to improve the environmental well-being.

Other tensions are created by external drivers; amendments to the Health Act and the Building Act require the implementation of new infrastructure and management. These costs are being loaded onto ratepayers at a time when financial restraint is urged by communities and Central Government, the authors of the new legislation.

Following the adoption of the 2006-16 LTCCPs, in 2007 the Office of the Auditor General provided a useful overview of the success (or otherwise) of the process.

Long-term planning is not new for Local Authorities. ... The emphasis on long-term planning in the Act reflects the concerns of Parliament and the public that the governing and accountability framework for Local Government should give it incentives to plan for sustainable long-term service delivery, informed by an understanding of community needs and views.

The role of the LTCCP and areas for improvement I am aware from anecdotal reports that some Local Authorities perceive a contradiction between the potential roles of an LTCCP as: a high-level articulation of strategy; and a document to record detailed management intentions ... Using this approach, the LTCCP is a process that bridges high-level strategic planning and detailed work planning ... My auditors have advised me that more usable LTCCPs tended to result where local authorities embedded the preparation of the LTCCP as a process, rather than treating the LTCCP as a document that was prepared as a one-off compliance exercise.

The LTCCP should reflect a Local Authority's synthesis of its community feedback and of its policies and strategies, including its financial management strategies, culminating in the prospective financial statements. Through the LTCCP process, financial estimates and implications become the main ingredients to inform decision-making. (Office of the Auditor-General, 2007)

So it's a bridge! Spanning the Community's idea of where they want to go, the planning on how to get there (eventually, and what the authorities actions are that will take the Community in that direction. The process may well be as important as the result.

Can we see the direction and the purpose?

The Panel considers that the concept of a 10-year plan is sound and notes that the LTCCPs have been important in making transparent forecast Council expenditures and forecast levels of rate increases. The Panel considers that the concepts, if properly applied, reflect good management practice and thus does not accept the argument advanced in some Council submissions that LTCCPs represent an "unfunded mandate".

The Panel considers that LTCCPs should not be prepared merely to comply with the Act. Rather, they should be the Council's own key planning document and be capable of being readily produced from its own planning system. Councils already having sound planning mechanisms in place appear to have found the preparation of such a detailed plan less onerous than those with weaker planning mechanisms. Nevertheless, the Panel accepts that the level of detail required makes the preparation of the plan a costly exercise. (Local Government Rates Inquiry Panel, 2007)

If we can't see the point and value in the process then little is achieved. A compliance approach may leave strategy and planning divorced from the organisation's culture and operations.

Which Strategy?

Many infrastructural assets have long lifecycles, and a ten year strategy only considers a part of that lifecycle. Robust planning will take a long term approach, and an organisation may choose to prepare a strategy with a view well beyond the LTCCP. This raises the issue of which strategy informs which?

Selwyn District Council has prepared an integrated strategy for all of its water services with a sixty year view. This provides a direction to the Water Services Activity (Asset) Management Plan (ten to twenty year view) and the LTCCP (ten year view). The strategy also takes in cross-boundary issues raised in the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy. This is a great approach but becomes confused if you see the LTCCP as the strategy.

A decision needs to be made here. What is our strategy – our long term plan for success and what are the factors that need to be considered as part of that plan? If this is not done then we have an unachievable combination of vision, goals, objectives, community outcomes and well-beings mixed in with legislated or regulated directives.

What about 'business as usual'?

For many of us, we just want to get on and do the job; less talk and more action!

When circumstances change so quickly why bother planning for ahead for 10 years, 20 years or more; shouldn't we focus on our

operations being efficient and effective right now?

Without Asset Management you are operating in the dark. It's like driving at night with your headlights showing you just a few metres of the coming road. Introducing asset management is like switching on your high beam. Suddenly, with a better view of the consequences of your actions, you can now see a long distance in front. (Burns, P, 2009) Surely this is lifecycle asset management, not operations. The issue I have (with all due respect!) is that you need to know where you are heading – what is the purpose of the journey?

As Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd said We should not be focussed just on fixing or replacing what we have. We need to focus on laying the foundations for the future.

A 10 year plan is not 10 one year plans! We need a direction, endorsed by our communities to work towards. Otherwise what is business as usual, just more of the same with no consideration of the future or what the community values.

Conclusion

If we compare the Local Authority context with the commercial business world, is there a place for strategic asset management?

Businesses make a decision as to where they want to be and structure their actions towards it. Lucky for them they are able to be so focussed. Local Authorities are creatures of statute and operate in a complex environment of legislation and community drivers, with conflicts and tension. The achievement of one goal or the enhancement of one well-being may degrade another goal or well-being.

From the New Zealand experience we can see real benefits, but these are yet to be fully realised as Authorities work through the complexity of drivers and influencing factors.

On the positive side, a review by the Society of Local Government Managers in December 2008 reported:

An LTCCP is a comprehensive and integrated plan that also specifies what services will be delivered, to what level of service, and why. Done well, an LTCCP should be a demonstration to the Community of the value the Community receives in return for rates and charges ... generally the planning and financial framework put in place

by the Act was working. Managers saw them as driving improvements in asset and financial management practice and as leading to better informed decision-making, and the ability to put improved information before the public about the future costs of both existing and proposed services. The LTCCP as a mechanism was seen as driving a continuous improvement in local governance and management.

Many Local Authorities are demonstrating strong linkages from their vision through their planning to operations. Timaru District Council has shown this through their Land Transport Planning. Some have taken a long term view and engaged the Community to formulate this - Selwyn District Council's Five Waters Strategy. Others are defining the purpose of planning documents, such as Waitaki District Council Water Supply Activity Management Plan so we can see what it seeks to achieve.

Is strategic asset management really strategic?

There are three key issues.

1. Know the Direction. Engage the Community and set a course. Like a yacht you may need to tack one way then the next but you need to know where you are heading to in the long run.

Individuals, Companies and Governments need a clear vision to drive towards. If people believe it is achievable, they are prepared to put in a considerable effort. There has to be real excitement embodied in the Vision about the benefits for our business and customers from improving asset management. Start from a view of where we want to be in 10 or 20 years, and what outcomes we want to deliver, and then work back to where we are now. (Burns, P & Holland, G, 2009)

2. Understand your purpose and you will understand the role of the organisation, and your part in it. Remember purpose is preparation for doing what is right and what is worthwhile. As such it creates a sense of obligation...it's a way of knowing what you can and can't do (Mourkogiannis 2006).

3. Formulate your strategy and establish effective frameworks. For Strategic Asset Management to be successful across the organisation, many frameworks and linkages need to be defined and established. Know

what success is and monitor your way, learning from the successes and failures along the way.

The aim of strategic planning is strategic decision-making and action, not more and better plans (Don Mackay, Society of Local Government Managers, November 2007)

References

Brisbane City Council. (2007) Brisbane Long Term Infrastructure Plan, Brisbane City Council, Brisbane, 6

Brisbane City Council. (2008) Our shared Vision Living in Brisbane 2026, Brisbane City Council, Brisbane 1,2

Burns, P. "A compelling case for asset management", Strategic Asset Management Issue 263, AMQ International, Salisbury 2,3,4

Burns, P and Holland, G. "A compelling case for vision", Strategic Asset Management Issue 264, AMQ International, Salisbury, 8

City of New York (2007) Report: PlaNYC: A Greener, Greater New York, City Of New York, New York, 11,12

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/planyc2030/html/plan/plan.shtml> Retrieved on 23 May 2009

Collins. (2006) Collins English Dictionary, Harper Collins, Glasgow, various

Environment Canterbury. (2009) Long Term Council Community Plan 2009-19: Community Outcomes, Environment Canterbury, Christchurch, 7

Greater London Authority. (2008). The London Plan, Greater London Authority, Greater London Authority, London, xii

Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia. (2009) National Asset Management Strategy IPWEA NAMS.AU, Sydney, 2

Local Government Rates Inquiry Panel. (2007) Funding Local Government. Local Government Rates Inquiry, Wellington, 243

Melbourne City Council (2009) Council Plan 2009–2013, Melbourne City Council, Melbourne, 2,6,7

Mintzberg, H (1994). The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning, Pearson Education Ltd, Essex, 32

Mourkogiannis, N. (2006). Purpose, Palgrave, New York Macmillan, 16,47,52

New Zealand Parliament. (1 July 2008 reprint) Local Government Act 2002, New Zealand Parliament, Wellington

New Zealand Society of Local Government Managers (SOLGM). (2008) Managing for Sustainable Communities - Briefing of

SOLGM to the Minister of Local Government, SOLGM, Wellington, 7,8

http://www.solgm.org.nz/site/News/Brief_to_the_Minister.aspx Retrieved 29 May 2009

New Zealand Society of Local Government Managers (SOLGM). (2007) Performance Management Frameworks: Your Side of the Deal SOLGM, Wellington, 6,47,103

<http://www.solgm.co.nz/Other+SOLGM+Good+Practice+Material/Performance+Management+Frameworks.htm> Retrieved 1 June 2009

Office of the Auditor-General. (2007) Matters arising from the 2006-16 Long-Term Council Community Plans, Office of the Auditor-General, Wellington,3,5,7,47

Rudd, K (18 November 2008) Prime Minister of Australia - Opening Address to Australian Council of Local Government,

http://www.pm.gov.au/media/Speech/2008/speech_0618.cfm, Retrieved on 16 April 2009

Appendix A: The New Zealand System of Local Government

A useful explanation of the New Zealand regime is contained in the December 2008 SOLGM paper *Managing for Sustainable Communities - Briefing of SOLGM to the Minister of Local Government*

Our System of Local Government

The New Zealand system of local government has evolved rapidly over the past two decades. This has been the response to changes in the legislation under which it has operated, and to changes in “the real world”. It is worth briefly recapping the key steps in this process as background to current issues.

Mid 1980s - The Beginning

Pre 1989 New Zealand had more than 700 local authorities – a highly fragmented patchwork of small organisations with overlapping jurisdictions and limited capacity. Central government played a large role in both funding and delivering local infrastructure and services (especially through the Ministry of Works and Development).

Late 1980s – New Structure

The comprehensive reorganisation of local authority boundaries in 1989 produced a structure of 86 multi-functional organisations. Reforms of central government saw the substantial withdrawal of central government agencies from a local presence. Most central government funding support to local authorities (other than for roads) was phased out.

Early 1990s - New Ways of Delivering Services

Local authorities moved away from the “traditional” model of in-house service delivery for all services. Arms length trading enterprises were created to undertake some activities on a more “commercial” basis (similar to SOEs). Contracting out of service delivery became widespread where this offered advantages. Most local authority works (including all state funded work) became subject to competitive tender. The focus of local government became more about making decisions on the type and levels of services that communities wanted, with the actual delivery of those services undertaken in a variety of ways.

Late 1990s - Focus on Financial and Asset Management

From 1998 new financial management requirements saw the sector adopt longer term financial planning, and more sophisticated asset management practices, through the development of long term financial strategies.

2002 – New Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) rationalised a body of legislation that had become outdated and unwieldy. It balances a broadly expressed general power to act with a relatively demanding set of planning and accountability requirements. Other innovations include more stringent process for adopting bylaws, a more comprehensive long term plan (the LTCCP), and the audit of this plan. A new Local Electoral Act and Local Authority (Rating) Act were also enacted.

2002-2008 – New Challenges

The 2006-16 LTCCPs were the first fully audited long term plans under the LGA 2002. They presented a significant management and governance challenge for local authorities. The results of these LTCCPs highlighted issues around the funding of local infrastructure and the resulting levels of rates, and ultimately led to the Independent Inquiry into Rating. Over the last nine years, more than 60 pieces of legislation have been enacted that affect the sector, there is an increasing level of frustration among local authorities around the compliance cost and other costs imposed from the centre in a range of areas as diverse as building regulation and water supply.

There are also useful comments comparing the New Zealand Regime with those Found in Australia and the United Kingdom. (Local Government Rates Inquiry Panel, 2007. Funding Local Government - Local Government Rates Inquiry Page 50-51)

In general, Australian local government is significantly more dependent than New Zealand local government on the vertical transfer of revenues from higher levels of government. During the 1980s and 1990s, Australian state and federal interest in local government focused on operational efficiency and effectiveness. Policy responses at this time tended to focus on structural change in the form of forced amalgamations of councils. The five reports reflect a shift in focus to the sustainability of councils, particularly from a financial perspective. Identified causes of non-sustainability include: the devolution of services without provision of adequate funding tools, increasing complexity and standard of services required by the state, and raised public expectations.

In the period between July 2004 and December 2006, Sir Michael Lyons issued two reports looking at changes to the local government system in the United Kingdom, in particular tax reform, user charging powers, other revenue options, and local government's role and function. In contrast to New Zealand, in the United Kingdom local government delivers a wider range of services, many of which are delivered by central agencies in New Zealand. As a result in the United Kingdom there is a far greater transfer of central government grant funding, and in many respects local authorities are a service delivery arm of central government.

Biography

Grant Holland

Grant Holland has been employed by Waugh Infrastructure Management Ltd (formerly Waugh Consultants) since August 2004 and works with a range of Local Authorities throughout New Zealand.

Grant holds a Land Surveying Degree and worked in Surveying and Land Development prior to joining the Southland District Council where he was involved in implementing Asset Information Systems. He then worked as an Area Engineer working closely with local communities as an Infrastructure Asset Manager.

Grant's is an Asset Management Specialist; his work is frequently at a strategic level, assisting clients with long term planning and advising on the implementation of plans.

