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AGENDA
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FRIDAY 9 NOVEMBER 2018
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In the Manawatū District Council Chambers,
135 Manchester Street, Feilding
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Chief Executive
MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson

Councillor Stuart Campbell

Deputy Chairperson

Councillor Barbara Cameron

Members

Her Worship the Mayor, Helen Worboys
Councillor Barbara Cameron
Councillor Stuart Campbell
Councillor Hilary Humphrey
Councillor Phil Marsh
Councillor Howard Voss

External Member – John Fowke
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. MEETING OPENING

2. APOLOGIES

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Draft resolution
That the minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting held 7 September 2018 be adopted as a true and correct record.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Notification from elected members of:
4.1 Any interests that may create a conflict with their role as an elected member relating to the items of business for this meeting; and
4.2 Any interests in items in which they have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest as provided for in the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968

5. NOTIFICATION OF LATE ITEMS

Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting, that item may be dealt with at that meeting if:
5.1 The Council by resolution so decides; and
5.2 The Chairperson explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public the reason why the item is not on the agenda, and the reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

6. PRESENTATIONS

6.1 DRINKING WATER STANDARDS

Presentation by General Manager – Infrastructure Hamish Waugh on Drinking Water Standards - 2017/18 Compliance Report

7. OFFICER REPORTS

7.1 KEY PROJECTS: REVIEWS AND LESSONS

Report of the General Manager – Community and Strategy dated 25 October 2018

7.2 SPECIAL FUNDS

Report of the General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory dated 5 November 2018
8. UPDATE ON INTERNAL AUDIT

Progress update from General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory

9. CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS

10. NOTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

11. PUBLIC EXCLUDED BUSINESS

COMMITTEE TO RESOLVE:

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

a) Confirmation of minutes

That the general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Grounds under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Confirmation of minutes re Insurance Renewals</td>
<td>Section 7(2)(j) - prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or advantage and section 7(2)(c)(i) Protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be.</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings would be likely to result in a disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding that information would exist, under Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as specified above.

12. MEETING CLOSURE
Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Friday 7 September 2018, commencing at 8.30am in the Manawatū District Council Chambers, 135 Manchester Street, Feilding.

PRESENT: Cr Stuart Campbell (Chairperson)
Cr Barbara Cameron
Cr Howard Voss
Cr Hilary Humphrey
Cr Phil Marsh
Mr John Fowke
Mayor Helen Worboys

IN ATTENDANCE: Cr Shane Casey
Cr Michael Ford
Deanna Macdonald AON
Matthew Wilson AON
Shayne Harris (Acting Chief Executive)
Hamish Waugh (General Manager – Infrastructure)
Frances Smorti (General Manager – People and Culture)
Brent Limmer (General Manager – Community and Strategy)
Paul Stein (Communications Manager)
Mat Bayliss (Community Facilities Manager)
Colleen Morris (Chief Financial Officer)
Ross Wheeler (Strategic Accountant)
Rachel Raggett (Executive Assistant – Community and Strategy)
Nichole Ganley (Governance Support Officer)

ARC 18/102 MEETING OPENING

The Chairperson declared the meeting open.

ARC 18/103 APOLOGIES

There were no requests for apologies.

ARC 18/104 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting held 10 August 2018 be adopted as a true and correct record.

Moved by: Councillor Howard Voss
Seconded by: John Fowke
CARRIED

ARC 18/105 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

John Fowke noted he is a director of Central Economic Development Agency (CEDA)
ARC 18/106  NOTIFICATION OF LATE ITEMS

There were no items of late business notified.

ARC 18/107  PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations

_Her Worship the Mayor Helen Worboys joined the meeting at 8.32am_

ARC 18/108  ANNUAL REPORT

Report of the General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory dated 31 August 2018 presenting for information the draft Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018 and details of the process required to adopt the Annual Report

**RECOMMENDED**

That the Council receives the draft Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018.

That the Mayor and Chief Executive be delegated authority to sign the Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2018.

Moved by:   Councillor Barbara Cameron
Seconded by:   Councillor Howard Voss

CARRIED

ARC 18/109  LONG TERM PLAN 2018-28 – AUDIT MANAGEMENT REPORT


**RECOMMENDED**

That the Audit and Risk Committee receives the attached Audit Management Report from Audit New Zealand on the Long Term Plan 2018-28.

Moved by:   Councillor Phil Marsh
Seconded by:   Her Worship the Mayor Helen Worboys

CARRIED

ARC 18/110  UPDATE ON INTERNAL AUDIT

General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory gave a verbal update on the progress of Internal Audit. He advised the approved contractor had put together a programme, which the MWLASS directors would be discussing at their meeting scheduled for 10 September 2018.
RESOLVED

That the Audit and Risk Committee receives the verbal update from General Manager – Corporate and Regulatory on the progress of Internal Audit.

Moved by: Councillor Stuart Campbell

Seconded by: Her Worship the Mayor Helen Worboys

CARRIED

ARC 18/111 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS

There were no late items for consideration.

ARC 18/112 NOTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

There were no items notified for the next meeting.

ARC 18/113 PUBLIC EXCLUDED BUSINESS

RESOLVED

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

a) Confirmation of minutes
b) Insurance Renewals

c) Confirmation of
Minutes re Insurance Loss Modelling and Key Risks – Assessment of Controls and Treatments

That the general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Grounds under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) Confirmation of 
Minutes re Insurance Loss Modelling and Key Risks – Assessment of Controls and Treatments | Section 7(2)(j) – prevent the disclosure of use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage and 7(2)(c)(i) protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be. | Section 48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings would be likely to result in a disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding that information would exist, under Section 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. |
| b) Insurance Renewals | Section 7(2)(b)(ii) - protect information where the making available of the information would be likely | |
General subject of each matter to be considered

Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter

Grounds under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution

unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as specified above.

Also move, that Matthew Wilson and Deanna Macdonald of AON be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of Insurance Loss Modelling. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed, is relevant to that matter because they will be undertaking the work.

Moved by: Her Worship the Mayor Helen Worboys

Seconded by: Councillor Barbara Cameron

CARRIED

The meeting went into public excluded session at 9.34am and resumed open session at 10.22am. For items ARC 18/114 to ARC 18/117, refer to public excluded minutes.

ARC 18/118 MEETING CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 10.24am

Approved and adopted as a true and correct record:
Key Projects: Project Reviews and Lessons

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present to the Audit and Risk Committee a summary of the results of four Key Project Reviews and their lessons.

Significance of Decision

The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations

That the Audit and Risk Committee receives the report “Key Projects: Project Reviews and Lessons”.

Report prepared by:
Michael Hawker
Project Delivery Manager

Approved for submission by:
Brent Limmer
General Manager - Community and Strategy
1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

_Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatū District – the best lifestyle in New Zealand_

| Manawatū District protects the natural environment through stewardship of the District’s natural and physical resources. | Manawatū District attracts and retains residents and businesses. | Manawatū District develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector. | Manawatū District is connected via quality infrastructure, services and technology. | Manawatū District’s built environment is safe, resilient and attractive. | Manawatū District Council is a customer-focused and efficient organisation. |

2 Background

2.1 Projects are a key method for Manawatū District Council (MDC) to deliver the Long Term Plan. Practices that improve the chance

2.2 This report is to support the Audit and Risk Committee

- To maintain an overview of the risks for overall project delivery and how those risks are being managed through effective and formal knowledge management.

- To assess how well lessons identified in project reviews are being applied to improve project performance.

2.3 The Project Management Institute (PMI) is the leading international professional membership association for the project management profession. Their resources and research have provided a valuable basis for improving project delivery at MDC. PMI provides globally recognized standards, certification programs, extensive academic and market research programs.

2.4 PMI defines high performers as organizations that achieve 80 percent or more of projects on time, on budget and meeting original business benefits. Low performers are organizations that achieve 60 percent or fewer projects on time, on budget and meeting original business benefits.

2.5 What contributes to higher project success rates? Since 2006, PMI’s Pulse of the Profession® annual global survey of project management has charted the major trends for project management.

2.6 Their research shows that high performing organisations focus their efforts on four categories of practice: people, change management, processes and outcomes. This report is concerned with how the people category of practice contributes to project delivery success.

2.7 The people practices of high performing organisations are shown in Figure 1 below. High performers are more likely to conduct these people practices well.
Knowledge transfer is defined as “the methodical replication of the expertise, wisdom, insight, and tacit knowledge of key professionals into the heads and hands of their co-workers”. It’s more than just on-the-job training.

Knowledge transfer is an important goal in the world of projects, which is knowledge intensive, and often has high levels of complexity and risk. Both could be minimized by transferring valuable knowledge.

Figure 2 shows the formal steps of the Knowledge Transfer cycle which are used to ensure that essential knowledge is captured and shared. When this is done well, an organization should see improved results across the range of project metrics.
Steps of the Knowledge Transfer Life Cycle:

1. Identifying: Determine what knowledge needs to be transferred
2. Capturing: Accumulate the essential knowledge that needs to be transferred
3. Sharing: Establish methods for transferring the knowledge
4. Applying: Use the knowledge that is transferred
5. Assessing: Evaluate the benefits of the knowledge that is transferred

The knowledge transfer life cycle

Project reviews and documenting their lessons are important are approaches for the capturing knowledge step. Figure 3 shows the most effective knowledge capture approaches and activities.

Figure 2: Pulse of the Profession®: Capturing the Value of Project Management Through Knowledge Transfer (2015)
2.12 MDC has captured lessons from its project reviews and is commencing sharing and applying that knowledge. Lessons cannot be said to have been learnt until they have been shared, applied and their effectiveness assessed.

2.13 Future Key Project Reviews will be reported to the Audit and Risk Committee to support oversight on project delivery.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 Four Key Projects have completed project reviews and documented their lessons. They are:

- LTP 2018-2028 Project Review
- MAC Re-Development Project Review
- Nannestad Line Project Review
- Jarvis Project Review

3.2 The Project Reviews are attached to this report.
3.3 The success measures for the reviewed projects are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Project</th>
<th>On Budget</th>
<th>On Schedule</th>
<th>Benefits Delivered</th>
<th>Project Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTP 2018-2028</td>
<td>Under Budget</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC Re-development</td>
<td>Under Budget</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nannestad Line Box Culvert Replacement</td>
<td>On Budget (within acceptable limit)</td>
<td>Exceeded Original Schedule</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>Challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis</td>
<td>Under Budget</td>
<td>On Schedule</td>
<td>Awaiting measurement</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 From the Project Reviews, there are the following key lessons of good practice to continue doing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Category</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship and Governance</td>
<td>Sponsors need to act early to ensure external providers have the right personnel and approach</td>
<td>Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Project Status reporting process is helpful for gaining engagement of Sponsors and Governance</td>
<td>LTP 2018-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A well informed project sponsor and a good communicating relationship between the project sponsor and manager helps to resolve project risks and issues more effectively</td>
<td>LTP 2018-2028 MAC Re-Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Teams</td>
<td>Developing project teams who are committed to the same goal, timelines and each other produces enjoyable work environments, good teamwork</td>
<td>LTP 2018-2028 MAC Re-Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 From the Project Reviews, there are the following key lessons to use to seek improvements in project practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Category</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Include benefits education in the communication plan to help stakeholders understand the “Why” for a project.</td>
<td>MAC Re-Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formalise communications plans to improve communication consistency and decrease project risk exposure.</td>
<td>Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Category</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Be proactive in engaging all key stakeholders to ensure that everyone is informed in a timely way for their involvement.</td>
<td>LTP 2018-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage with iwi, early, preferably face-to-face and with Project Manager. (Not through third parties)</td>
<td>Nannestad Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Teams</td>
<td>When a project structure or key personnel change, ensure that there is a process to manage the changes without losing project progress.</td>
<td>MAC Re-Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure task roles and responsibilities are clearly understood by all the project team.</td>
<td>Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Do not just identify risks during the project start-up but formally throughout the project.</td>
<td>LTP 2018-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Management</td>
<td>Allocate formally in the project plan time and resources for error prevention tasks and quality inspections</td>
<td>LTP 2018-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Be proactive in engaging all key stakeholders to ensure that everyone is informed in a timely way for their involvement.</td>
<td>LTP 2018-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Methodology</td>
<td>Apply a project methodology and project management practices to all project phases, not just the procurement and construction phases.</td>
<td>MAC Re-Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Category</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Do not enter a contract without an approved resource consent as it increases risk and schedule pressures.</td>
<td>Nannestad Line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Operational Implications

4.1 There are no capital/operating expenditure implications associated with this report.

### 5 Financial implications

5.1 There are no capital/operating expenditure implications associated with this report.

### 6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 There are no statutory requirements associated with this report.

### 7 Delegations

7.1 The Audit and Risk Committee’s Terms of Reference sets out its responsibility for considering risk management and the system of internal controls. This includes:

- Setting the Council’s appetite for risk;
- Understanding the key risk areas including likelihood and consequences;
- Effectiveness of internal controls; and
- Fraud risk and procurement risk.

7.2 The Audit and Risk Committee does not have delegated authority for decision-making, therefore recommendations are made to Council for adoption.

### 8 Consultation

8.1 There are no consultation requirements associated with this report.

### 9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this report.

### 10 Conclusion

10.1 MDC has reviewed four completed Key Projects and captured lessons from those projects.
11 Attachments

- LTP 2018-2028 Project Review
- MAC Re-Development Project Review
- Nannestad Line Project Review
- Jarvis Project Review
## PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

### PROJECT NAME: Long Term Plan 2018-28

### PROJECT SPONSOR: Brent Limmer

### REVIEW DATE: August 2018

### PROJECT MANAGER: Tracey Hunt

## HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

### What was the justification for the project to proceed?

By having a Long Term Plan, Council will comply with Local Government Act and Rating Act. The Council will be able to strike, gather rates, and execute its work programme. The Long Term Plan also delivers on council and community expectations.

### What were the key project milestones and their key issues?

Resourcing issues experienced in the project due to the vacancy of the Project Coordinator role were partially addressed through the support of other Council staff. The coordinator role was then filled in November 2017 by organisational recruitment of a Corporate Projects Adviser.

Budget preparation encountered a number of key issues resulting in financial errors. The MagiQ financial modelling software still requires further development to ensure that budget preparation is automated reducing the need for manual adjustments. System errors resulted in lost work and additional time spent on re-work. This resulted in delays in the budget preparation and reduced the amount of time available for quality assurance.

Only the LTP budget was prepared in MagiQ. Due to lack of resourcing, budgets for the 30-year Infrastructure Strategy budget and 20-year Development Contributions Policy budget were prepared outside of MagiQ by non-financial staff and peer reviewed by finance staff. Lack of integration between the three individual budgets resulted in a high error environment especially when manual budget adjustments were required.

A further issue in the project arose due to a delay in the completion of the 30 year budget. The delay resulted from changes to project budgets as a result of changes made to the Development Contributions Policy Schedule and budget carry-forwards that were agreed through deliberations on submissions to the draft Long Term Plan. The budgets inclusion in the Infrastructure Strategy meant that the strategy’s completion was also delayed, and it was presented to Council later than anticipated. This meant that on Audit NZ’s arrival to MDC in February, they could only be provided with the un-adopted draft strategy until the Council meeting had occurred. Audit NZ were comfortable to proceed with auditing the draft strategy. The interim delay did not have any impact on the final audit deadline. Delays in confirming budgets also impacted on the timeframe for the Development Contributions Policy.

The Audit NZ approval process left the project team with very tight timeframes, however careful mitigation of risk meant there were no significant project delays, and the LTP document received a clean audit opinion.

The Project Manager resigned towards the end of the project, however continued to execute the project through to completion via contract.

### What was the output delivered by the project?

19
The Long Term Plan 2018-28 obtained a clean audit opinion and was adopted by Council on the 28\textsuperscript{th} June 2018.

**What are the planned benefits of the project? How and when will these be achieved?**

Adoption of the Long Term Plan enabling Council to strike and gather rates and execute the planned work programme. This benefit was achieved upon adoption of the LTP by Council on 28\textsuperscript{th} June.

In addition, a planned benefit is that the Long Term Plan delivers on council and community expectations. This will be indicated via performance measurements outlined throughout the plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Successful Was the Project?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Explanation Assessment &amp; Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Budget</strong> targets met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The project was completed under budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Schedule Target Dates</strong> met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Time spent on testing target dates against progress meant that where deadlines did not seem obtainable, re-baselining could occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the project deliver its <strong>Scope</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>In future, more time needs to be allowed/allocated for quality control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Quality</strong> targets met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>In future, more time needs to be allowed/allocated for quality control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was <strong>Customer Satisfaction</strong> achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Councillors to assess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did <strong>Teamwork</strong> meet requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A great team who worked incredibly hard and continued to deliver on the project’s objectives. Everyone was committed to executing the project plan to the best of their ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Stakeholder Engagement</strong> targets achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Key Project Status Reports and workshops served as useful mechanisms to keep elected members informed. Rural meetings with the community were well attended, aided by the rates issue being very contentious and conversation worthy. Facebook streaming and social media proved a successful medium to engage the community with the LTP process. Jarvis and the staff newsletters were extremely useful mechanisms for internal communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Risk &amp; Issue Management</strong> targets achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Risks were identified in the Project Charter, which unfortunately did come to fruition despite efforts to mitigate. Issue/Risk mitigation did occur throughout the project. Some of the risks required rapid response and mitigation measures weren’t always recorded. It would be useful to ensure that in future LTP Projects that there is a capture point for issues and risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Communication</strong> targets met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Were Iwi consultation targets met?
- LTP presentations were made to Nga Manu Taiko.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Lessons have been learnt?</th>
<th>Lessons and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What went well and should be retained?** | The use of a methodology and a MS Project Schedule meant that deliverables, tasks and milestones could be more clearly defined. Will be useful to further develop the methodology in some areas for use in future LTP projects.  
  The submission response process was organised, implemented very well and exceeded expectations. The performance of the GMs during this process was particularly commendable.  
  Good engagement and briefing of Council throughout the LTP process. They were provided with enough information to be able to make well-informed decisions, particularly in weighing up and choosing between different projects.  
  Although there was some negative feedback about the extent of consultation with the public, a real effort was made to provide the community with as many opportunities as possible to learn about the LTP and to understand the reasoning behind Council’s preferred options.  
  The communication between the Sponsor and Project Manager, in particular with Audit NZ, helped pave the way to an unqualified opinion which was the project’s ultimate goal. |
| **What could be improved and how?** | Put all 30 years of the budget into MagiQ, so there is one source of the truth, and cut it 3-ways for Infrastructure Strategy, Development Contributions Policy, and Asset Management Plans. This process will reduce the capacity constraints of Finance during the LTP process.  
  Review the DC policy and related financials outside of the LTP Project, leaving the Schedule of Assets as the only aspect needing to be developed within. This will further increase the capacity of the Finance Team during the LTP review.  
  The organisation needs to assess the value and effectiveness of MagiQ - important to assess this as soon as possible to ensure we are using the best system possible.  
  An Asset Management/LTP group met monthly throughout the project to discuss AMP and LTP deadlines. However, there is potential to have an Asset Manager or a member of the Infrastructure department on the LTP Project Team or as an associated stakeholder to help ensure that there are clear deadlines understood throughout the organisation.  
  Increase the time spent clarifying with Activity Managers the expectations and timeframes involved in the Topic Response Document. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Statistics</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget ($)</td>
<td>$173,447</td>
<td>$116,636.17</td>
<td>$56,810.83</td>
<td>Payment to external graphic designer for design of final LTP document still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule (Weeks)</td>
<td>Mid 2018</td>
<td>68 weeks (Completed 18th July 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project considered complete once Project Review Meeting had occurred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1
Long Term Plan 2018-28 – Key Learnings - Project Review Meeting – 18th July


Project Methodology – Further Development

- The Project Methodology was used for the first time, and it would be useful to expand it in some areas. Need more thought into how much resource each task actually uses to allow for more sophistication in allocation of resources.
- Issues in the Finance Team during the LTP were due to a combination of governance, system, process, and human factors.
  - The demand on the finance team during the project was underestimated. It wasn’t anticipated that there would be almost daily rating examples to model
  - More detail in the project schedule re: formation of the budget will be helpful, but also need to control timeliness and quality of inputs from other parts of the organisation – the number of organisational interfaces into the financial process were often the root cause of delays.
  - Lesson learned: Put all 30 years of the budget into MagiQ, so there is one source of the truth, and cut it 3-ways for Infrastructure Strategy, Development Contributions Policy, and Asset Management Plans. This process will reduce the capacity constraints of Finance during the LTP process

Financial Modelling Tool – Usefulness of the Current Tool

- The organisation needs to assess the value and effectiveness of MagiQ - important to assess this as soon as possible to ensure we are using the best system possible

Working with an External Consultant

- The preparation of the Development Contributions (DC) Policy was a point of failure at times. Internally, there was often no capacity to review the work of the external consultant preparing the policy, and at times communication with the consultant could have been better.
- The DC policy does not need to be reviewed with the LTP, it only has to be reviewed once every 3-years.
- Lesson learned: Review the DC policy and related financials outside of the LTP Project, leaving the Schedule of Assets as the only aspect needing to be developed within. This will further increase the capacity of the Finance Team during the LTP review.

Project Team – Consideration of Additional Members

- Asset Managers were often unaware of when their interest items were going up to Council meetings, and at times they failed to meet deadlines with their contributions to the project.
- There is potential to have an Asset Manager or a member of the Infrastructure department on the LTP Project Team, or at least attending the fortnightly meetings as an associated stakeholder.
This extra member would help to ensure that there are clear deadlines understood throughout the organisation, and be a mitigating factor for the risk of information not being passed down from GMs to their teams.

Risk-Issue Management

- Risks were identified in the Project Charter, which unfortunately did come to fruition despite efforts to mitigate.
- Issue/Risk mitigation did occur throughout the project, but it would be helpful to capture responses. Would be useful to ensure that in future LTP Projects that there is a capture point for issues and risks.

Document Management

- Formatting of the LTP proper took a significant amount of time, contributed to by multiple users of the document creating inconsistencies
- Version control was also an issue for the Project Team. At times, confusion resulted from multiple versions of the same document existing within Jarvis. Most team members are aware Jarvis has solutions for versioning, but do not know enough information about it. It is also crucial to delete redundant documents when they are no longer needed.
- A document naming convention prescribed at the beginning of the project would help to avoid confusion and inconsistencies.
- Imperative to provide feedback to the Jarvis team regarding the difficulties the Project Team had with the system throughout the LTP Project. Further training may be required.
- The creation of a Document Owner Role within the Project Team would allow for sufficient resourcing dedicated to collation and formatting of the LTP document. It is important to ensure that the individual fulfilling this role has good knowledge of the software involved.

Quality Control

- More time needs to be allowed/allocated for quality control.
- A mitigating factor could be trying to settle on Council decisions earlier in the process, consequently allowing more time for quality control

Topic Response Document

- Increase the time spent clarifying with Activity Managers the expectations and timeframes involved in the Topic Response Document
- The purpose of the document is two-fold – to provide guidance and information to councillors on submission topics for deliberations, and to provide information for submission response letters. Comments should be inputted accordingly, however it is expected that some editing will need to take place before they can be inputted to submission response letters.

Attendees of the Project Review Meeting are committed to developing an Action Plan, including responsibilities and timeframes, to ensure that salient learnings from the LTP project are actioned and implemented where appropriate, and that progress can be monitored by General Managers.
**PROJECT REVIEW REPORT**

**PROJECT NAME:** NANNESTAD LINE BOX CULVERT REPLACEMENT  
**PROJECT SPONSOR:** Hamish Waugh  
**REVIEW DATE:** 9th August 2018  
**PROJECT MANAGER:** Jim MestyaneK

**HISTORY OF THE PROJECT**

**What was the justification for the project to proceed?**

Replacement of box culvert, restoring full access after storm damage

**What were the key project milestones and their key issues?**

Gaining Resource Consent was a key issue and delay in the project. Pre-lodgement feedback was positive, but upon initial lodgement in Feb 2016 it was indicated that the consent application would require additional work.

Ensuing delays to gaining consent were due to both technical questions (calculation of hydrology) and iwi objections. Resource Consent was eventually received in August 2017.

Complications with iwi engagement around the resource consent process caused extensive delays to this project. The complications led to an agreement to the production of an Iwi Observers Cultural Report, meaning that unbudgeted payments had to be provided to iwi.

**What was the output delivered by the project?**

Bridge replacement and road construction was completed 8 June. Re-fencing and riparian planting in private property is pre-paid, under-way, and expected to be completed by end of August 2018.

**What are the planned benefits of the project? How and when will these be achieved?**

For three years, since June 2015, the bridge was closed to heavy traffic fully and open to light traffic only in one lane. However, the new construction has restored full two lane access, providing improved road width and alignment, as well as an improved waterway area. The new asset has eliminated the risk of flooding which previously characterised this location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How Successful Was the Project?</strong></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Explanation Assessment &amp; Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Budget</strong> targets met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Budget was slightly exceeded, but within acceptable limits. Not having the Resource Consent when contract was awarded increased the cost of the project as the contractor’s inflationary factors had to be allowed for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Schedule Target Dates</strong> met?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Did not meet original expectations, but the schedule was re-baselined and target dates were met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the project deliver its <strong>Scope</strong>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Production of an Iwi Observers Cultural Report was initially not included, but became in-scope. Technical re-design required some scope changes. No construction scope change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Quality</strong> targets met?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was <strong>Customer Satisfaction</strong> achieved?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Land-owners and road users were satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did <strong>Teamwork</strong> meet requirements?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Were **Stakeholder Engagement** targets achieved?

- Stakeholder engagement was a key success of the project. A emphasis was put on stakeholder engagement to identify existing problems so effort could be put towards rectifying them.

Were **Risk & Issue Management** targets achieved?

- Obtaining Resource Consent was a key issue of the project. Risk was managed through interpersonal interaction with the community and stakeholders.

Were **Communication** targets met?

- Contractor risk arising from delay in gaining resource consent was mitigated through communication and contractual management.

Were **Iwi** consultation targets met?

- Iwi complications throughout this project have resulted in change of practice for iwi consultation as outlined in lessons learnt below.

### What Lessons have been learnt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What went well and should be retained?</th>
<th>Lessons and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive stakeholder engagement is extremely important to ensure that Council does everything it can to get things done right the first time, and avoid building something that money will need to be spent on later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What could be improved and how? | A lesson learnt from this project is to avoid tendering and awarding a contract before Council has gained the relevant Resource Consent. Delays to consent in this project meant that the start-up meeting with contractor included the message – you must not begin work. This provided a great deal of risk to Council, as technically we were defaulting on contract. However, this risk was managed successfully through communication with the contractor. In the future, conversations with iwi need to be had early on, and preferably face-to-face with the Project Manager as opposed to via written communication. In this project, Horizons were left to contact iwi which occurred via email, and this was not perceived as respectful by some iwi members. |

### Project Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Statistics</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Budget ($)         | $699,000| $712,435| $13,435 (1.9%) | Final Project Costs were composed of:  
  - construction contract (under budget)  
  - staff time  
  - iwi cultural report fees  
  - riparian planting  
  Iwi payment & cost of riparian planting were not originally... |
planned for and put the overall project cost slightly over.
PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

PROJECT NAME: JARVIS (SHAREPOINT) – PHASE 1
PROJECT SPONSOR: SHAYNE HARRIS
REVIEW DATE: JANUARY 2018
PROJECT MANAGER: MEL RUSH

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

What was the justification for the project to proceed?

The organisational Information Management Strategy, adopted by the MDC executive team in 2014, identifies that in order to achieve MDC’s vision of ‘A connected, thriving and vibrant Manawatu – the very best rural lifestyle in New Zealand’, MDC needs to be an agile IT organisation, dedicated to enabling the organisation to meet changing needs, particularly:

- Changing customer expectations in the way Council interacts and delivers services
- Expectations that Council is easy to do business with and does ‘better with less’
- Demands for greater and faster sharing of information and knowledge internally and externally

MDC is wanting a future whereby access to our information by customers is easy and convenient, available at all times and able to support as many activities, enquiries and transactions as possible. Expectation from our customers is increasing and we are expected to have all information relating to both property and customer available online. We also want to reduce the time it takes to seek content, and improve our customer service response times. By having information available at our fingertips, rather than spending time looking in various locations, our ability to be an agile and responsive Council would increase.

In order to meet these objectives, we need the technology to provide a repository to store our active and historic information, and to enable our community and staff to access that information in a technology driven world. We will be enabled to improve our customer service level by doing better with less.

The implementation of an EDRMS will allow us to:

- Enable the customer and staff online through website and mobile development; within the context of an overall channel strategy
- Enhance the intranet to improve relevance, ease of use and increase ‘first time’ resolution of decision making; also in the context of a channel strategy

What were the key project milestones and their key issues?

Project set up

It was identified early on that project set-up was not progressing as expected and provision from Information Leadership (IL) was not delivering acceptable outcomes. Project leadership took action to ensure the right people were in place to manage and undertake the core work of implementation.

Server Design/Build

IL completed the server design and build. It took longer than expected to receive a build document and had to be requested multiple times. The user profile photo sync with exchange never worked properly even after multiple attempts from IL to resolve, so we changed the setup to sync with Active Directory.

Software Purchased

iWorkplace, Harmon.ie and Nintex were all purchased to extend the functionality of SharePoint and have been working well. ShareGate was purchased to assist in migration due to issues with suggested migration methods.

Taxonomy/File Plan/ Metadata Design
The taxonomy development was a key part of changing the way MDC work and the uptake with this was mostly positive. The initial design and metadata requirements were built on by the teams working in each specific area which helped organisational buy in.

**Intranet Design Build**

The Intranet was a quick win for MDC as this went live first. This was a good way to promote SharePoint. There is still work to do in migrating the old Intranet and the design will be improved on over time.

**Workspaces Design Build**

The process for builds was not documented well when it was handed over to MDC from IL. The project team had some training, but essentially learnt as they built the live sites. MDC picked up this aspect of the project extremely quickly and this allowed workspaces to be built over and above the expected output and changes or improvements to be implemented quickly and smoothly.

**Training**

MDC project team members took part in several courses run by IL and were hands on in both the design and building of sites. This allowed MDC to take over the training of internal staff relatively quickly. By having the internal staff take over the training, rather than continue to rely on IL for this, the MDC project team were seen as experts and saved significant budget.

**Project Management**

Due to an internal restructure the role of project manager was confused for a time. The Lead BA ended up taking responsibility for project management. The timeline was adhered to and the project stayed on track.

**What was the output delivered by the project?**

It appears that MDC’s eventual ability to develop Jarvis far exceeded the expectations of IL. IL quoted for approximately 30 sites and MDC has created approximately 90. If the project had to continue relying on IL, the end product wouldn’t have been completed to the same spec.

Integration with other systems was considered out of scope but Jarvis is looking up to MDC’s ERP (Ozone) in a number of places to ensure consistency and that the integrity of the data is kept intact. MDC decided to implement this up front as it will play a key part in the future development of Jarvis.

Some workflows have been implemented to improve or automate processes.

The output of the project is an intranet and document management system that have been well received by the organisation and that provide a platform to build a digital workplace.

**What are the planned benefits of the project? How and when will these be achieved?**

Jarvis will assist MDC to comply with legislation and best practice standards as set out by the Public Records Act and Archives New Zealand while also enabling better sharing of information, reducing document loss and lowering the risk of litigation. Jarvis will keep staff connected and become the platform for MDC to work with in becoming a digital workplace.

Jarvis is the platform for this development. The next phase will see workflows created which will save time, ensure staff accountability and see paper processes moved into Jarvis as a priority. The development phase will happen over the 2018 year.

Future planning will be considered holistically as MDC look to implement a digital strategy moving forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Successful Was the Project?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Explanation Assessment &amp; Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Budget</strong> targets met?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Budget targets were met, and Phase 1 of the project saw a significant underspend. This was largely due to the speed that MDC was able to take over the build process and internal training from IL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were Schedule Target Dates met?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target dates were met consistently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did the project deliver its Scope?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of the project was met and in some cases exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were Quality targets met?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL quoted for approximately 30 sites and MDC has created approximately 90. If the project had to continue relying on IL, the end product wouldn’t have been completed to the same spec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was Customer Satisfaction achieved?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User adoption/buy-in is high, and Jarvis is becoming known as a platform to build upon for automation and process improvement. Jarvis has been implemented without any significant staff upheaval, and staff have mostly adopted the new way of working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did Teamwork meet requirements?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core team brought a commitment, teamwork, fun and lightness to the project, which has brought the MDC organisation along with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were Stakeholder Engagement targets achieved?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to inform and involve stakeholders were regular and successful. The expo was a particular success, and introduced stakeholders to the scope of the first phase, as well as key phases, and timeframes for stakeholder involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were Risk &amp; Issue Management targets achieved?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project team were quick to respond to any issues/risks as they arose which built up the trust of the organisation. The project manager covered issues/risks in weekly project team meetings, and reviewed the project plan/timeline when required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were Communication targets met?</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With no formal communications/change management plan in place, the official communications could have been more consistent at each point of the project. Regardless, there were some excellent change/communications activities undertaken for stakeholders. Project team meetings were held regularly and included the project sponsor when necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Were Iwi consultation targets met?</strong></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What Lessons have been learnt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What went well and should be retained?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of a dedicated SharePoint administrator role, the skill set of the project team and the organisational attitude of MDC meant that project management, technical requirements,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
product development and change management implications were able to be taken over from IL much earlier than expected. Efforts to involve and inform stakeholders were regular and successful. The expo introduced people to the project and its scope. During handover, documentation was readily available to end users and project team members were available to help in person or over the phone. Key stakeholders were also involved during the design process for each activity which ensured that the end product was fit for purpose.

The project sponsor re-evaluated the performance of the external provider early on, and deemed their delivery to be unacceptable. The project was then put on hold and a new person was assigned to IL’s Lead BA role, which lead to more successful project delivery. The outcome of this decision shows the importance of regularly assessing the delivery of external providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What could be improved and how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles that changed after project kick-off were not clearly redefined or communicated in a timely matter. With more visibly defined roles, task responsibility and authority would have been better understood by the project team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project lacked a detailed change management and communication plan. Although there were successful communications activities throughout the project, the lack of a clear plan meant no overall, consistent approach. This added pressure to the core project team and added to project risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be useful to have a set process to follow if significant changes to project structure occur, such as loss of project team members. The Jarvis project saw the loss of the initial project manager early on. A change in project manager should be carefully planned, and a formal process to follow in the event of a change would ensure that project delivery is not adversely affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule (Weeks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1

Summary of Post-Project Review Meeting, Wednesday 17th January

Attendees: Brittney Evans, Bruce McKay, Chris Whiley, Dan Sanders, Frances Smorti, Mel Rush, Michael Hawker, Paul Stein, Shayne Harris

Learnings from the project

Roles & Responsibility

- Would have been useful to have a process to follow when project roles and responsibilities become unclear
- There was a desire for an internal Project Manager to be appointed to the project due to high cost and continuity problems MDC has had with previous external providers. However, no one internal was available to lead the project which lead to IL being appointed
- A reference providing key contacts and points of advice would have been a useful tool for a Project Manager to utilise during the project
- Dan’s role meant that the project’s success was able to rely less on IL
- Potential for a simple document to describe management of the face of intranet as BAU

External Providers

- It was a fault of IL to underestimate how much of a new environment SharePoint was to the Project Team. Decisions were made quickly in the beginning when the knowledge of MDC was at a low point

End Product

- IL quoted for approximately 30 sites and MDC has created approximately 90. If the project had to continue relying on IL, the end product wouldn’t have been completed to the same spec. It seems likely that MDCs eventual ability exceeded ILs expectations

Communications Plan

- Comms pieces were released as the project went along, however there could have been more clarity about what could have gone out
- Project meetings had the potential to guide comms better if they had more clearly outlined project milestones and progress. A comms agenda item in each meeting could have addressed requirements
- An organisational change plan could have been integrated with the comms plan. The comms plan should be reviewed as the project progresses, and change management implications need to be incorporated

Team Dynamics

- The IM & IT relationship was positive, and this could be attributed to the co-location of these teams

What has enabled MDC to develop Jarvis so quickly?

- The project team has not faced the extent of change management hurdles that they expected to encounter. The organisations attitude was positive, aided by Chief Executive endorsement of the product, and the fact that the BA & PM role were the same individual, meaning the project was more flexible
- Stakeholders had proactively available support which helped to overcome change resistance
- A document management system didn’t previously exist before Jarvis, so staff weren’t attached to another system and were keen to change over
The Intranet went live early on, which built stakeholder familiarity
Manager buy-in was invaluable to the project – other organisations have had to wait for managing staff to leave their roles before they could get certain parts of their councils on board
The structure of the project was conducive to the development of Jarvis. Road show for confidence building, intranet for a first taste, decision to have team members with high level of skill, and positivity of people involved in handover for lowering resistance to the project

Feedback to IL
- Ensure their staff are well prepared before moving them into consulting roles
- Ensure that decisions made with clients are followed through, e.g. design wiki decisions
- The communication between the BA and technical teams within IL could have been better, especially at the beginning of the project

Learnings for general MDC projects
- A specific process for loss of project team members, especially Project Manager, would be useful
- Long term, MDC may need to look at the availability of Project Managers. There are currently staff undergoing project training, however they are not necessarily available to lead projects
- Direction from any external body needs to be tailored to MDC organisational direction
- Co-locating a team that has to work together can be extremely valuable

Next Phase
- Have plans upfront, but revisit them as the phase progresses
- Challenge now is to bring in the comms as a lot of people see the Jarvis project as finished – need to keep end goals in sight
- Need to be clear about the scope of phase 2 with stakeholders and manage their expectations
- Prioritisation of tasks in phase 2 is key. Focus on things that are important at an organisational level, but also bring individual stakeholder requirements along too. Steps model may be useful to convey this prioritisation to stakeholders
- Another expo may be useful, and could showcase developments like the gift register and the uniform site
- Potential to prioritise individual’s ideas of what Jarvis can do for them
- Reduce project team size for phase 2 as the project moves towards BAU, but retain some project structure and maintain the sponsor role
- Potential to also have a larger governance type group that meets once or twice a year to address larger organisational issues and goals, as well as BAU
- The development of a digital strategy could help to address organisational goals, and could incorporate knowledge from the Jarvis team
- The exec. team will be presented with Phase 2 project plan, then it will be pushed out through comms to stakeholders
HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

What was the justification for the project to proceed?

The Makino Aquatic Centre Redevelopment is a ‘Legacy’ project for the Makino Aquatic Centre in 2015, equivalent to the 1972 construction of the outdoor pools and the 1992 construction of the indoor complex. The Makino Aquatic Centre Redevelopment project has been a long-awaited project for the Manawatu Community. The project was initiated as part of the 2005 ‘Leisureville’ concept involving Library, Aquatic Centre and Makino Park and a number of submissions to the Long Term Council Community Plan and Annual Plan at the time.

In late 2010 the Makino Aquatic Centre Redevelopment was prioritised as a project for the Manawatu community by Council. In 2011 a community focus group was established for the project and through 2012 robust and considerable community engagement on the scope, priorities and objectives of the project were undertaken.

Through 2013 community engagement and developed design was undertaken. The building’s lower seismic state expanded the scope and the project budget was increased from $3.2 to $4.5 million to allow for strengthening.

As part of the 2015 – 2022 Long Term Plan, Council approved a final project scope and increased the overall project budget from $4.5 million to $5.6 million to enable the project procurement phase to commence.

What were the key project milestones and their key issues?

- Procurement  October 2015
- Construction Phase September 2016
- Temporary Services Operating 1 May 2016.
- Complex opening to the public for the first day on 29 July 2016.

What was the output delivered by the project?

Delivery of upgraded facilities and new learn to swim pool within allocated budget.

What are the planned benefits of the project? How and when will these be achieved?

Upgrades and additional learn to swim facilities increasing usage

How Successful Was the Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Explanation Assessment &amp; Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Budget</strong> targets met?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Met budget objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Schedule Target Dates</strong> met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered to approved schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the project deliver its <strong>Scope</strong>?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved scope was completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Quality</strong> targets met?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality targets outlined in project documents, with process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was <strong>Customer Satisfaction</strong> achieved?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council and public satisfaction has been demonstrated by increase in usage, especially new facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did <strong>Teamwork</strong> meet requirements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>As the main contractor noted: “MDC provided great site shouts, this boosted morale and kept the team going. All members of the Project team were positive towards the project. Everyone had the same common goal and were eager to achieve this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Stakeholder Engagement</strong> targets achieved?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Procurement &amp; Contract Management</strong> targets achieved?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were <strong>Risk &amp; Issue Management</strong> targets achieved?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project sponsor was well informed in a timely way through regular meetings with the project manager and project team including the specialist advisers and was aware of any issues and able to take timely action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Review Report

Project Name: 1515 Makino Aquatic Centre Re-Development
Project Sponsor: Brent Limmer
Review Date: July-August 2017
Project Manager: Doug Tate (MDC)

Were Communication targets met?

- For the procurement and construction phase project team communication was effective.
  
  2 improvements are benefit communication and contractor to contractor communication when staff changes occur.

Were Iwi consultation targets met?


What Lessons have been learnt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What went well and should be retained?</th>
<th>Lessons and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the procurement and construction phase the community was involved in the design option assessments which successfully set up the delivery of the project.</td>
<td>The majority of the project practices that went well occurred during the procurement and construction phases. These included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of the project practices that went well occurred during the procurement and construction phases. These included:</td>
<td>• Clear and defined project organisational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structured scheduled project meetings</td>
<td>• Key Project Status reporting to Sponsor, ET and Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear roles and responsibilities assigned and followed</td>
<td>• Good access to project information, especially issues and their escalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key Project Status reporting to Sponsor, ET and Council</td>
<td>• Structure procurement focusing on time/cost/quality constraint balancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good access to project information, especially issues and their escalation</td>
<td>• Clear quality requirements with a process to approve project results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Structure procurement focusing on time/cost/quality constraint balancing</td>
<td>• Handover process in place that was clear and effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear quality requirements with a process to approve project results</td>
<td>• Effective engagement of Council in monitoring and guiding decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What could be improved and how?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What could be improved and how?</th>
<th>Lessons and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The key area to improve is the application of effective project management disciplines and structures throughout all project phases, not just the procurement and construction phases. Key project documentation to improve through all phases includes communications planning, project phasing plan and quality processes. Key project benefits while identified needed a better communication plan, especially for public understanding and knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Statistics</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget ($)</td>
<td>$6.016M</td>
<td>$5.960M</td>
<td>$0.056M</td>
<td>Unspent contingency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Special Funds
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To provide a summary of Council’s Trust and Special Funds.
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That the Audit and Risk Committee receives the summary of Trust and Special Funds.
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1. **Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes**

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

*Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatū District – the best lifestyle in New Zealand*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatū District protects the natural environment through stewardship of the District’s natural and physical resources.</th>
<th>Manawatū District attracts and retains residents and businesses.</th>
<th>Manawatū District develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatū District is connected via quality infrastructure, services and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatū District’s built environment is safe, resilient and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatū District Council is a customer-focussed and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Background**

2.1 Over time, Council has been given funds for a specific purpose. These funds are held in Trust and can only be spent in accordance with the deed of gift. The unspent funds are classified as Trust Funds in the financial statements.

2.2 In addition, Council, by resolution, has established Special Funds. These funds can only be spent in accordance with the resolution.

2.3 Separate financial records are kept for each of these funds and interest is allocated to the fund at year-end. Movements and balances are disclosed in the Annual Report.

3. **Discussion and Options considered**

3.1 The policies associated with Special Funds, Trusts and Bequests is due for revision. This is scheduled to be completed early next year. The new policies will be presented to Council for approval.

3.2 The table below details the balance of each fund at 30 June 2018, the source of the fund, the purpose of each fund and any restriction on the fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund and Purpose</th>
<th>Restriction</th>
<th>Available for distribution 30/6/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Special Fund</td>
<td>The fund is currently capped at $2 million</td>
<td>$428,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund held for unspecified purposes. When Council considers appropriate, proceeds from specific event (e.g., sale of assets, unbudgeted revenues or surplus funds) may be transferred to this reserve. When balance falls below an appropriate level, it will be gradually replenished by rates at the level determined by Council during the Long Term or Annual Plan process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Current Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Special Fund</td>
<td>The fund is currently capped at $1.2 million.</td>
<td>$923,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Subdivision Reserve</td>
<td>The fund is the unspent balance of Reserve Contributions. Development Contributions replaced Reserve Contributions in 2006.</td>
<td>$531,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusts and Bequests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook Bequest</td>
<td>The capital fund ($10,000) is protected and is unable to be distributed.</td>
<td>$2,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trewin Bequest</td>
<td>The capital fund ($300) is protected and is unable to be distributed.</td>
<td>$512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakerill Trust</td>
<td>The capital fund ($200) is protected and is unable to be distributed.</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dickson Library Trust</td>
<td>The capital fund ($1,000) is protected and is unable to be distributed.</td>
<td>$2,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To fund the insurance excess (greater than $10,000) or to fund the repair or replacement of uninsured assets lost or damaged in an uninsurable event.

To be spent on the purpose defined by the Local Government Act.

To assist the poor/needy residents of Feilding or for charitable purposes in Feilding.

Estate of the late Miss Mabel Inglewood Hook in 1942.

Custodian – Community Funding Committee.

Maintenance of the Trewin monument.

Bequest to Council in 1927.

Funds are periodically transferred to the Feilding cemetery account.

Maintenance of the Wakerill monument.

Bequest to Council in 1940 by the late Charlotte Chelly Wackrill.

Funds are periodically transferred to the Feilding cemetery account.

To purchase suitable books for the children's section of the Library.

Bequest in 1971.

Custodian – Library Services Manager.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Capital Fund details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.A. Broad Memorial Trust</td>
<td>Books on NZ sport and wildlife. A card must be attached to each book.</td>
<td>The capital fund ($1,000) and 50% of the interest (accumulatively $2,512) is protected and is unable to be distributed.</td>
<td>$3,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bequest in 1982 in memory of Peter Andre Broad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodian – Library Services Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Trust</td>
<td>To enhance the Library's local research area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds were from the disestablished Manchester Block Centennial Associations in 1978.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodian – Library Services Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Welfare Trust</td>
<td>These funds were from Birthright's general funds when the organisation wound up. For the same purposes as the Robert Dickson Educational Trust.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodian – Community Funding Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dickson Educational Trust</td>
<td>For advice, guidance and assistance to solo mothers and their children for education matters and advancement in life.</td>
<td>The capital fund ($11,800) is protected and is unable to be distributed.</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The funds were given to Council in 1981.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodian – Community Funding Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Trust</td>
<td>The source of this Trust is unknown and Council has directed the Trust to enhance the library's local research area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodian – Library Services Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding and District Relief Trust</td>
<td>Funds were donated to Council for relief purposes following the 2004 floods. The undistributed balance of the fund was carried forward and has been distributed to provide relief following natural disasters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$58,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Operational Implications

4.1 There are no operational implications arising from this report.
5. **Financial implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report.

6. **Statutory Requirements**

6.1 There are no statutory implications or actions arising with this report.

7. **Delegations**

7.1 The Audit and Risk Committee are able to receive this report.

8. **Consultation**

8.1 There are no consultation requirements associated with this report.

9. **Cultural Considerations**

9.1 There are no cultural considerations arising from this report.

10. **Conclusion**

10.1 It is recommended that the Audit and Risk Committee receive this report.
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Expenditure Carried Forward at 30 June 2018
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To provide a summary of expenditure carried forward from the 2017/18 financial year to the 2018/19 financial year.
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That the Audit and Risk Committee receives the list of expenditure carried forward from the 2017/18 financial year to the 2018/19 financial year.
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1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

*Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatū District – the best lifestyle in New Zealand*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatū District protects the natural environment through stewardship of the District’s natural and physical resources.</th>
<th>Manawatū District attracts and retains residents and businesses.</th>
<th>Manawatū District develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatū District is connected via quality infrastructure, services and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatū District’s built environment is safe, resilient and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatū District Council is a customer-focused and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Background

2.1 At the last meeting, the Audit and Risk Committee requested information regarding the expenditure budgets carried forward at 30 June 2018.

2.2 A number of projects were included in the 2017/18 budget but were not completed during the year. At the time of adopting the 2018-28 Long Term Plan Council approved the carry forward of a number of these projects into the 2018/19 financial year.

2.3 At the time of preparing and approving the Long Term Plan the forecast of year-end expenditure was used to determine the level of expenditure carried forward. Once the financial statements were complete, adjustments were made to the carry forwards were made to reflect the difference between the forecast used and the actual expenditure at year-end.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 The following is a list of expenditure that was carried forward at 30 June 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Carried forward as a part of the LTP process</th>
<th>Subsequently carried forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading growth projects – Port Street and Turners Road</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD Redevelopment projects</td>
<td>80,195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised minor improvements – Pohangina Road resilience project</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>15,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised cycle facilities</td>
<td>38,364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency roading work – July 2017 event</td>
<td></td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater growth projects – Port Street and Turners Road</td>
<td>1,167,000</td>
<td>(3,559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater new works in Feilding – Kimbolton Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater renewals – includes Derby Street</td>
<td>343,000</td>
<td>154,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Carried forward as a part of the LTP process</td>
<td>Subsequently carried forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding wastewater growth projects – Port Street</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>318,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desludging oxidation pond</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>(6,103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater – village renewals carried forward for the centralisation project</td>
<td>1,083,500</td>
<td>141,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater pump station telemetry</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater pump station renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding water growth project – Port Street</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>77,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding water treatment plant renewals</td>
<td>1,472,435</td>
<td>(32,655)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding water pressure zones and metering/backflow</td>
<td></td>
<td>137,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himatangi water supply new works</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>54,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanson water treatment plant new works</td>
<td>329,000</td>
<td>82,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanson water renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanway/Halcombe water treatment and intake capacity improvements</td>
<td>463,000</td>
<td>59,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, reserves and sportsground – growth related projects – Makino Precinct and Timona Park</td>
<td>378,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding cemetery extension</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>(1,091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening earthquake prone buildings</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feilding Little Theatre roof renewal</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makino Park playground and skate park</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanson public toilets</td>
<td>210,391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Street/Kawakawa Road development</td>
<td>417,000</td>
<td>(11,134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community planning capital projects</td>
<td>10,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and reserves walkway linkages</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>(254,424)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston and Timona Park redevelopment</td>
<td>11,743</td>
<td>(8,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway land / Greenspine</td>
<td>418,782</td>
<td>(11,676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanson playground</td>
<td>155,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunnythorpe Hall grant</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halls maintenance</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos management</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves Management Plan</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Facilities Provision</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Carried forward as a part of the LTP process</td>
<td>Subsequently carried forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link walkways and cycleways</td>
<td>25,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Plan 2018-28 – to cover existing commitments (operational project)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>(23,051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations – Strategy activity</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery – Strategy activity</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Plan project</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>(1,504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planning – implementation</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Committee funds</td>
<td>64,469</td>
<td>8,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFB Project</td>
<td>207,782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development – event fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Management System</td>
<td>104,700</td>
<td>18,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General new assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake prone building project</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>(1,608)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File room – record digitisation</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total carried forward</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,385,528</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,227,442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capital projects carried forward</th>
<th>Operational projects carried forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,265,704</td>
<td>1,119,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total carried forward</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,385,528</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,227,442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 **Operational Implications**

4.1 The carry forward expenditure has been taken into account when planning the 2018/19 projects and resources.

5 **Financial implications**

5.1 The carry forward expenditure and associated revenues has been incorporated into the 2018/19 budgets.
6 Statutory Requirements
6.1 There are no statutory implications or actions arising with this report.

7 Delegations
7.1 The Audit and Risk Committee are able to receive this report.

8 Consultation
8.1 There are no consultation requirements associated with this report.

9 Cultural Considerations
9.1 There are no cultural considerations arising from this report.

10 Conclusion
10.1 It is recommended that the Audit and Risk Committee receive this report.
First Quarter Report to 30 September 2018

Purpose

To provide a summary to 30 September 2018 of the Council’s performance against Year One of the 2018/28 Long Term Plan.

Significance of Decision

The Council’s Significance and Engagement policy is not triggered by matters discussed in this report.

Recommendations

That the Audit and Risk Committee recommend:

That the Council receives the First Quarter Report and the Capital Expenditure Report for the period ended 30 September 2018.

Report prepared by:
Colleen Morris
Chief Financial Officer

Approved for submission by:
Shayne Harris
General Manager - Corporate and Regulatory
1 Contribution to the Council Vision and Council Outcomes

1.1 Relationship to the Council Outcomes that underpin the Council’s Vision:

Connected, vibrant and thriving Manawatū District – the best lifestyle in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manawatū District protects the natural environment through stewardship of the District’s natural and physical resources.</th>
<th>Manawatū District attracts and retains residents and businesses.</th>
<th>Manawatū District develops a broad economic base from its solid foundation in the primary sector.</th>
<th>Manawatū District is connected via quality infrastructure, services and technology.</th>
<th>Manawatū District’s built environment is safe, resilient and attractive.</th>
<th>Manawatū District Council is a customer-focussed and efficient organisation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2 Background

2.1 Quarterly governance reports provide interim updates towards end of year results to be published in the Annual Report 2018/19. The Annual Report accounts for how Council performed against Year One of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. The quarterly reports summarise Council’s financial performance, progress on capital projects, levels of service performance and reasons for significant differences from what was planned.

3 Discussion and Options considered

3.1 This report is for information purposes. Any matters that require resolution would be reported separately to Council.

4 Operational Implications

4.1 There are no capital or operating expenditure implications, or maintenance costs associated with this paper.

5 Financial implications

5.1 Any financial implications would be reported separately to Council.

6 Statutory Requirements

6.1 Quarterly governance reports provide an overview of results towards the Annual Report, which will be prepared and audited in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002.

7 Delegations

7.1 The Audit and Risk Committee’s Terms of Reference includes the responsibility for financial reporting, including the following:

- long term planning including the financial strategy;
- appropriateness of accounting policies;
• annual report; and
• internal report (monthly and/or quarterly).

8 Consultation

8.1 There are no consultation requirements associated with this matter.

9 Cultural Considerations

9.1 There are no cultural considerations associated with this report.

10 Conclusion

10.1 The quarterly reports are a mechanism of transparently reporting against progress towards achieving targets set in the Long Term Plan.

11 Attachments

• Quarter One Report
• Capital Expenditure Report for the period ended 30 September 2018
Key Indicators
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Capital Expenditure
Total Operating Revenue (excluding rates)
Total Operating Expenses
Loans Raised (excluding refinancing loans)
Total External Debt

Key Performance Indicators

Key
- Annual Plan
- YTD Budget
- Actual - On Track
- Actual - Needs Monitoring
- Actual - Not achieving
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Overall Council Summaries
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Key
- Annual Plan
- Year End Forecast
- YTD Budget
- YTD Actual - favourable OR unfavourable < 5% budget
- YTD Actual - unfavourable 5-15% budget
- YTD Actual - unfavourable > 15% budget

Operating Revenue - by activity

Operating Expenditure - by activity

Operating Revenue - by type

Operating Expenditure - by type
Overall Council Summaries
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Comments:
In July we borrowed $1 million from the BNZ to meet our cash flow needs. This was repaid in August once rates were received. Cash flow forecasts indicate we will need to borrow $5 million from the LGFA in December 2018.

External Borrowings

Investments - by type
Community Facilities
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Revenue is from rates and user fees and charges.

Makino Swim School is $9k below budget, however new swim classes will commence in October, increasing revenue for the rest of the year.

Parks and Sports Grounds - anticipated work delayed due to weather, will be caught up over the next few months.

The capital expenditure report contains the progress of individual projects.

Makino Aquatic Centre (MAC) - The customer survey has not yet been completed.

13,662 customers have participated in water activities The target for the full year is 50,000.

The Pool Safe accreditation remains valid until 1 April 2019.

Halls and Recreation Complexes - Hall usage will be measured later in the year once the Hall Committee Annual Returns have been received.

Property - The customer survey has not yet been completed.

(Continued Page 15)
Income is primarily from rates.

Economic Development - The Ultra Fast Broadband project ($212k) in the industrial area is on hold, pending other decisions on the Turners Road development.

Community Projects - $25k difference to budget as Creative Communities Grants to be paid in October, not September. $30k of budgeted Community Grants to be paid later in the year.

Manfeild Park Grandstand demolition progress completed ahead of schedule.

There is no capital expenditure for this activity.

Economic Development - The CEDA Statement of Intent was approved by Joint Strategic Committee on 26th September. There are five strategic outcomes, 15 service level statements and 25 performance measures. Performance is reported in their six month report due in the third quarter and the Annual Report due in the first quarter of 2019/20.

Community Development - Council has received reports from three representative grant fund recipients this year. Community Committee and Manawatu Youth Ambassadors minutes are received by Council each month. Partnership fund accountability reports will be received in the second quarter.

(Continued Page 15)
Income is primarily received through rates.

Expenditure is on track.

There is no capital expenditure planned for this activity.

Civil Defence - Community satisfaction with service yet to be measured for financial year 2018/19. Resident satisfaction was 77% in the 2017/18 financial year (from 457 respondents).
Regulatory
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Dog registration revenue $36k ahead of budget. Estimated 5% of animals left to be registered this year.

District Planning fees are $17k ahead of budget as a result of an increased number of applications.

Alcohol Licencing Fees $9k and Environmental Health $11k lower than budget. Renewal dates are spread unevenly during the year. The annual budget is expected to be met.

Building Control - $70k additional expense for building consultants due to the increased number of applications. Recovery is expected at a later date. This cost is offset by increased building control revenue. Earthquake prone project $39k lower than budget, pending the appointment of an engineer resource.

Environmental Health and Monitoring costs lower than budget $32k as internal and overheads charged to better reflect time charged to this activity.

The District Plan project consultant costs are $92k behind budget. They are expected to be utilised later in the year.

The capital expenditure report contains the progress of individual projects.

Capital expenditure planned for this activity will be completed by December 2018.

Animal Control - There were 60 priority one, 60 priority two and 184 priority three requests were received. The target of responding to 90% of requests within the specified timeframes is achieved in all measures.

Building Control - There are 422 buildings with compliance schedules in the district. 5% (or 22) are required to be audited during the year. Eight premises were audited this quarter.

A total of 170 building consents; 176 code of compliance certificates; and 52 fast track building consents have been issued. Council also received 13 complaints. The targeted response times have been achieved in all measures.

(Continued page 15)
Governance and Strategy
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Income is received through rates.

Expenditure on conference expenses and other remuneration were lower than budget by $19k. This is expected to be utilised later in the financial year.

There is no capital expenditure planned for this activity.

The satisfaction survey relating to the community involvement in decision making has not yet been carried out.

There have been no breaches of the rating or debt levels set in the financial strategy. The limit for rate increases in the Financial Strategy for the 2018/19 year is 5.0% (excluding increases as a result of growth and new levels of service) with a planned increase of 4.8% in the Long Term Plan. Actual rates revenue is in line with the budget.

The borrowing limit in the Financial Strategy for the 2018/19 year is $86 million with $77 million planned in the Long Term Plan. $1 million short term borrowing was required in the first quarter.
Revenue is received through rates and NZTA subsidies.

The increased subsidy is a result of the increased expenditure for emergency works related to June 2018 weather event, plus the Pohangina bridge and the Kimbolton CBD construction.

An application for a claim will be made to NZTA for the September 2018 weather event.

Other operating expenses are expected to be on track for the remainder of the year.

The capital expenditure report contains the progress of individual projects.

The three measures categorised as “need monitoring” relate to the reseal programme that has not yet begun, the road crash statistics that are not yet available and the customer satisfaction survey relating to navigation and signage that has not yet been carried out.

33 urgent and 250 non-urgent requests have been received and resolved within the targets set.

(Continued page 15)
Solid Waste
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Revenue is primarily from rates, gate takings at the transfer station and blue bag sales.

Transfer station gate takings are $15k ahead of budget, primarily due to accepting more commercial waste at the transfer station.

Refuse bag sales are $39k behind budget. Bag sales expected to catch up to total budget in coming months.

Disposal costs are overall $11k greater than budget. These costs are offset by additional transfer station gate takings.

Closed Landfill costs are $54k greater than budgeted as more work than anticipated was completed in the first quarter.

Waste Minimisation Education expenditure is on hold, pending a review of the programme.

The capital expenditure report contains the progress of individual projects.

The capital costs associated with the kerbside recycling are for bin purchases.

The capital costs associated with Solid Waste Collection and Disposal are for the Resource Recovery Centre. Initial planning costs are ahead of schedule.

Two waste education programs are currently running.

Zero Waste Education: North Street School (24 pupils)

Enviro schools: Apiti, Gail’s Childcare, Kimbolton, Manchester Street, Mt Biggs, Newbury, Puddleducks, Sanson, Secret Garden, Tangimoana (626 pupils).
Stormwater
For the period ended 30 September 2018

All revenue is sourced from rates.

The slight overspend is mainly due to additional staff time charged to the activity.

The capital expenditure report contains the progress of individual projects.

A number of projects have been carried forward from last financial year.

A total of 16 complaints have been received to date. Based on the 6,896 connections this equates to 2.3 complaints per 1,000 connections to date (the target is less than six complaints per 1,000 property connection for the year). If this trend continues the maximum number of complaints will be exceeded.

No flooding of habitable dwellings have been reported.

Key Performance Indicators
Wastewater
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Revenue is from rates, trade waste charges and volumetric charges.

Trade waste revenue from Ovation is less than budgeted as fees have been reassessed. This trend is expected to continue for the rest of the year. Additional revenue streams from other trade waste customers are being investigated.

Operational spend is expected to meet year end target.

The capital expenditure report contains the progress of individual projects.

Feilding Waste Water Treatment Plant projects are ahead of schedule and will be managed within the overall Waste Water Treatment Plant budget.

Two overflows have been recorded during the quarter - one dry weather and one wet weather overflow in Feilding. The median attendance and resolution times are with the targeted timeframes.
Revenue is from rates and metered water.

Operational spend is on target.

The capital expenditure report contains the progress of individual projects.

A number of projects have been carried forward from last financial year and physical works are programmed for the summer construction season.

All water samples taken showed that the water was safe to drink i.e. no E coli. The current sampling regime complies with the drinking water standards.

The Sanson and Stanway/Halcombe schemes are not protozoa compliant. The new water supply for Sanson is scheduled to be commissioned before the end of 2018/19. Treatment for the Halcombe village is being investigated.

Himatangi Beach and Waituna West supplies currently have a leakage rate (water loss) of slightly higher than 35%.

One urgent and 77 non-urgent faults have been recorded. The median attendance and resolution times are with the targeted time.
Health and Safety
For the period ended 30 September 2018

Notifiable events this quarter
Notifiable: 0  Not Notifiable: 34

Significant incidents this quarter
* Abusive and threatening behaviour towards compliance officers issuing a trespass notice regarding an incident at the dog pound
* Fire Hydrant blew hitting the staff member in stomach and high pressure water hitting his face, minor bruising injury
* Two library staff lost time (7 days) due to manual handling injuries

Communication and education
* Reporting near misses or unsafe work practices
* Sun strike
* Eye care offer to staff
* Poster theme: mental health

Wellness initiatives
* 9 workstation assessments
* 4 pre-employment drug and alcohol tests
* Eye Care Policy launched

Training and inductions
* 4 new staff inductions
* Quad bike training
* Advanced driver training
* Breathing apparatus training
* Certified handler training
* Dangerous goods training

Injury type - quarter 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injury Type</th>
<th>Number of events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrasion / graze</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding nose</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruise/contusion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn (chemical)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn/scald</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushing injury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatitis/skin rash</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislocation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fainting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head injury concussion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laceration, cut</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprain, strain</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puncture wound</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Previously 'near drownings' were reported as near misses. They have now been re categorised as dry or wet rescues and recorded as incidents.
Comments Continued

Community Facilities

Public Conveniences - Two complaints have been received. One related to a soap dispenser not working, and the other related to a faulty hot tap. Both issues were immediately rectified. The target is less than 10 complaints for the year.

Cemeteries - No complaints have been received about late or inadequate interment services. The first quarter customer survey indicated 94% satisfaction from 69 respondents.

Library - There has been a total of 12,525 digital users (target 55,000). Due to technical limitations Wi-Fi statistics are an average of last year’s results, however actual user statistics are expected to become available in October.

The issues per capital (currently two against a target of eight for the year) and the number of events/participants currently 377 and 5,341 against a target of 920/13,800) are on track to exceed the year end target.

Community Facilities

Parks, Reserves and Sports Grounds - There have been no closures, or health and safety incidents, as a result of poor or inadequate maintenance. The target for both measures is 0.

The satisfaction survey indicated that 98% of the 102 respondents were satisfied with parks and sports grounds (target 90%).

Regulatory

Compliance and Monitoring - All licenced premises, health registered premises, and licenced premises are on track to have the required amount of inspections by year end.

27 reports of issues endangering public health, 83 urban noise complaints and 56 other issues not endangering public health were reported. The targeted response times have been met.

Consent and District Planning - 71% of the 21 controlled activities resource consents received have been completed within 10 working days (target 90%). The six that exceed the timeframe were land use consents which were determined with the attached subdivisions.

141 of the 157 non-notified resource consents were completed within the 20 working day timeframe (Target 90%).

District Development

Community Development (continued) - The first quarter survey indicated 59% satisfaction (from 60 respondents). Last year’s results showed 55% satisfaction. Satisfaction has increased by more than the 2% target.
### Community Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Actual YTD</th>
<th>Budget YTD</th>
<th>Variance YTD</th>
<th>Variance YTD</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>Annual Plan</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Year End</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Renewals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Collection Purchases</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library New Works</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Renewals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makino Park Playground and Skate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Pool Renewals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Pool Renewals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park's and Reserves Community Planning Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Reserves Community Planning Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>-99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohangina Valley Renewals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makino Park Sealing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston Park Sealed Roads</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timona Park New Works</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener Park Capital Works</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Land Beautification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>(967)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5,287</td>
<td>5,277</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Community Facilities</strong></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>(967)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5,287</td>
<td>5,277</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Animal Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Actual YTD</th>
<th>Budget YTD</th>
<th>Variance YTD</th>
<th>Variance YTD</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>Annual Plan</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Year End</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control - New Works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control - Renewal Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Animal Control</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emergency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Actual YTD</th>
<th>Budget YTD</th>
<th>Variance YTD</th>
<th>Variance YTD</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>Annual Plan</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Year End</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDEM radio repeater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate EDOC Fire-Connection and Cabling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Tower Upgrade and WiFi Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Emergency</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Capital Expenditure**

For the period ended 30 September 2018

- Work for plantroom improvement is in the preparation stage. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
- Work on plantroom improvement is in progress. Expected to be completed in time for the summer season.
Approved NZTA budget is $82,705. This will be used in 2018/19 year for design and installation for stage 3 (high use roads) in Feilding.

Bin movements out to community.

Design work underway. Projects have construction scheduled for the 2018/19 summer period.

To carried out in conjunction with subsidised renewal projects.

Extension of Poole Street footpath has been completed. New footpaths in Port Street are planned for later in 2018/19.

Mangaweka bridge design work to be undertaken by June 2019. Other work includes the Otara Bridge (boundary bridge) strengthening to improve safety. New footpaths in Port Street are included in the approved 2019/20 NZTA subsidised work programme.

Subsidised Sealed Road Resurfacing

Subsidised Bridge Renewals

Subsidised Drainage Renewals

Subsidised Traffic Renewals

Subsidised Pavement Rehabilitation

Subsidised Accelerated LED Renewals

Roading District Footpath Renewal

Subsidised Road New Footpaths

Non Subsidised Roading Renewal

Total Roading

Solid Waste

Purchase of New Recycling Bins

Recycling Inventory

Resource Recovery Centre

Kaitunai Rural Transfer Station Improvements

Establish Mobile Recycling Centres

Total Solid Waste

Stormwater

Stormwater Growth Feilding

Stormwater New Work Feilding

Stormwater Unplanned Renewals

Stormwater District Widening Works

Total Stormwater
Wastewater

- Desalting Clarifier Ponds: Costs are for tendering process and design works at Sanson.
- Folding WWTP Asset Renewal: Pumping works managed as part of overall Feilding Wastewater Treatment Plant projects.
- Himatangi Wastewater Asset Replacement: Design and investigation underway.
- Himatangi Wastewater Asset Renewals: Work for Himatangi Beach connections is carried out as demanded. Expenditure is offset by contributions from property owners.
- Himatangi Wastewater Growth: Work is carried out as required.
- Himatangi Retention Work: Project will take place later in the 2018/19 year.
- Rongotai WWTP Renewals: Options are being considered for the removal of protozoa. This is a requirement from the Director General of Health, as a result of the Havelock North water issue.
- Water Supply New Connections: Project is confirmed as part of the centralisation upgrade works.
- Water Supply Renewals: Renewals are made as required.
- Water Supply Source Renewals: Work for Himatangi Beach connections is carried out as demanded. Expenditure is offset by contributions from property owners.

Water

- Fielding WWTP Renewals: Work for Himatangi Beach connections is carried out as demanded. Expenditure is offset by contributions from property owners.
- Himatangi Wastewater Asset Renewals: Work for Himatangi Beach connections is carried out as demanded. Expenditure is offset by contributions from property owners.
- Himatangi Wastewater Asset Replacement: Design and investigation underway.
- Himatangi Water Asset Renewals: Work is carried out as required.
- Himatangi Water Supply New Work: Work is carried out as required.
- Saxon Water Asset Renewals: Renewals are made as required.
- Saxon Water Treatment Plant New Works: Project is confirmed as part of the centralisation upgrade works.
- Water Supply New Connections: Work for Himatangi Beach connections is carried out as demanded. Expenditure is offset by contributions from property owners.
- Water Supply Renewals: Renewals are made as required.
- Water Supply Treatment New Works: Project is confirmed as part of the centralisation upgrade works.

Support Services and Other

- Motor Vehicle Renewals: Project is confirmed as part of the centralisation upgrade works.
- Software - Document Management: Project is confirmed as part of the centralisation upgrade works.
- Other HR Renewal Projects: Project is confirmed as part of the centralisation upgrade works.
- Software Replacement: Renewals are made as required.
- MOZ Administration Building New Works: Work is carried out as required.
- MOZ Administration Building Renewals: Work is carried out as required.
- Call Centre Autex Paneling: Project is confirmed as part of the centralisation upgrade works.
- General Renewals: Work is carried out as required.

Total Capital Expenditure

- Greater than 10% of budget
- Less than 5% greater than budget
- Less than 5% lower than budget
- 0% - 5% of budget