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Dear Minister


We set out to answer the following two questions in our review of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Electoral Act 2001:

- Are any of the provisions of the two Acts a barrier to achieving the policy intent? If they are, is legislative amendment appropriate?
- Are any of the ways that councils are operating and/or interpreting the Acts a barrier to achieving the policy intent? If they are, is the development and dissemination of further good practice guidance appropriate?

We are aware that councils have had limited experience with certain aspects of the Acts. However, our investigations have demonstrated that this experience has not been as limited as to prevent general themes and trends from emerging. Accordingly, we have been more definitive in our findings and recommendations than we had perhaps expected.

We conclude that both Acts are fundamentally sound and assist in achieving their general policy intent and legislative purpose. The number of provisions we have endorsed is testament to this.

The Local Government Act promotes participation in local decision-making and the accountability of councils to their communities for the decisions they make. Their decisions and their actions should aim to enhance community well-being and meet the ‘reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations’. They will also reflect the diverse nature of their communities.

There is already plenty of good practice material available to guide councils in implementing and giving full effect to the Local Government Act. Plans are in place to update and expand this material and we encourage the agencies concerned.

We believe some councils are failing to fully understand some critical provisions and in so doing are inadvertently making the operation of this Act more demanding than it needs to be. This may be discouraging public participation in some areas. Advancing and adopting good practice, by council officers and elected members alike, is the key to furthering the policy intent of the Act.

That is not to say there is no need for legislative amendment and we make specific recommendations in some areas.
With respect to the Local Electoral Act 2001, we believe that generally the present balance between uniformity of rules on electoral processes and diversity, through local decision-making, is appropriate at this time.

We believe that local choice in two key areas, namely the electoral system and order of candidates on voting documents, will need to be addressed further in the future.

The improved operation of the Local Electoral Act will be best achieved through a combination of specific legislative amendments and continued development and dissemination of good practice guidance.

We would like to thank all those who gave freely of their time, through submissions, responding to surveys, or face-to-face discussions, to share their experiences of working with both Acts. This input was invaluable in assisting us in our review.

Sue Piper
Chair

Gwen Bull
Commissioner

Wynne Raymond
Commissioner
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1. Overall conclusions

1.1 Local Government Act 2002

We have concluded that generally the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, if fully understood and properly implemented, support the policy intent for the legislation.

We believe that, with a few notable exceptions, improved operation of the Act will be best achieved by the development and dissemination of (further) good practice guidance, coupled with the provision of training, as distinct from significant legislative amendment.

We recommend a few substantive amendments to the Act and numerous technical amendments (see Section 5: Recommendations).

We believe that the recommended good practice guidance and amendments will assist local authorities to be more responsive to the needs of their communities and more effective in carrying out their prescribed role.

1.2 Local Electoral Act 2001

We have concluded that generally the provisions of the Local Electoral Act 2001 support the purpose of the Act. This includes an appropriate balance, at this time, between uniformity of rules on electoral processes and diversity through local decision-making.

We believe improved operation of the Act will be best achieved through a number of specific legislative amendments (see Section 5: Recommendations) and continued development and dissemination of good practice guidance.

We believe our recommendations will assist the achievement of more democratic representation for local communities and facilitate greater public confidence and understanding of electoral processes.

Our recommended amendments include a number previously recommended by the both the Justice and Electoral Committee and the Commission. We recommend that these amendments proceed as soon as possible.
2. Introduction

2.1 Purpose of report

This report summarises the findings from our review of the operation of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Electoral Act 2001. The detailed analysis and commentary underpinning our findings can be found in our full report Review of the Local Government Act 2002 and Local Electoral Act 2001.

2.2 Focus of review

The requirement for the Commission to undertake this review is outlined in section 32 of the Local Government Act 2002. That section limits the scope of the review to the operation of that Act and the Local Electoral Act.

Accordingly, we have taken the policy intents for both Acts (outlined below) as given. However, this has not prevented us from commenting on the policy intent when we have considered that necessary.

Without limiting the scope of the review, section 32 requires us to assess and determine:

- the impact of conferring on local authorities full capacity, rights, powers and privileges
- the cost-effectiveness of consultation and planning procedures
- the impact of increasing participation in local government and improving representation on local authorities.

Given the operational focus, key questions for the review were as follows:

- Are any of the provisions of the two Acts a barrier to achieving the policy intent? If they are, is legislative amendment appropriate?
- Are any of the ways that councils are operating and/or interpreting the Acts a barrier to achieving the policy intent? If they are, is the development and dissemination of further good practice appropriate?

We have given particular attention to:

- legislative provisions that were introduced for the first time in the Local Government Act 2002 or the Local Electoral Act 2001
- issues raised in submissions or in discussions with interested parties.

2.3 General policy intent

2.3.1 Local Government Act 2002

The general policy intent for the Local Government Act 2002 was outlined in the Government’s Statement of Policy Direction for Review of Local Government Act 1974 released in November 2000. There were four key aspects of the policy direction:

1. A coherent overall strategy for local government including:
   - a focus on local authorities as part of the overall structure of democratic government
   - local government being based on clearly articulated principles concerning communities’ rights for representation, leadership, participation, diversity, fairness and accountability

2. A more broadly-empowering legislative framework under which local authorities can meet the needs of their communities including:
   - recognition of the diverse nature of local communities
   - a need for flexibility to allow local government to respond to changing circumstances

---

1 ‘Full capacity, rights, powers and privileges’ is now commonly referred to as the ‘general empowerment’ of local authorities and this latter term is used throughout our report. General empowerment more accurately describes the powers given to local authorities than the term ‘power of general competence’.
• a need for local authorities to be responsive and accountable to the communities they represent
• scope for communities to make their own choices about what their local authorities do and how they do it
• the range of local authority activities stated more broadly and flexibly in legislation along with rigorous decision-making and accountability processes

3. A partnership relationship between central and local government including:
• central and local government being viewed as two arms of our system of government
• a shared focus on contributing positively to the well-being of communities
• recognition that the social, economic and environmental problems confronting New Zealand are not capable of being resolved by central government alone
• a need for local government along with community groups, non-governmental organisations and business to be able to work together to find solutions and advance the aspirations of local communities


2.3.2 Local Electoral Act 2001
The purpose of the Local Electoral Act 2001 (set out in section 3 of the Act) was to modernise the law governing the conduct of local elections and polls and to provide uniform rules in respect of many electoral processes and local discretion on other specified matters.

Modernisation recognised that all local authority elections are now conducted using postal voting and that there is an increasing use of technology in the management of local elections.

In addition, the Act reflects the New Zealand Labour Party’s 1999 election manifesto for an option for local authorities to adopt the single transferable vote (STV) electoral system, establishment of locally elected district health boards using STV, and introduction of expense limits for candidates at local elections.

2.4 Councils’ experience in operating under these Acts
Councils’ experience of this legislation, particularly the Local Government Act, is still limited. For example:

Local Government Act:
• The first round of community outcomes identification took place prior to 2006 with reporting on progress toward achievement of outcomes required by 2009; the next round of identification of community outcomes is due in 2012.
• The first full round of long-term council community planning was completed in 2006 (2006-16 LTCCPs) and councils are now preparing for the next round (2009-2019 LTCCPs).

Local Electoral Act:
• Three rounds of local elections have been conducted (in 2001, 2004 and 2007).
• STV was an option for councils and local communities at the 2004 and 2007 elections, with ten councils using STV at the 2004 elections and eight councils at the 2007 elections.
• Two rounds of representation reviews have been completed with most councils having completed only one round.

We have taken this experience and the planned longer-term evaluation into account when making our recommendations.
2.5 Longer-term evaluation

The Local Government and Community Branch of the Department of Internal Affairs is undertaking a ten-year evaluation of the Local Government Act, the Local Electoral Act and the Local Government (Rating) Act. This will involve both process and outcome evaluations, with provisional report dates of October 2012 for the LTCCP and community outcomes process evaluation, and June 2013 for the overall outcome evaluation.

While not a prime objective, we believe much of the information collected as part of our review, some of which is contained in our report\(^2\), will help form a baseline for this longer-term evaluation. Given that councils will have been operating under these two Acts for more time, the ten-year evaluation should be capable of being more definitive in its findings on certain issues than was possible for this review.

\(^2\) Other information has been placed on the Commission’s website www.lgc.govt.nz or is available on request.

3.1 Framework for analysis

We present our review of this Act in two parts:

- the planning, decision-making and accountability provisions of Part 6 of the Act (Chapter 3: Responsive Local Government in the main report);
- all other provisions of the Act (Chapter 4: Effective Local Government in the main report).

3.1.1 Responsive local government

We set out to address the following question: *How responsive and accountable are local authorities in meeting the present and long-term needs of their communities?*

The Act requires every local authority to take a sustainable development approach in undertaking its role of enabling democratic local decision-making and promoting community well-being. In being responsive and accountable to its community, a local authority must take account of the diversity of its community, and it must make itself aware of and have regard to community views. It is required to apply these principles in all its planning and decision-making processes.

We addressed the provisions and requirements relating to the following:

- the community outcomes process
- the long-term council community plan (LTCCP)
- the annual plan
- decision-making
- consultation
- contributions to decision-making processes by Māori
- the annual report.

3.1.2 Effective local government

We set out to address the following question: *How effective are local authorities in performing their role of enabling local decision-making and action, and promoting community well-being?*

In addition to the provisions of Part 6, the Act places a number of checks and balances on the activities of local authorities as limits and controls on general empowerment. The Act also sets out the structure of local government in New Zealand and governance and management provisions within which local authorities must operate.

We addressed the provisions and requirements relating to the following:

- empowerment of and relations between regional councils and territorial authorities
- special obligations and restrictions
- regulatory, enforcement and coercive powers
- other legislation
- powers of the Minister and central government
- the structure of local government
- reorganisation of local authorities
- the Local Government Commission
- local authority governance
- elected member issues
- community boards
- council organisations and council-controlled organisations
- employment matters.
3.2 Key findings

3.2.1 Empowerment has not led to a proliferation of new activities

Some provisions in the predecessor Act (i.e. the Local Government Act 1974) provided local authorities with wide powers in certain areas. For example:

- A regional council could, with the consent of the territorial authorities in its region, fund and coordinate the promotion of tourism within the region.
- A territorial authority could undertake, promote and encourage the development of such services and facilities as it considered necessary to maintain and promote the general well-being of the public.

Responses from our all-councils survey indicated that councils are undertaking a wide range of activities. Councils had the powers to undertake most, if not all, of these activities previously.

We conclude that the new Act, and particularly the conferring of full capacity, rights, powers and privileges on local authorities, has not led to a proliferation of new activities being undertaken by councils. There also appears to be no appetite within the local government sector for major change to the empowering provisions of the Act.

3.2.2 The need for and benefits of long-term planning are generally accepted but the quality of documentation needs to be improved

The merits of long-term planning and the legislative vehicle for this, the LTCCP, appear to be largely accepted by councils. The benefits are seen in terms of an enhanced strategic focus, improved asset and financial planning, and opportunities for public participation.

However, there were concerns from councils about the prescribed documentation requirements for inclusion in LTCCPs and the resulting size of plans making it difficult to engage the community. We believe a number of these concerns reflect a misunderstanding of the role of the LTCCP as distinct from the LTCCP summary document. The latter document is the principal consultation tool.

The quality of LTCCP summaries was of concern in 2006 and we believe this should be a priority focus for the upcoming 2009-2019 LTCCPs.

3.2.3 The concept of ‘significance’ is pivotal to a good understanding of the Act but is often not properly understood

The concept of ‘significance’ is at the heart of the decision-making and accountability provisions of the Act. An effective significance policy enables councils to determine the extent they will apply the detailed provisions of the Act and engage and be accountable to the community.

We are concerned that the concept appears to be poorly understood by some councils. We believe this leads to misunderstandings of other provisions of the Act and to perceptions of legislative ‘complexity and over-prescription’. We believe this should be a priority area for development and dissemination of further good practice guidance.

We do acknowledge that some of the confusion may be caused by the multiple and sometimes varying uses of the words ‘significance’, ‘significant’ and ‘significantly’ in the Act. We recommend a review of the use of these words.

3.2.4 The consultation requirements are often not properly understood

We believe a number of the concerns raised about the consultation requirements also arise from a lack of understanding of the provisions of the Act. The Act requires local authorities to be aware of and give consideration to community views before making decisions. However, section 78(3) makes it clear such requirements do not, of themselves, require public consultation to be undertaken.

There is a clear need for councils to have processes in place to enable them to identify to what extent community views are already known and therefore the need, or otherwise, for further consultation. The absence of such processes can lead to perceptions of ‘over-consultation’ and consequences of, for example, low response rates.
The Act does require consultation to be undertaken in certain specified cases using the special consultative procedure. This procedure is a statutory minimum for such cases.

Where use of the special consultative procedure is not prescribed, we believe more councils need to consider other possibly more effective consultation mechanisms. We believe there is a need for more good practice guidance on effective consultation and engagement mechanisms.

3.2.5 There is a need for further good practice guidance and training

We are heartened by the work being done by Local Government New Zealand, the Society of Local Government Managers, the Office of the Auditor-General and the Department of Internal Affairs to develop and disseminate good practice guidance. They also seek to identify and encourage initiatives around the country in relation to implementation of both the Local Government Act and the Local Electoral Act. We commend these agencies and wish to encourage them to continue this work.

As noted, there are some critical areas where further good practice guidance and training is urgently required. These include the community outcomes process, long-term planning, understanding and application of ‘significance’ in relation to decision-making and consultation, and effective consultation processes.

We congratulate the Government on its recent budget initiative for a professional development programme for local authority elected members. We believe this will be useful for enhancing elected member understanding of the legislation.

3.2.6 There are specific items requiring focus

In addition to work identified under both Acts and the development and dissemination of good practice guidance, we recommend the following for particular focus to assist the effective implementation of both Acts:

- monitoring of central government agencies’ involvement in the community outcomes process, participation levels in local authority decision-making processes, and the effectiveness of local authority consultation practices as part of the ten-year evaluation of local government legislation
- an audit of the effectiveness of local authority engagement with Māori
- a comprehensive review of all statutory provisions authorising local authorities to make bylaws
- a review of the remaining provisions of the Local Government Act 1974 with a view to complete repeal of this Act
- a review of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968.
### 3.3 Summary of findings

#### 3.3.1 Responsive local government: Where improvements need to be made

The following table summarises where we believe the operation of the Local Government Act could be improved in order to further advance the policy intent for achieving responsive local government.

**Areas where operation of the Local Government Act could be improved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>No significant concerns</th>
<th>Still bedding in</th>
<th>Needs attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identification of outcomes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• engagement in process</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reporting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTCCPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• process issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• documentation issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• summary documents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• adoption date</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• audit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• amendments</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• public perceptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• council perceptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• concept of significance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• public perceptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• council perceptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• awareness of community views</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• principles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• special consultative procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to decision-making by Māori</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ✓✓ signifies issues we believe require priority attention
3.3.2 *How improvements should be achieved*

The following table outlines how the identified improvements would be best achieved.

**How best to improve the operation of the Local Government Act**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
<th>Good practice development and dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identification of outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• engagement in process</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reporting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTCCPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• process issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• documentation issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• summary documents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• audit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• amendments</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• council perceptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• concept of significance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• council perceptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• awareness of community views</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• principles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• special consultative procedure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to decision-making by Māori</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.3 Effective local government: Where improvements need to be made

The following table summarises where we believe the operation of the Local Government Act could be improved in order to further advance the policy intent for achieving effective local government.

Areas where operation of the Local Government Act could be improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>No significant concerns</th>
<th>Still bedding in</th>
<th>Needs attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relations between regional councils and territorial authorities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• triennial agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• significant new activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• transfer of responsibilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special obligations and restrictions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• water and sanitary services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other restrictions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/enforcement/coercive powers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• bylaw-making powers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• enforcement powers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• offences and penalties</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining LGA 1974 provisions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers of the Minister and central government</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of local government</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganisation of local authorities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Commission</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority governance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• governing body</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• local governance statements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• meeting procedures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• delegations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected members</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• declarations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• code of conduct</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• conflicts of interest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• remuneration</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community boards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (-controlled) organisations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment matters</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ✓✓ signifies issues we believe require priority attention
3.3.4 How improvements should be achieved

The following table outlines how the identified improvements would be best achieved.

### How best to improve the operation of the Local Government Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
<th>Good practice development and dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between regional councils and territorial authorities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• triennial agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• significant new activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• transfer of responsibilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special obligations and restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• water and sanitary services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other restrictions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/enforcement/coercive powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• bylaw-making powers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• enforcement powers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• offences and penalties</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining LGA 1974 provisions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of local government</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganisation of local authorities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• delegations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• declarations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• codes of conduct</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• conflicts of interest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community boards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Responsive local government: Discussion

3.4.1 Community outcomes process

Councils have completed one round of identifying community outcomes for inclusion in their LTCCPs commencing 1 July 2006. We believe councils will learn from this experience and revise their approach as necessary. They are not required to engage in another process for a further six years (i.e. for their 2012 LTCCP) though they must report on progress toward achieving outcomes at least every three years.

We note:

- Many councils see the value as not just the resultant statement of outcomes but the dialogue held with other agencies in the process and the commitments gained to work towards common objectives.
- The various initiatives that are aimed at improving central government agencies’ input and commitment to this process.
- A process and outcome evaluation will form part of the Department of Internal Affairs’ ten-year evaluation of the legislation.
We do not recommend any legislative changes relating to identification and reporting on community outcomes. However, we believe there is a need for further good practice guidance on these processes and requirements.

3.4.2 Long-term council community plan

The LTCCP is at the heart of a council’s planning, decision-making and accountability responsibilities including the need to take a sustainable development approach. The LTCCP is a mechanism to identify the key issues, the options and the implications of each for the community. It serves to facilitate what the Auditor-General describes as “the right debate” for the community.

LGNZ advised that there is general support for the LTCCP process and recognition of its usefulness for long-term planning, financial and asset management, and community confidence. However some councils, particularly smaller and rural councils, had some concerns relating to:

- the time and resources (including costs) required for the process
- a perceived focus on compliance rather than a plan for the community
- the necessity of particular content requirements
- their ability to communicate the plan to the community, within audit requirements, given its size.

We believe concerns about the size of the LTCCP confuse the purpose of the LTCCP as distinct from the LTCCP summary. It is the latter document that the Act requires to be the principal vehicle for consultation, and the Act does not require specific disclosures for the summary document. The Auditor-General in his report on 2006-16 LTCCPs singled out LTCCP summaries as receiving low priority and needing attention for the 2009 round.

We believe some members of the public will want the full version of the funding and financial policies and it is more convenient for them to have these policies all together in the LTCCP. A key issue is the quality of the policies themselves and succinctness is one important measure. Good practice guidance on the writing of such policies is therefore important.

We believe that the requirements relating to two of the policies should be reviewed. We recommend that the requirement to have a policy on partnerships with the private sector should only be necessary if the local authority intends entering into such a partnership. We believe the general requirements relating to policies on rates remissions and postponements should be sufficient to disclose the rationale for any remissions or postponement of rates in respect of Māori freehold land. Accordingly we recommend deletion of the requirement for a separate policy specifically relating to rates remissions and postponements on Māori freehold land.

We recommend retention of present requirements relating to adoption dates for LTCCPs and auditing requirements. The latter are now generally seen as valuable to provide assurance to communities that long-term plans are robust and soundly based. We recommend a small extension to the audit role relating to LTCCP amendments as finally adopted by councils.

We also make recommendations relating to amendments to LTCCPs. These are aimed at ensuring local authorities retain a strategic focus in the LTCCPs and that changes and trade-offs are made in the full knowledge of impacts on service levels and financial consequences.

SOLGM pointed out in its submission that the concept of ‘significance’ can be seen as a key determinant in the circumstances where amendments to the LTCCP are required. However, it noted that three of the ‘triggers’ for amendment appear to encompass any change regardless of scale. We address these concerns by recommending:

- amendments only cover significant activities in relation to section 97(1) requirements
- amendments only for significant changes to the funding and financial policies required to be included in the LTCCP
- use of the special consultative procedure rather than the LTCCP for proposed changes relating to endowment land.
Most councils have undergone only one full round of LTCCP development and audit. The Auditor-General reflected this fact in assessing overall performance and the need for improvement when referring to concerns about "project management and sequencing issues, information gaps and the still developing familiarity of many in the sector with the requirements of the Act".

Councils are beginning to prepare their 2009-2019 LTCCPs. It is unlikely that there will be any legislative changes enacted prior to 30 June 2009. We believe the focus should be on development and dissemination of good practice guidance for councils on preparing LTCCPs. The Office of the Auditor-General and SOLGM will play a leading role in the development of this guidance.

3.4.3 Annual plan

We received several submissions about the relationship between the annual plan and the LTCCP. The annual plan is the link between the LTCCP and the annual rates levy and information needed to provide the value proposition (i.e. level of service provided to the community at a particular cost). As such, we believe the annual plan should be retained and we recommend no legislative amendments.

3.4.4 Decision-making

The purpose of local government includes 'to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities'. We believe top priority must therefore be given to ensuring effective and efficient decision-making processes. We addressed this key issue in relation to:

- public perceptions and experiences of council decision-making
- council perceptions and experiences in relation to the nature of the legislative requirements and their influence on decision-making
- the concept of significance.

Our research of residents identified some key points:

- Only a very small percent (3%) believed the public cannot influence councils’ decisions.
- Voting was perceived to have the greatest influence over council decisions (37% said it has “a lot of influence” and 42% said it has “some influence”).
- Based on the different responses in our research (for example, according to income level, ethnicity, and gender), there is a need to accommodate the needs and preferences of increasingly diverse communities when attempting to encourage public participation.
- Submissions received a relatively low rating as a method by which to influence council decision-making (although 62% see them as having at least “some influence”).

While some councils described the requirements as “onerous”, others pointed out the aspirational quality, i.e. as to what constitutes robust and transparent decision-making.

In our view, concerns about the perceived prescriptive nature of the decision-making provisions of the Act highlight in many cases a failure to fully understand the purpose and scope of:

- section 78 (Community views in relation to decisions)
- section 79 (Compliance with procedures in relation to decisions).

Section 79 makes it clear that councils have discretion based on certain considerations to determine the degree to which they comply with both sections 77 and 78 in relation to any particular decision or matter. Councils are responsible for making judgments, based on their own discretion, on:

- how to achieve compliance with sections 77 and 78 in proportion to the significance of the matters affected by the decision
- in particular, the extent options are to be identified and assessed, benefits and costs are to be quantified, information is to be considered, and a written record kept on the manner of compliance.

The section requires the council, in making these judgments, to have regard to the significance of all matters and:

- the principles set out in section 14
- the local authority’s resources
- the circumstances of the decision.
We see these provisions as being designed to provide for councils an appropriate balance between robust decision-making criteria, for which they are accountable to their community, and discretion in their application according to particular considerations and circumstances. Section 79 makes it clear compliance is to be “largely in proportion” to the significance of the matter and regard is to be had to the local authority’s resources. We note section 77 also refers to “reasonably practicable options” (emphasis added).

Like SOLGM, we are not convinced that the requirements are fundamentally flawed or that any appropriate alternatives have been suggested.

Both SOLGM and LGNZ expressed reluctance for legislative change around the decision-making provisions.3 Nor, generally speaking, did we sense any great appetite for such change among the councils we spoke to.

Accordingly, we recommend no change to the legislative requirements relating to local authority decision-making, and development and dissemination of further good practice guidance in this area including in relation to a sustainable development approach.

The concept of ‘significance’ is at the heart of robust, transparent and sustainable local decision-making. It is the key issue when it comes to analysing how well or otherwise the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act are working.

Discussions with the Office of the Auditor-General highlighted the following points in regard to the assessment of significance:

- The concept of significance is inconsistently understood.
- Assessment of significance is not always based on clear criteria.
- Some significance policies do not align with significance under the Act.
- Few significance policies talk about what constitutes a significant change to level of service provision (and other related areas where significance is a relevant consideration).

We believe our recommendations relating to amendments of the LTCCP and consultation will enhance the efficiency of council decision-making processes. We also see the need for more good practice guidance in this area. We commend the Office of the Auditor-General on its initiative to form a working group of local government staff and advisors to produce a good practice guide.4

We acknowledge that one source of confusion for councils may be the multiple and sometimes varying use of the words ‘significance’, ‘significant’ and ‘significantly’ in the Act and we recommend a review of these words. We also recommend moving section 90 (Policy on significance) to follow section 79 (Compliance with procedures in relation to decisions).

3 Other than clarity of requirements that link to the concept of significance and may therefore trigger certain process requirements.
In relation to the consultation principles, key findings from our research were:

- Around two-thirds of survey respondents agreed that the council provided them with enough background information about the issue or issues they raised in their submission (67%), and that this information was user-friendly and easy to understand (66%).
- The vast majority of the submitters (90%) agreed that they had enough time to prepare and submit their views.
- Nearly three-quarters of submitters (72%) agreed with the statement: “The council was open to hearing my views.” However, when asked specifically if council carefully considered the issues they raised in their submission, only 37% of submitters agreed, and 29% were unsure.
- Over half (59%) of submitters agreed that the council kept them informed about when it would make a decision.
- Nearly two-thirds (63%) of submitters for whom council had made a decision, agreed that council explained the reasons for their decision in a way they could easily understand.
- The vast majority of submitters (95%) said they would be likely to make another submission about an issue they felt was important.

While we have no doubt there are individual examples where councils have not handled a consultation exercise as well as they might, we saw nothing in the results that would suggest any systemic failure. Accordingly we believe there is no need for wholesale changes to the consultation provisions of the Act.

Two aspects of consultation on which councils could do better stand out from this research:

- Councils keeping people better informed about when a decision will be made
- Councils explaining the reasons for their decision, once made, in a way that residents can understand.

We believe a reason a number of councils have concerns about the consultation provisions of the Act arises from a misinterpretation of the meaning and resulting application of the sections 14(1)(b) and 78. Section 14(1)(b) sets out the principle that local authorities must ‘make themselves aware of and have regard to the views of all their communities’. Section 78 requires local authorities to ‘give consideration to these views’.

Neither the principle nor the requirements of section 78 automatically translate into an obligation to consult the community. Local authorities may be aware of community views from a number of sources and, if so, there is no obligation to undertake further consultation arising from this principle or the requirements of section 78. Section 78(3) confirms this.

How councils become aware of community views is a matter for their discretion. This can be achieved through a range of mechanisms including feedback received in the carrying out of their everyday functions. A first question in respect of a particular decision is “Do we have enough information on community views now?” If not, a range of public participation or engagement strategies and processes, including but not limited to public consultation, may be considered.

The Office of the Auditor-General’s 2007 good practice guide provides examples of the broad range of ongoing engagement processes used by New Zealand (and overseas) councils to assist them to meet and manage the requirements of section 78.

We believe it is important that councils are aware of the full range of engagement processes available and that they consider carefully which is likely to be the most effective in particular circumstances. This information can then be the basis of an engagement or consultation policy. This policy should be reviewed regularly as new information and feedback on existing processes is reviewed. Again we see the need for more good practice guidance in this area.

Section 82 sets out consultation principles local authorities must act in accordance with. A key provision is subsection 82(3) which provides discretion for local authorities in the observance of the principles. Subsection 82(3) makes it clear that the principles are to be observed by a local authority in such a manner as it considers, in its discretion, to be appropriate in any particular instance.

We believe the Act provides appropriate flexibility in the application of the consultation principles and we recommend no change to these provisions. We also believe monitoring of local authority practices is required and we see the Department of Internal Affairs’ ten-year legislative evaluation as an appropriate vehicle.
The special consultative procedure received more comment than any other decision-making or consultation provision.

We are concerned that some councils are using the special consultative procedure, the prescribed statutory minimum in specific circumstances, on other occasions when more effective mechanisms may be available. Our survey of all councils suggested this is the case (40% of councils said they used it when not statutorily required to do so).

However, the survey also highlighted that councils were employing a range of methods to engage with their communities and, if anything, the take-up of that range is likely to increase in the future. It appears that methods beyond the special consultative procedure have been, and will be, used.

Given misunderstandings about the role of the special consultative procedure and current practices, we did consider whether the procedure could be removed. A benefit of such a step would be to remove what for some councils appears to be a barrier to further innovation in consultation activities i.e. it is used as the ‘default’ consultation mechanism by some councils.

On the other hand, we believe that the desired outcomes from the special consultation procedure would still have to be prescribed to achieve its intended purpose of a final unrestricted invitation for submissions before adoption of the council plan/proposal. Such prescription of outcomes would be little different from the current prescribed procedure. Accordingly, we do not recommend removal of the prescribed special consultation procedure.

We believe guidance is necessary on the (limited) purpose of the special consultative procedure and dissemination of existing good practice on new and innovative approaches to consultation. We believe this good practice approach is preferable and accordingly we do not agree with the Local Government Rates Inquiry recommendation “that the current consultation processes be replaced by more selective and streamlined consultation arrangements”.

Given our recommendations for more good practice guidance and monitoring as part of the ten-year evaluation, we do not see the need for a further independent review of the consultation and decision-making provisions of the Act as recommended by the Local Government Rates Inquiry.

3.4.6 Contributions to decision-making processes by Māori

The Local Government Act requires local authorities to:

- establish and maintain processes to give Māori an opportunity to contribute to decision-making, consider ways to foster Māori capacity to do so, and provide relevant information to Māori for these purposes
- take into account the relationship Māori have with ancestral lands and waters when making significant decisions.

In relation to obligations to Māori under the Act, the SOLGM submission referred to misconceptions that abound about “the obligation to consider how to build Māori capacity to participate in local government”.

It seemed important to us to elicit information on local authorities’ and Māori experiences with the new provisions of the Act relating specifically to opportunities for Māori to contribute to local authority decision-making, requirements in relation to significant decisions and in relation to consultation. We did this by various means.

There is a large body of information about local authority and central government engagement with Māori. Most of the information records structural arrangements and processes and reports on local authority perceptions of progress, issues, and problems. We note that information is light on the perspectives of Māori on progress, issues and problems.

There is also a wide range of good practice guides, relating to such legislation as the Local Government Act and the Resource Management Act, on how local authorities (and/or central government agencies) can more effectively engage with Māori. Guides on how Māori can more effectively engage with local authorities are less evident.

The various reports we considered and our own analysis reveals that engagement activity is patchy across the country. This is due in part to capacity issues for both Māori and local authorities.
Local authorities need to develop their capacity to engage with Māori. A lack of capacity and lack of confidence can mean that local authority elected members and staff find engagement processes intimidating.

LGNZ has been active in supporting local authorities by providing advice and sharing information on how local authorities can effectively engage with Māori. Looking forward, LGNZ has a long-term project to develop resources over time to assist local authorities to engage more effectively with Māori. We encourage LGNZ in this area.

Advice and assistance to Māori has been less evident and we are not aware of any forums or organisations that can provide similar nation-wide support and information sharing for Māori.

Although our role is to review the operation of the Local Government Act, we decided, in light of the information we were presented, to take a broader approach and considered the bigger picture regarding local and central government engagement with Māori generally. We did so because:

- We believe that many factors and considerations relevant to engagement under the Local Government Act are also relevant to central and local government engagement under other legislative, regulatory, and service delivery regimes.
- Whilst many local and central government agencies each have their own kaupapa, the Māori organisations they engage with have holistic values and aspirations that span a range of activities. We believe it is important that our considerations are based on a clear view of the bigger picture and that our recommendations fit with a ‘whole-of-government’ approach.

We see the need for a strategic approach across both local and central government in relation to engagement with Māori, and in particular a need for:

- an independent audit of the effectiveness of local authority engagement with Māori
- a more co-ordinated approach to funding of the development of iwi management plans or similar strategic documents.

We consider that an independent audit of the effectiveness of local authority engagement with Māori would be useful and that periodic reviews should track progress over time. Such an audit should focus on the effectiveness of the engagement rather than on the existence of protocols and agreements. We suggest that the Local Government Commission and the Office of the Auditor-General be assigned to jointly lead this audit.

We recommend no change to the provisions of the Local Government Act relating to Māori pending completion of the recommended independent audit.

We believe Māori and both central and local government would benefit from more comprehensive availability of iwi management plans or similar strategic documents. We envisage a strategy being developed to boost and extend the scope of strategic planning, incorporating the following:

- Development of a ‘whole-of-government’ funding strategy (a dedicated fund) to support tangata whenua to develop iwi management plans or similar strategic documents which contain a clear, comprehensive articulation of tangata whenua values, strategic aspirations, and interests on a holistic basis.
- Development of a ‘whole-of-government’ funding strategy to support strategic planning by taura here organisations that are involved in community well-being and service delivery.

Clearly further consultation with Māori, both tangata whenua and taura here, would be required before implementing such initiatives.

Whether the above recommendations are adopted or not, we still see the need for further promotion of good practice guidance to local authorities on effective engagement strategies and opportunities to contribute to decision-making. We encourage LGNZ to continue to play the important role it has assumed in this area.

3.4.7 The annual report

We received no submissions relating to annual reports and we recommend no change to the present requirements.
3.4.8 Financial management

We recommend changing the order of the financial management sections in the Act. We believe the balanced budget requirement (in section 100) should follow the more general financial management provisions of section 101, which include the requirement for prudence, and section 102 which covers funding and financial policies.

We also recommend consideration of the implication of the statutory requirement to act in accordance with ‘generally accepted accounting practice’ given New Zealand’s transfer to the International Financial Reporting Standards.

3.5 Effective local government: Discussion

3.5.1 Empowerment of and relations between regional councils and territorial authorities

The Local Government Act provides for the empowerment of both regional councils and territorial authorities. It contains provisions to ensure necessary collaboration and coordination between regional councils and territorial authorities in a region and avoidance of duplication in the carrying out of roles. These provisions require a triennial agreement on communication and coordination protocols, and compliance with procedures relating to significant new activities and the transfer of responsibilities.

We see the triennial agreement as a key element in processes of checks and balances on the empowerment of local authorities. We do not agree with one submitter that it should be removed from the legislation. However, we believe existing triennial agreements may not be achieving their full potential.

We recommend an amendment to require consideration of choice of electoral system and timing of representation reviews as part of the development of triennial agreements. We also recommend development and dissemination of further good practice guidance on the development of triennial agreements including examples of benefits of enhanced local authority collaboration and cooperation.

We recommend no change to the requirements relating to proposals by regional councils to undertake significant new activities. But we do recommend that section 16 provide for the Local Government Commission to perform the role presently prescribed for the Minister of Local Government in relation to proposals to undertake significant new activities.

We also recommend consideration of an amendment to remove the requirement for prior notice of a proposed transfer of responsibilities between local authorities to be given to the Minister of Local Government. If this provision is seen to be necessary, we believe the requirement should be amended to provide for the prior notice to be given to the Local Government Commission rather than to the Minister of Local Government.

3.5.2 Special obligations and restrictions

The Part 7 provisions relating to the provision of water and other sanitary services, disposal of parks, reserves and endowment properties, and membership of public libraries may be seen as further specific limits and controls on the general empowerment of local authorities. We were interested to see whether the provisions were consistent with the original policy intent for the legislation.

The provisions relating to the provision of water and other sanitary services may be seen as being supportive of the regulatory role that the Public Health Bill, before Parliament, envisages for territorial authorities. This role includes assessing ‘the state of play’ of services in the district.

As a consequence of being responsible for this role, a territorial authority may be directed by the Minister of Health, under the provisions of the Public Health Bill, to provide for a particular service in its LTCCP. This regulatory role envisaged by the Public Health Bill is different from the essentially service delivery role carried out by territorial authorities through their LTCCP.

In line with this public health regulatory role, we recommend no change relating to requirements for territorial authorities to undertake water and sanitary service assessments.
We believe the provisions relating to the means of delivery of water services can be seen to be contrary to the Government’s statement of policy intent. SOLGM argued that the provisions confuse ‘means’ with ‘ends’. The provisions also need to be considered alongside those of section 88 which require the special consultative procedure to be used in relation to a change of mode of delivery of significant activities.

We recommend repeal of the provisions placing specific obligations and restrictions on local authorities relating to the delivery of water services (i.e. section 130 and consequential repeal of sections 131 to 137 with the exception of provisions relating to restriction or stopping of the water supply) and these matters be left for local communities to determine.

In line with our recommendations in Chapter 3 of our main report relating to consultation and decision-making, we recommend the repeal of section 138 and its prescriptive consultation requirement on all proposals for the sale or disposal of parks.

3.5.3 Regulatory, enforcement and coercive powers

Local authorities require a range of regulatory and other coercive powers to promote well-being in their communities. Bylaws are the most familiar local authority regulatory power but other powers are also required, such as powers to enter onto private land and powers, in certain circumstances, to require certain work to be done.

We received a number of submissions on the provisions of Parts 8 and 9 of the Act. We also commissioned a legal analysis on these provisions given their nature and the existence of bylaw-making provisions in other Acts.

This analysis recommended a comprehensive review of all local authority statutory bylaw-making provisions to ensure consistency of approach between Acts and with a view to achieving efficient and effective administration of all bylaw-making powers. We endorse this recommendation.

We also recommend that current bylaw-making powers for the control of liquor be extended to regional councils in respect of land owned or controlled by regional councils. Further extensions of bylaw-making powers to regional councils may be identified as a result of the recommended comprehensive review of all statutory bylaw-making powers.

We make a number of recommendations relating to technical enforcement issues as identified by submitters and our legal analysis. In response to a number of submissions on the subject, we also recommend that regulations be made under section 259 as soon as practicable to prescribe breaches of bylaws that are infringement offences along with associated infringement fees.

3.5.4 Other legislation

We recommend a review of the remaining provisions of the Local Government Act 1974 relating to roading, private drains, land drainage, transport activities, fire hydrants and the remaining offence provisions with a view to a complete repeal of this Act.

3.5.5 Other provisions of the Local Government Act

We make no substantive recommendations but raise some technical issues relating to the following:

- the powers of the Minister and central government
- the structure of local government
- reorganisation of local authorities
- the Local Government Commission.

3.5.6 Local authority governance

We recommend no change relating to the constitution, role and membership of the local authority governing body as the responsible and democratically accountable decision-making body. We also recommend no change to provisions relating to local governance statements and meeting procedures including the provision for a casting vote.

We are aware of a suggestion for local authorities to conduct some of their business on-line. We recommend that work is undertaken on this issue including the scope for such a provision and its advantages and disadvantages.
We raise some technical issues relating to committee and officer delegations.

### 3.5.7 Elected member issues

In response to submissions, we recommend an amendment to clarify that, in the event of a conflict, the territorial authority declaration signed by a councillor shall take precedence over a declaration in respect of that councillor's membership of a community board.

We received several submissions on the requirement for local authorities to adopt a code of conduct. These related to the absence of a statutory process for investigations of alleged breaches, the absence of statutory penalties and the exclusion of the mandatory requirement for a code for community boards.

We gave careful consideration to this issue. We also discussed codes of conduct with the Office of Auditor-General and considered reports by the Controller and Auditor-General.

We understand that it was a specific Government policy not to prescribe penalties in the Act for breaches of codes. This was on the basis of concerns about members judging each other, natural justice and a need for appeal rights to an independent body.

The Auditor-General did not identify any significant concerns regarding current enforcement processes, but:

- considered that it would be better for independent external people (rather than members) to be used for the investigation stage
- noted strong views on whether or not the Act should provide for penalties but no consensus or majority view
- suggested that codes encourage issues to be raised and resolved at the lowest possible level and allow for a screening process with discretion to dismiss complaints that do not warrant formal enforcement processes.

Given the resource implications of establishing an independent appeal or primary adjudication body, the Auditor-General’s comments about the nature of most allegations, and the uptake of good practice guidance in this area including the use of independent persons for initial investigations, we recommend no change to the current provisions.

We recommend that a good practice template for a code of conduct for community boards be developed, either by the Department of Internal Affairs or LGNZ. This should then be circulated to community boards for consideration.

We agree with submitters that there is an urgent need for a review of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act to modernise its application and bring its scope, approach and provisions into line with more recent legislation such as the Crown Entities Act. Options to achieve this are to retain a stand-alone statute or consolidate the relevant provisions into the Local Government Act.

We recommend a review of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act as soon as possible consolidating necessary statutory provisions relating to the ‘discussing and voting rule’ for elected members into the Local Government Act.

We discussed the operation of the elected member remuneration provisions with the Remuneration Authority. No substantive concerns with the legislative provisions were raised and accordingly we recommend no change to the Act.
3.5.8 Community boards

We considered several issues relating to the establishment and functioning of community boards. We also received a copy of a report prepared for LGNZ on behalf of the Community Boards Executive Committee on the roles and functions of community boards.

We believe community boards have an important function in the structure of local government in New Zealand and all territorial authorities should regularly consider the option of establishing community boards in their district. We therefore endorse the 2002 amendment to the Local Electoral Act to require such consideration as part of territorial authorities’ representation reviews.

We believe the best models for effective community boards are those where the territorial authority has delegated significant and meaningful responsibilities to their boards. Accordingly we recommend development and dissemination of good practice guidance on relationships between territorial authorities and their community boards including consideration of appropriate delegations.

We are aware of concerns in some areas regarding proposals to levy targeted rates on communities with community boards to fund board running costs.

We are on record as saying we believe community boards are a part of the governance structure for the district as a whole and therefore their administration should be funded across the district, not just by the community concerned. In order to ensure this, we believe a legislative amendment is necessary. We recommend clause 39 of Schedule 7 be amended to clarify, for the purpose of funding the administration of community boards, that “general revenues of the district” precludes the levying of targeted rates.

We recommend no other changes relating to the general provisions on establishment, roles and membership of community boards.

3.5.9 Council (-controlled) organisations

We were aware that the Local Government Rates Inquiry made a number of recommendations relating to the operation of business enterprises owned or controlled by local authorities. As we understood there was to be a whole-of-government response to the Inquiry’s report and recommendations, we did not address the operation of these enterprises and organisations.

We did receive a few submissions on the provisions relating to exclusion and exemption from council-controlled organisation requirements, establishment requirements and director indemnification. Following our consideration, we were not convinced of the need for any legislative changes at this time.

3.5.10 Employment matters

We received one submission on the Act’s general employment provisions and one on the issue of the employment of the chief executive. We also discussed the latter issue with both LGNZ and SOLGM.

LGNZ advised its preferred position was that chief executives be appointed for a five-year term with the local authority having discretion to extend the term for a further five years without the need for advertising. This was on the grounds of the cost of advertising and the negative impact uncertainty of reappointment of the chief executive after five years can have on the local authority.

SOLGM noted there was a level of acceptance of the statutory provisions albeit a reluctant acceptance in some areas. It also noted the practice of some councils and chief executives to agree to advertising after five years, rather than undertake the required performance review to allow for a two-year extension.

LGNZ has recently published guidance material for councils on hiring of and relationships with the chief executive. We believe such guidance to councils should address concerns in this area. In the absence of strong sector-wide calls for statutory change, we recommend no change in this area.
4. Review of the operation of the Local Electoral Act 2001

4.1 Framework for analysis

We present our review of this Act in Chapter 5: Democratic Local Government.

We set out to address the following question: How well do current arrangements provide for democratic representation for local communities and for facilitating public confidence and understanding of the electoral process?

The purpose of the Act (section 3) is to:

- provide sufficient flexibility in law to readily accommodate new technologies and processes as they are developed
- adopt uniform rules in relation to particular aspects of the conduct of local elections and polls
- allow diversity, through local decision-making, in certain specified areas.

We addressed this purpose in relation to the principles of the Act of ‘fair and effective representation’, ‘reasonable and equal opportunities to participate’ and ‘public confidence in, and public understanding of, local electoral processes’.

We addressed the provisions and requirements relating to the following issues:

- the electoral system
- separate Māori representation
- representation arrangements
- the representation review process
- candidate issues
- elector issues
- the appointment and role of the electoral officer
- the conduct of local elections and polls.

4.2 Key findings

4.2.1 An appropriate balance between uniform rules and local diversity has been achieved.

Generally the Local Electoral Act is achieving its statutory purpose and achieving an appropriate balance on a continuum between ‘diversity through local decision-making’ at one end and ‘comprehensive uniform requirements and implementation’ at the other.

We believe that in the long term, it would be desirable for voters to be faced with one electoral system at local elections and one order of candidates at least on combined voting documents. At this time there is insufficient experience of the STV electoral system to recommend it as an alternative to FPP, and insufficient research applicable to the New Zealand environment to recommend one preferred candidate order for voting documents.

4.2.2 There is a need for a better balance between fair and effective representation

We have identified a need for more flexibility around the fair representation requirement relating to the ratio of population to elected member (the +/-10% rule) in order to provide a better balance with the requirement for effective representation of communities of interest. We make recommendations to achieve such flexibility.

We believe these recommendations, along with a recommendation for the Act to set out all the factors to be considered in determining appropriate representation arrangements, will help ensure achievement of both fair and effective representation for individuals and local communities.
4.2.3 Recommended enhancements in administration of local elections and polls should proceed

Arising from its inquiry into the 2004 local elections, the Justice and Electoral Committee recommended a number of amendments to enhance the administration of local elections and polls. These recommendations, also supported by the Commission in its initial report on this review, will help achieve the three principles of the Act of ‘public confidence and understanding’, ‘fair and effective representation’ and ‘reasonable and equal opportunities to participate’.

The recommendations relate to elector awareness and education, the information provided to electors in candidate profile booklets and the availability of these booklets, voting methods, the quality of voting documents, the nomination process, the election timetable and providing for public assurance around the integrity of vote processing and counting systems.

We have endorsed most of these recommendations again in our review and recommend they be enacted as soon as possible.

4.3 Summary of findings

4.3.1 Democratic local government: Where improvements need to be made

The following table summarises where we believe the operation of the Local Electoral Act could be improved in order to further advance the policy intent for achieving democratic local government.

Areas where operation of the Local Electoral Act could be improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>No significant concerns</th>
<th>Still bedding in</th>
<th>Needs attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Māori representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• basis of election</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• maximum number of members</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• community boards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• fair and effective representation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation review process</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dual candidacy/membership</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• eligibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affiliations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• deposits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• profile statements</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• nomination process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• expense limits and donations</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elector issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• enrolment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• non-resident ratepayer franchise</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• voting method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• voter turnout</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment and role of electoral officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conduct of elections and polls

- legislative framework ✓ ✓
- election timetable ✓ ✓
- voting documents ✓
- candidate order on voting document ✓
- vote processing and counting ✓
- elected member issues ✓
- election data ✓
- electoral records ✓
- STV technical issues ✓
- electoral offences ✓
- licensing trust boundaries ✓

Note: ✓✓ signifies issues we believe require priority attention

4.3.2 How improvements should be achieved

The following table outlines how the identified improvements would be best achieved.

How best to improve the operation of the Local Electoral Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
<th>Good practice development and dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation arrangements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• maximum number of members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• community boards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• fair/effective representation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation review process</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dual candidacy/membership</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• profile statements</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• nomination process</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elector issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ratepayer franchise</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• voting method</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• voter turnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment and role of electoral officer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Democratic local government: Discussion

4.4.1 Electoral system

The Local Electoral Act provides for local authorities and communities to choose between the first past the post (FPP) or the single transferable vote (STV) electoral system. In addition, the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act provides that district health board elections are to be conducted in conjunction with local authority elections using STV.

These provisions have resulted in the majority of electors being faced with dual electoral systems at the 2004 and 2007 local elections. Ideally, we believe electors should not have to face dual electoral systems.

Our analysis suggests that there is a negative impact from having dual electoral systems on the same voting document. The incidence of blank and informal voting documents relates, in part, to voters having to change between the two electoral systems on one voting document rather than the nature of STV itself.

While STV has the potential to enhance representation and engagement, we do not believe it has wide enough public support at this time for it to be made mandatory. We believe more education on the advantages and disadvantages of FPP and STV is necessary before a decision is made on the preferred option.

We recommend that the legislative status quo regarding local choice of electoral system be retained at this time along with more good practice guidance on the provision of information about the two systems. In addition we recommend a technical amendment to clarify that a local authority resolution on the electoral system applies for two elections as is the case when a poll is conducted.

4.4.2 Separate Māori Representation

We received no submissions specifically on the provisions in the Local Electoral Act on the establishment of separate Māori wards or constituencies. In light of this and the fact that no such wards or constituencies have been established under the provisions of this Act, we recommend no change in this area.

4.4.3 Representation arrangements

Basis of election

We received no submissions relating to the provisions in the Local Electoral Act on the basis of election (i.e. choice for territorial authorities of at large elections, wards or a mix of both, and mandatory constituencies for regional councils). We recommend no change to these provisions.
Maximum number of elected members

We considered the matter of the maximum number of members for regional councils in light of a submission proposing that the present maximum of 14 be increased to 15. No reason was given for selecting the number 15.

We are aware of concerns about achieving a balance between fair and effective representation in some regions given the impact of the +/−10% rule coupled with the statutory maximum of 14 members.

We noted the maximum number of members for regional councils was originally the same as for territorial authorities (i.e. 30) but was changed in 1992. The policy issue is whether a different maximum for regional councils can now be justified given the general empowerment of both regional councils and territorial authorities. However, there have been no calls for a return to the original policy.

In light of this and the signal such a move could send, a majority of us recommend that the maximum number of members for regional councils be increased to 16.

Community boards

We recommend a new provision in the Local Electoral Act for a territorial authority to seek the approval of the Local Government Commission for disestablishment of a community board, other than as part of a representation review, when an election for that board fails to attract sufficient candidates to constitute a quorum. Such an application would be subject to prior public notification of the consequences of a failure to nominate sufficient candidates.

This recommendation arises from a situation at the 2007 elections when a community board attracted only one nomination for four positions. Consequently, without a quorum, the board was unable to meet to appoint further members.

Fair and effective representation

One of the Local Electoral Act principles is achievement of fair and effective representation for individuals and communities. This principle gives equal weight to both ‘fair’ and ‘effective’ representation.

There are concerns in the sector and some parts of the wider community that the objective measure for fair representation in the Act (i.e. the +/−10% rule) gives an inappropriate weighting to this requirement at the expense of effective representation of communities of interest. This issue was the subject of the majority of submissions on representation issues.

We believe that consideration needs to be given to whether the Local Electoral Act allows for achievement of an appropriate balance between fair and effective representation. We are aware, for example, of instances where rigorous implementation of the +/−10% rule has led to the division of a recognised community of interest.

We also believe that there are other factors that should be considered beyond calculating the ratio of population to members when seeking achievement of fair and effective representation. These factors include the electoral system to be used and the total number of members needed.

We identified three options to address these concerns:

• more flexibility around the requirement for fair representation
• an objective measure of effective representation
• prescribing all factors to be considered in determining representation arrangements.

We concluded that prescribing all factors to be considered in reviews has merit. This is on the basis that it will formalise what councils, to a greater or lesser extent undertake now, guided by existing Commission Guidelines. Making the decision-making process more explicit, with a legislative underpinning beyond good practice guidelines, would provide more assurance and accountability that a proper and comprehensive process has been undertaken.

We believe this approach will enhance community understanding and confidence in the process while also achieving the principle of (both) fair and effective representation.

We also believe that the Local Electoral Act should provide for both territorial authorities and regional councils:
• more flexibility in the requirement for fair representation by allowing an ‘averaging of the +/-10% rule’ for two wards/constituencies in order to achieve effective representation of communities of interest
• exceptions to the +/-10% rule based on explicitly identified grounds and subject to Commission approval.

4.4.4 Representation review process

We received several submissions relating to the role of the Local Government Commission in determining appeals or objections against local authority representation review proposals. We believe these submissions and also the recommendations of the Justice and Electoral Committee on this issue reflected concerns arising from a few determinations made by the previous Commission.

In some cases these determinations represented quite different outcomes from those proposed by the council concerned in relation to the basis of election, numbers of elected members, ward arrangements and establishment of community boards.

The current Commission believes that understanding by councils of these requirements is improving after two rounds of representation reviews under the new legislative requirements. Most undertake appropriate review processes.

We believe the recommendations in our report, particularly the prescribed steps for consideration in the review process and some more flexibility around the +/-10% rule, will further enhance both outcomes and community satisfaction with the review process undertaken.

We recommend some further procedural steps to ensure full compliance with the law and that due weight is given to council resolutions on representation proposals properly undertaken. In particular, we recommend all territorial authority proposals that do not comply with the legislation be referred to the Commission for determination, as currently occurs with non-complying regional council proposals.

We also recommend the following two technical amendments to the provisions of the Local Electoral Act:

• Provision be made for adjustments to representation arrangements after three years relating, for example, to alterations to private property boundaries or to meshblocks that impact on electoral boundaries. Such 'technical' reviews could occur without waiting for up to six years for the next comprehensive review and would be subject to Local Government Commission approval.
• An amendment to clarify that representation review determinations made under sections 19H and 19I of the Local Electoral Act may only be made in the year before a triennial election. This would prevent the situation of a council receiving a valid demand for a poll on the electoral system or on separate Māori wards/constituencies after a council determination on its representation arrangements.

4.4.5 Candidate issues

Dual candidacy/membership

Subject to certain exceptions, individuals are able to stand for and become members of multiple local authorities. This is in line with the principle that ‘all qualified persons have a reasonable and equal opportunity to nominate and accept nomination as a candidate.’ It also reflects the philosophy that electors are in the best position, and should have maximum freedom, to choose those candidates they wish to represent them. Other arguments supporting dual membership include it does not unnecessarily limit the talent pool.

Two exceptions on dual candidacy/membership apply relating to regional councils and territorial authorities or community boards in the same region, and territorial authorities and community boards. These restrictions appear generally to be accepted and we recommend no change.

Some concerns were raised about late ‘tactical’ withdrawals of a candidate from one position. These concerns include the cost in either reprinting voting documents or, if past a certain time, notifying electors of the withdrawal and possible wasted votes for a withdrawn candidate.
To address these concerns we recommend removal of the provision for voluntary retirement by candidates after the close of nominations. Current provisions relating to retirements due to death, incapacity or invalid nomination of a candidate following the close of nominations would still apply.

Eligibility

Candidates have to be qualified parliamentary electors and New Zealand citizens. Candidates do not have to reside in the area for which they wish to stand.

Arising from its 2004 inquiry, the Justice and Electoral Committee recommended all candidates be required to include their principal place of residence in their candidate profile statement. This reflected the Committee’s acceptance of the status quo of no residency qualification for election candidates. We endorse the Committee’s recommendation which will ensure that electors are aware of the non-residency of any candidate.

We also recommend provision for an electoral officer to request proof of citizenship of a candidate.

Affiliations

Some concerns were raised relating to the current definition of ‘affiliation’ in the Local Electoral Act. We acknowledge these concerns and recommend consideration of the practicality of providing further statutory guidance on the definition of candidate affiliation in section 57.

Candidate deposits

One submission sought power for territorial authorities to have discretion to set the deposit for community board candidates. On balance we believe national consistency in the quantum of deposits should prevail and we recommend no change.

Candidate profile statements

We noted from our post-election survey, the important function candidate profile statements play for electors in deciding who to vote for. Therefore, we endorse the following legislative changes recommended by the Justice and Electoral Committee to enhance candidate profile statements:

- Profile statements be published as soon as possible after the close of nominations.
- Candidates be required to include their principal place of residence in profile statements.
- Candidates be required to identify any dual candidacies in profile statements.

We also endorse the Committee’s recommendations for good practice guidance on enhancing both the quality of candidate profile booklets and their accessibility.

The nomination process

SOLGM made representations identifying issues arising from candidates being able to submit their nomination form, candidate profile statement and deposit separately. The Justice and Electoral Committee supported a proposal to require all three elements of a candidate’s nomination to be submitted together. We endorse its recommendation in order to facilitate efficient management of the nomination process and reduce the potential for errors.

Candidate expense limits and donations

The Local Electoral Act provides that candidates’ electoral expenses must not exceed a certain amount based on the population of the area over which the election is held. The provisions were aimed at addressing concerns about the ability of candidates to spend unlimited amounts of money on their campaigns and the impact this has on representation and local electoral processes. The provisions support the principle that all qualified persons have a reasonable and equal opportunity to nominate one or more candidates and accept nomination as a candidate.

We believe the existence of expense limits sends an important message that the relative abilities of candidates and/or popularity of their policies, should determine electoral success, not the relative resources of the candidates. The limits can contribute, as a result, to achievement of better representation of the diversity of interests of the community. We recommend no change to the present requirements.
We acknowledge that the policing of the corollary authorisation requirement can be a very time consuming activity for electoral officers and may become politicised. In response to concerns raised, we recommend consideration of the introduction of an infringement offence regime to replace the summary conviction offence provision in section 135 of the Act relating to unauthorised advertisements.

We received several submissions relating to the threshold for which electoral donations must be declared and relating to anonymous donations. We believe the present $1,000 threshold for declaration of donations, including anonymous donations, is an appropriate balance between funding needs and transparency requirements. We recommend no change to these provisions.

4.4.6 Elector issues

Elector enrolment

Following a suggestion from the Electoral Enrolment Centre, we recommend the SOLGM electoral working party be encouraged to consider options to better synchronise the timing of the availability of preliminary electoral rolls for local elections with national enrolment update campaigns.

Non-resident ratepayer franchise

We understand it was a Government policy decision to retain the non-resident ratepayer franchise and we make no recommendation in this regard.

We did receive a number of suggestions proposing simplification of enrolment procedures for the franchise and we recommend that these be investigated including the need for enrolment itself.

We also received a proposal that there should be provision for an unpublished non-resident ratepayer roll for local elections as there is for residential electors. We recommend consideration of this proposal.

We recommend several technical amendments relating to the timing of provision of information on qualifications and enrolment procedures for the franchise, and minor necessary amendments to the Local Electoral Regulations.

Voting method

The Local Electoral Act provides for different voting methods but regulations have only been promulgated for booth and postal voting.

We note that after the initial positive impact of postal voting on voter turnout, voter turnout has more recently returned to pre-postal voting levels. It is argued by some that new initiatives are now required to boost turnout.

One possible initiative is to introduce electronic voting. We recommend that the SOLGM electoral working party and the Department of Internal Affairs commence work on issues and options relating to the introduction of electronic voting at local elections.

In response to occasional concerns about the integrity of postal voting, we recommend implementation of a Justice and Electoral Committee recommendation for a mandatory notice on voting documents relating to offences such as filling out other people’s voting documents. We also recommend the SOLGM electoral working party continue to provide good practice guidance relating to postal voting processes and procedures.

Voter turnout

Overall voter turnout at local elections has gradually declined since 1989. We agree with submitters that in-depth comparative analysis is required to identify the factors impacting on voter turnout in New Zealand local authority elections. We noted that the following factors have previously been identified in the New Zealand context:

- size, geography and nature of regions and districts
- occurrence of mayoral elections
- particular local issues.

Research should include the impact of the three-week voting period. In the meantime we recommend no change to the length of the voting period, polling day or close of voting.
We endorse a recommendation of the Justice and Electoral Committee for consideration of formally assigning responsibility for promoting voter turnout and awareness, and also education on electoral systems associated with local elections, to the Electoral Commission.

As another initiative to promote voting, we also recommend the Local Electoral Act and Local Electoral Regulations provide for electronically-enhanced provision and return of voting documents for overseas voters as occurs at parliamentary elections.

We also recommend that the SOLGM electoral working party consider and promote further initiatives to promote voter turnout.

4.4.7 Appointment and role of electoral officer

Current local electoral officer arrangements reflect a model that has been in place for many years. It is based on the territorial authority electoral officer carrying out the core election tasks for all elections in the area. These arrangements worked satisfactorily in 2007.

Recommendations for change by the Justice and Electoral Committee from its 2004 elections inquiry, arose as a result of the significant delay (up to three weeks) by one service provider in announcing STV election results.

This provider used different software in 2007 and did not sub-contract out this function as it had done in 2004. Generally it met all expectations of its clients in 2007. We do not believe there is a strong case for a central government agency (new or existing) assuming direct responsibility for local elections.

We recommend no change to roles and responsibilities in the conduct of local elections including electoral officers being appointed by local authorities and then acting independently of that body. However, we do believe there is scope to enhance the efficient management of local elections and we recommend development and dissemination of further good practice guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of electoral officers.

We also recommend amendments to:

- facilitate consideration of shared service arrangements in the provision of electoral services
- effect a full prohibition on the appointment of a local authority chief executive as its electoral officer
- require local authorities to name their electoral officer in their annual report.

4.4.8 Conduct of local elections and polls

The legislative framework

Electoral officers have a high level of satisfaction with the local electoral legislative framework comprising the Local Electoral Act and Local Electoral Regulations accompanied by SOLGM’s good practice code. However, some concerns have been raised at the need to refer back and forward between the Act and the Regulations to identify the required provision.

We recommend, as part of any future comprehensive review of the Local Electoral Act, a review of the consistency of the provisions of the Act and the Local Electoral Regulations in relation to the purpose of the Act of providing for matters of detail in regulations.

Election timetable

Electoral officers seek an additional week in the election timetable after the close of nominations and before voting packs are mailed to electors. An extra week is highly desirable to address concerns about the very limited time to finalise voting documents for printing and the resulting pressure that can lead to errors in these documents. We endorse the recommendation of the Justice and Electoral Committee for an extra week in the election timetable to be achieved by moving the close of nominations to 57 days before polling day.
Voting documents

The SOLGM electoral working party submitted that voting documents were a ‘work in progress’ and that it intended undertaking further work to enhance their quality. We recommend that this be encouraged and the work include consideration of prescription of separate voting documents when the two different electoral systems are being used, the ranking instructions for STV elections, and the double column format of some voting documents.

Order of candidates on voting documents

We undertook analysis and research, including a review of international research, on the issue of the order of candidates on voting documents. Our analysis of results at the 2007 elections showed that the order of candidates on the voting document had an impact on election outcomes. Candidates whose names were early in the alphabet (and therefore early in the candidate profiles booklet) and early in alphabetically ordered voting documents were up to 4% more likely to be elected than those whose names were later in the alphabet.

This effect did not disappear, as might be expected, when candidates’ names were listed in pseudo-random order or random order on the voting document. We believe this is possibly a result of candidates’ names still being listed alphabetically in the candidate profiles booklet.

To address fully the effect of being early in the alphabet and alphabetical ordering, we believe it would be necessary to have the same order in the booklet as on the voting document. However, such a step is likely to hinder voters in finding their preferred candidates in the booklet and would be very expensive to implement as each booklet would have to be printed separately.

Our analysis also found there was a significant bias in favour of candidates in the left column of voting documents when there was more than one column of candidates. This needs to be considered in relation to the arguments for and against particular candidate order options.

We concluded that any analysis on this issue is unlikely to be definitive. A range of factors needs to be taken into account including such matters as the number of candidates, their profile or degree of name recognition, the amount of candidate information available, any dual candidacies and the electoral system.

Our review of international research also confirmed that a definitive solution to this issue is unlikely. This research is limited and is often specific to the environment in which it is conducted. Some researchers have concluded that there are significant effects on electoral outcomes from the order of candidates while others say that much of the research leading to such conclusions is methodologically flawed and fails to take into account other explanations.

Given the limited research available that could be applied to New Zealand local elections, we are not in a position to recommend one uniform candidate order. Accordingly, we recommend more analysis be carried out on a preferred order of candidates for voting documents including the option of alphabetical rotational order as identified by the Justice and Electoral Committee.

Vote processing and counting

We acknowledge the considerable amount of work undertaken prior to the 2007 elections, led by the SOLGM electoral working party, on ‘end-to-end’ assurance for vote processing and counting systems. This work was aimed at ensuring both public and local authority confidence in these systems for future elections.

This work resulted in good practice guidelines being provided to electoral officers in time for the 2007 elections. We recommend the intent of these guidelines now be reflected in regulations by a generic requirement to achieve ‘end-to-end’ assurance on vote processing and counting systems used for local elections.

We also recommend implementation of the Justice and Electoral Committee recommendation for the repeal of section 79 of the Local Electoral Act. This section requires local authorities to determine whether early processing of voting documents is to take place at local elections. This practice is now adopted universally and we believe it should be left for electoral officer discretion.
Elected member issues

We make the following recommendations on issues relating to elected members:

- an amendment to provide that all members, whether elected unopposed or not, come into office at the same time
- no legislative change relating to the holding of by-elections
- an amendment relating to vacancies occurring on licensing trusts within 12 months of the next triennial election.

Other issues

We make recommendations relating to:

- accessibility of election data and the format of election results
- securing and destruction of electoral records
- the form of STV used in New Zealand and the STV calculator
- electoral offences
- alignment of licensing trust boundaries with meshblocks.
5. Recommendations

Having conducted the review of the Local Government Act 2002 and Local Electoral Act 2001, the Local Government Commission makes the following recommendations to the Minister of Local Government.

Local Government Act 2002

Responsive local government (see chapter 3 of main report)

3.1 Community outcomes

1. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   a. identification of community outcomes
   b. reporting on community outcomes.

2. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to:
   a. the identification and application of community outcomes as well as ways to enhance community understanding of the community outcomes process
   b. local authority monitoring and reporting on community outcomes.

3. Further work:
   a. Consideration be given to opportunities and methods of promoting greater collaboration between local authorities in identifying community outcomes using current examples, and this include opportunities for collaboration on a regional basis promoted through the triennial agreement.
   b. Monitoring of central government agency engagement in local community outcomes processes as part of the Department of Internal Affairs’ ten-year evaluation of local government legislation.
   c. Priority be given to ensuring the availability of relevant disaggregated statistical data to assist local authority monitoring of progress towards the achievement of community outcomes.

3.2 LTCCPs

4. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   a. the requirement for councils to prepare an LTCCP and have this plan in place at all times
   b. the timing of LTCCPs
   c. the audit of LTCCPs.

5. Amendments to the Local Government Act:
   a. Section 102(4)(e) to require local authorities to adopt a policy on partnerships between the local authority and the private sector, for inclusion in the LTCCP, only if the local authority intends entering into such a partnership.
   b. Deletion of section 102(4)(f) requiring local authorities to adopt a separate policy on the remission and postponement of rates on Māori freehold land.
   c. Extension of the auditing requirement for proposed amendments to LTCCPs, to include auditing of the amendment as finally adopted by the local authority.
   d. Section 97(1) to require amendments of an LTCCP only for significant changes to significant activities and strategic assets.

Explanatory note: Input was sought from various stakeholders during the course of the review. However, the Commission was not obliged to consult on its final recommendations. As such some of our recommendations are worded as “consideration be given to”, as in those cases we acknowledge further consultation is required.
e. Section 102(6) to require amendment of an LTCCP only in the case of significant changes to funding and financial policies.
f. Section 141 to require that the sale or exchange of endowment land must be undertaken by way of the special consultative procedure rather than as an amendment to the LTCCP.

6. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to:
   a. the preparation of LTCCPs including processes for:
      i. measuring and forecasting levels of service
      ii. financial forecasting and projecting price increases based on inflation
      iii. developing succinct funding and financial policies
   b. the preparation of summaries of statements of proposal for LTCCPs
   c. requirements for amendments to LTCCPs.

3.3 Annual plan
7. No change to the Local Government Act relating to the requirement for councils to prepare and adopt an annual plan for each financial year.

3.4 Decision-making
8. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   a. local authority decision-making requirements
   b. the requirement for local authorities to adopt a policy on significance subject to section 90 (Policy on significance) being moved to follow section 79 (Compliance with procedures in relation to decisions) in the Act.
9. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to:
   a. local authority decision-making processes and procedures including in relation to a sustainable development approach
   b. the application of the concept of significance by local authorities.
10. Further work: A review of the use of the words ‘significant’, ‘significance’ and ‘significantly’ in the Local Government Act including distinguishing between council assessments of these terms and when the special consultative procedure is required to be used.

3.5 Consultation
11. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   a. the consultation principles in section 82
   b. requirements for use of the special consultative procedure.
12. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to:
   a. the range of community engagement and consultation mechanisms available and methods of evaluating their effectiveness
   b. effective consultation practices including appropriate use of the special consultative procedure.
13. Further work:
   a. Monitoring of the effectiveness of local authority consultation practices as part of the Department of Internal Affairs’ ten-year legislative evaluation.
   b. Consideration of alternative and parallel mechanisms to newspapers for the giving of required public notices.
3.6 **Contributions to decision-making processes by Māori**

14. No change at this time to the Local Government Act relating to provision of opportunities for Māori to contribute to decision-making processes.

15. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to local authority engagement with Māori and opportunities for contributions to decision-making.

16. Further work:
   b. Consideration of a central government funding strategy to advance the development of iwi management plans or similar strategic documents.

3.7 **Annual report**

17. No change to the Local Government Act relating to the requirement for councils to prepare and adopt an annual report in respect of each financial year.

3.8 **Financial management**

18. An amendment to the Local Government Act: section 100 be moved to follow section 102.


*Effective local government (see chapter 4 of main report)*

4.1 **Empowerment of and relations between regional councils and territorial authorities**

20. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   a. the requirement for local authorities to prepare triennial agreements
   b. proposals by regional councils to undertake significant new activities.

21. Amendments to the Local Government Act:
   a. Section 15 to require consideration of the choice of electoral system and timing of representation reviews as part of the development of all triennial agreements.
   b. Section 16 to provide for the Local Government Commission to perform the role presently prescribed for the Minister of Local Government in relation to proposals for undertaking significant new activities.

22. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to the development of triennial agreements, including examples of the benefits of enhanced local authority collaboration and cooperation.

23. Further work: Consideration of an amendment to section 17 to remove the requirement for prior notice to be given to the Minister of Local Government of a proposed transfer of responsibilities between local authorities. If this provision is seen to be necessary the section be amended to provide for the prior notice to be given to the Local Government Commission rather than to the Minister of Local Government.
4.2 Special obligations and restrictions

24. No change to the Local Government Act relating to requirements for territorial authorities to undertake water and sanitary service assessments.

25. Amendments to the Local Government Act:
   a. Repeal of the provisions placing specific obligations and restrictions on local authorities relating to the delivery of water services (i.e. section 130 and consequential repeal of sections 131 to 137 with the exception of provisions relating to restriction or stopping of the water supply) and these matters be left for local communities to determine.
   b. Repeal of section 138 prescribing consultation on all proposals for the sale or disposal of parks.

4.3 Regulatory, enforcement and coercive powers

26. Amendments to the Local Government Act:
   a. Section 160A to state expressly that a bylaw not reviewed when required is enforceable for the specified two-year period before it is mandatorily revoked.
   b. Section 161(3) to clarify how the reference to section 17 is to work, including use of the special consultative procedure, given that the section primarily relates to transfers between territorial authorities or between regional councils.
   c. The current bylaw-making powers for the control of liquor be extended to regional councils in respect of land owned or controlled by the regional council, along with any other powers that may be identified as a result of the recommended comprehensive review of all statutory bylaw-making powers.
   d. Section 164(3) to identify the necessary requirements for the notice relating to the seizing and impounding of property or prescribe the form referred to in the section.
   e. Section 168(1) to clarify whether property may be disposed of within or after six months.
   f. An extension of the powers in section 181(1) and (2) in relation to construction of works on private land, to cover all land.
   g. Clarification that the powers provided to local authorities in section 181 include local authority organisations.
   h. Section 182 to confirm that powers to enter land to check water is not being wasted are able to be exercised in respect of waterworks under the control of a council-controlled organisation.

27. Further work:
   a. A comprehensive review of all local authority statutory bylaw-making provisions to ensure consistency of approach between Acts and with a view to achieving efficient and effective administration of bylaw-making powers.
   b. A review of the application of the provisions of section 188 relating to liability for payments in respect of private land, and consideration of a new generic provision enabling costs incurred by local authorities under various provisions to be a charge on the land concerned.
   c. Regulations be made under section 259 as soon as practicable to prescribe breaches of bylaws that are infringement offences along with associated infringement fees.
4.4 **Other legislation**


4.5 **Powers of the Minister and central government**

(No recommendations)

4.6 **Structure of local government**

29. An amendment to the Local Government Act: Clause 5 of Schedule 2 to provide that structures adjoining a district form part of that district in the same way as reclaimed land.

30. Further work: A review of those territorial authority district boundaries remaining at the mean high water mark with a view to extending them to mean low water springs.

4.7 **Reorganisation of local authorities**

31. Amendments to the Local Government Act:
   a. Clause 67 of Schedule 3 to provide for the continuation of delegations in respect of any Act, Regulations or bylaw made by a former local authority relating to an area coming under the jurisdiction of a new or different local authority.
   b. Provision for an Order in Council giving effect to a reorganisation scheme, or a ministerial notice, to alter, with the consent of the Minister of Health, the boundary of a district health board to conform with an altered territorial authority boundary.
   c. Clause 7 of Schedule 6 to provide that appeals against a decision of a territorial authority to not constitute a community must be lodged with the Local Government Commission within one month of the council’s decision being notified.

4.8 **Local Government Commission**

32. No change to the Local Government Act relating to the constitution, functions and membership of the Local Government Commission.

4.9 **Local authority governance**

33. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   a. the constitution, role and membership of the local authority governing body
   b. the requirement for local authorities to produce a local governance statement
   c. local authority meeting procedures including provision for a casting vote.

34. Amendments to the Local Government Act:
   a. Clause 32B of Schedule 7 to not automatically prohibit further delegation by an officer unless such a prohibition has been agreed by the local authority or is provided in another enactment.
   b. Section 5 to include a subcommittee appointed directly by the local authority in the definition of a committee.

35. Further work: Consideration of the option for local authorities to conduct business on-line including the possible scope for such a provision and its advantages and disadvantages.
4.10 **Elected member issues**

36. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   - a. requirements for codes of conduct including in relation to enforcement provisions
   - b. arrangements for the determination of elected member remuneration.

37. An amendment to the Local Government Act to provide that, in the event of a conflict, the territorial authority declaration signed by a councillor takes precedence over a declaration in respect of that councillor’s membership of a community board.

38. Further work:
   - a. A good practice template for codes of conduct for community boards be developed, either by the Department of Internal Affairs or Local Government New Zealand, and circulated to community boards for consideration.
   - b. A review of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act as soon as possible with consolidation into the Local Government Act of necessary statutory provisions relating to the ‘discussing and voting rule’ for elected members.

4.11 **Community boards**

39. No change to the Local Government Act relating to general provisions on establishment, membership and roles of community boards.

40. Amendments to the Local Government Act:
   - a. Schedule 6 include a new clause providing that a local authority resolution or Local Government Commission determination on establishment of a community board may determine any matter contained in section 19J(2)(d) to (i) of the Local Electoral Act.
   - b. Clause 39 of Schedule 7 to expressly preclude the levying of targeted rates for the purpose of funding the administration of community boards.

41. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to relationships between territorial authorities and their community boards including encouragement for territorial authorities to consider carefully the issue of community board delegations.

4.12 **Council organisations and council-controlled organisations**

42. No change to the Local Government Act relating to:
   - a. organisations excluded or exempted from council-controlled organisation requirements
   - b. requirements for the establishment of council-controlled organisations.

43. Further work: Consideration of alignment of statements of intent for council-controlled organisations with local authority LTCCPs.

4.13 **Employment**

44. No change to the Local Government Act relating to local authority employment provisions including those applying to chief executives.
Local Electoral Act 2001

Democratic local government (see chapter 5 of main report)

5.1 The electoral system for local elections

45. No change at this time to the Local Electoral Act relating to choice of electoral system for local authority elections.

46. Amendments to the Local Electoral Act:
   a. Section 27 to provide that a local authority resolution to adopt a particular electoral system applies for the following two triennial elections.
   b. Replace the term 'electoral system' with 'voting system' in each instance it occurs in the Act.

47. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to the provision of information to councils and communities on the advantages and disadvantages of the FPP and STV electoral systems.

5.2 Separate Māori representation

48. No change to the Local Electoral Act relating to establishment of Māori wards/constituentcies.

5.3 Representation arrangements

49. No change to the Local Electoral Act relating to the basis of election for local authorities (i.e. choice for territorial authorities of at large, wards or a mix of both and mandatory constituencies for regional councils).

50. Amendments to the Local Electoral Act:
   a. Section 19D to provide that the maximum number of members for regional councils be 16. (Note this recommendation was by majority.)
   b. Provision for a territorial authority, subject to appropriate prior public notification, to seek the approval of the Local Government Commission for disestablishment of a community board with insufficient nominations at an election for a quorum to be formed.
   c. Section 19V to provide more flexibility around the requirement for achieving fair representation by allowing:
      i. the +/-10% rule to apply 'on average' between particular wards/constituecies in order to ensure effective representation of recognised communities of interest
      ii. exceptions to the +/-10% rule for both territorial authorities and regional councils subject to Local Government Commission approval, so as to:
         1. provide effective representation for island and isolated communities of interest
         2. avoid splitting recognisable communities of interest
         3. avoid grouping communities of interest with few commonalities
         4. avoid potential barriers to participation of electors
         5. provide convenient access to local authority services
         6. allow for population forecasts to address present imbalances
   d. A requirement for the following steps to be considered in determining representation arrangements:
      i. identify the communities of interest of the district or region
      ii. determine whether wards, or a mix of wards and at large, are required to achieve effective representation of the communities of interest of the
district (applies only to territorial authorities), with factors to consider including accessibility, size and configuration of the district, and the electoral system to be used

iii. identify a range/total number of members required to effectively represent the diversity of the district or region, meet statutory obligations, and provide efficient and effective governance of the district or region

iv. determine the number, boundaries, and members per ward/constituency required to achieve effective representation (of groupings) of communities of interest

v. determine the number of members per ward/constituency required to achieve fair representation (defined by the +/-10% rule)

vi. determine the extent, if any, to which effective representation of a particular community of interest requires wards or constituencies to be defined, and membership distributed between them, in a way that does not comply with the requirement for fair representation

e. Section 19V(1) to refer to “electors” not “residents”.

5.4 The representation review process

51. No change to the Local Electoral Act relating to general responsibilities for the conduct of representation reviews.

52. Amendments to the Local Electoral Act:

   a. Section 19R to require the Local Government Commission, when considering appeals and objections against local authority representation review proposals, to give due weight to local authority proposals that have been the subject of full consultation with the community and comply with all legislative requirements.

   b. Section 19N to require the public notice given by local authorities of their final proposals to include the same information given in respect of their initial proposals relating to the +/-10% rule.

   c. Section 19V to require all territorial authorities and regional councils to refer all final proposals that do not comply with the legislation to the Local Government Commission for final determination.

   d. Provision for local authorities to make minor adjustments to ward, constituency or community subdivision boundaries after three years from their last representation review determination without the need for community consultation, but subject to Local Government Commission approval.

   e. Sections 19H and 19I to provide that local authorities may only make representation determinations in the year preceding triennial elections.

5.5 Candidate issues

53. No change to the Local Electoral Act relating to:

   a. dual candidacy for and membership of local authorities

   b. candidate deposits

   c. the regime of electoral expense limits for candidates at local elections

   d. receipt and declaration of donations at local elections.

54. Amendments to the Local Electoral Act:

   a. Implementation of the recommendation of the Justice and Electoral Committee for an amendment to section 61 requiring that dual candidacies be identified in candidate profile statements (not to be included in the 150 word limit).

   b. Repeal of section 69 and consequential amendments to sections 70 and 71 to remove provision for the voluntary retirement of a candidate following the close of nominations.
c. Implementation of the recommendation of the Justice and Electoral Committee for an amendment to section 61 requiring that all candidates include their principal place of residence in their candidate profile statement (not to be included in the 150 word limit).

d. Section 55 to provide for electoral officers to require proof of citizenship of a candidate.

e. Implementation of the recommendation of the Justice and Electoral Committee for amendments to sections 55 and 61 to require all nomination documentation (i.e. nomination form, candidate profile statement and deposit) to be submitted together.

55. An amendment to the Local Electoral Regulations: Implementation of the recommendation of the Justice and Electoral Committee for an amendment to regulation 29 requiring early publication of candidate profile statements.

56. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to the layout and readable typeface of candidate profile statements and their availability on request in accessible formats.

57. Further work:
   a. Consideration of the practicality of providing further statutory guidance on the definition of candidate ‘affiliation’ in section 57.
   b. Consideration of the introduction of an infringement offence regime to replace the summary conviction offence provision in section 135 relating to unauthorised advertisements.

5.6 Elector issues

58. No change to the Local Electoral Act relating to:
   a. provision for local discretion on choice of voting methods
   b. the length of the voting period, polling day or close of voting until research indicates such changes are likely to impact positively on voter turnout.

59. Amendments to the Local Electoral Act:
   a. Section 39(1)(b) to identify an earlier date by which councils are to provide, with their rates assessments/notices, information on qualifications and enrolment procedures for the non-resident ratepayer franchise.
   b. Implementation of the recommendation of the Justice and Electoral Committee for an amendment to section 75 requiring a statement to be included on voting documents relating to offences under sections 123 and 124.
   c. Provision for electronically-enhanced provision and return of voting documents for overseas voters as occurs at parliamentary elections.

60. Amendments to the Local Electoral Regulations:
   a. The term ‘rateable” to be substituted by “rating” on the two occasions it occurs in regulation 16(2).
   b. Schedule 1 to specifically include “trusts” as bodies for which persons may be eligible to be non-resident ratepayer electors.

61. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to:
   a. postal voting processes and procedures including the integrity of this voting method
   b. initiatives to promote voter turnout.

62. Further work:
   a. The SOLGM electoral working party be encouraged to consider options for better synchronisation in the timing of the availability of preliminary electoral rolls for local elections with national enrolment update campaigns.
b. The SOLGM electoral working party be encouraged to undertake work on options relating to the need for enrolment on the non-resident ratepayer electoral roll and/or the need for triennial confirmation of enrolment and if enrolment is found to be necessary, simplification of the prescribed enrolment form in the Local Electoral Regulations.

c. Consideration of provision for compilation of unpublished non-resident ratepayer rolls for local elections.

d. The SOLGM electoral working party and the Department of Internal Affairs commence work on issues and options relating to the introduction of electronic voting in local elections.

e. Consideration of provision for an Order in Council to move polling day for all local authorities or for a particular local authority, on advice provided by the Minister of Local Government.

f. Consideration of formally assigning to the Electoral Commission responsibility for voter turnout and awareness, and education on electoral systems associated with local elections.

5.7 Appointment and role of the electoral officer

63. No change to the Local Electoral Act relating to roles and responsibilities in the conduct of local elections including electoral officers being appointed by local authorities and then acting independently of that body.

64. Amendments to the Local Electoral Act:
   a. Sections 16 to 19 to provide that all electoral officers are responsible for all electoral tasks in the first instance.
   b. Section 14 to provide a full prohibition on the appointment of a local authority chief executive as that authority’s electoral officer.

65. Development and dissemination of further good practice guidance relating to:
   a. the role of the electoral officer including job profiles and person specifications
   b. contracts for the provision of services
   c. job training including the option of certification of electoral officers.

5.8 Conduct of local elections and polls

66. No change to the Local Electoral Act relating to:
   a. the holding of by-elections
   b. the New Zealand method of STV
   c. the publishing of the source code for the STV calculator or any other STV counting program used in local elections
   d. the effect of an irregularity on the result of an election or poll.

67. Amendments to the Local Electoral Act:
   a. Implementation of the Justice and Electoral Committee recommendation for an extra week in the election timetable by section 5 providing that nomination day shall be the 57th day before polling day.
   b. Implementation of the Justice and Electoral Committee recommendation for the repeal of section 79 requiring local authorities to determine whether early processing of voting documents is to take place at local elections, and the matter be left for electoral officer discretion.
   c. Section 115 to provide that all members, whether elected unopposed or not, come into office at the same time i.e. the day after declaration of the result of the election.
68. An amendment to the Local Electoral Regulations: Provision of a generic requirement to achieve end-to-end assurance on vote processing and counting systems used for local elections.
69. Further work:
   a. As part of any future comprehensive review of the Local Electoral Act, a review of the consistency of the provisions of the Act and the Local Electoral Regulations in relation to the purpose of the Act to provide for matters of detail in regulations.
   b. The SOLGM electoral working party be encouraged to undertake further work to enhance the quality of voting documents including consideration of:
      i. prescription of separate voting documents when the two different electoral systems are being used
      ii. the ranking instructions for STV elections
      iii. the double column format of some voting documents.
   c. More analysis be carried out on a preferred order of candidates for voting documents including the option of alphabetical rotational order.
   d. The SOLGM electoral working party be encouraged to consider the availability and accessibility to the public of election data, including electronic data, and also the format of official election results as presently prescribed in the Local Electoral Regulations.
   e. Consideration be given to appropriate provisions for the securing and destruction of all electoral records, including electronic records, following local elections including the issue of access to records for research purposes.
   f. Consideration of amendments to the Local Electoral Act to:
      i. make it an offence to obstruct the electoral officer in the conduct of his or her duties under the Act
      ii. require the electoral officer to maintain order in official election places and provide for the arrest or removal of any person suspected of committing or attempting to commit an offence under this Act, or willfully obstructing the proceedings or causing a disturbance, or conducting themselves in a disorderly manner.
   g. Consideration of a new regulation to regulate the conduct of scrutineers following the close of voting at local elections.
   h. A comprehensive review of all offence provisions under the Local Electoral Act taking into account the voting methods currently or likely to be used at future local elections.

Other legislation
70. The Local Government Act, the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act, and the Sale of Liquor Act to require local authorities to name their electoral officer in their annual report.
71. The Sale of Liquor Act to provide that a vacancy occurring on a licensing trust within 12 months of the next triennial election either be filled by an appointment or left vacant.
72. The Sale of Liquor Act to require licensing trust boundaries to align with meshblocks and to provide for the Local Government Commission to consider and determine proposals to alter licensing trust boundaries to assist the efficient administration of elections.
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