



GLADSTONE
REGIONAL COUNCIL

**SPECIAL MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA**

**TO BE HELD AT THE GLADSTONE ENTERTAINMENT
CONVENTION CENTRE, 56 GOONDOON STREET, GLADSTONE**

On 2 November 2020

Commencing at 9.00am

Notice Section 277E *Local Government Regulation 2012*: This meeting will be closed to the public, due to health and safety reasons associated with the public health emergency involving COVID-19. Live streaming will be available on Council's website.

**Leisa Dowling
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

Table of Contents

ITEM	PAGE
S/0. APOLOGIES	
S/0. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	
S/1. OFFICERS' REPORTS	3
S/1.1. AMENDED COUNCIL MEETING PROCEDURES POLICY	3
S/1.2. AUDIT RISK AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE POLICY REVIEW	5
S/1.3. CONTRACT STAFF REMUNERATION POLICY.....	7
S/1.4. NAMING OF INFRASTRUCTURE ASSETS POLICY.....	9
S/1.5. CHANGES TO DELEGATIONS AND ANNUAL REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS - COUNCIL TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	11
S/1.6. SERVICE AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR THE PHILIP STREET COMMUNITIES AND FAMILIES PRECINCT	15
S/1.7. COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM - REGIONAL ENHANCEMENT FUND - ENVIRONMENTAL CARE.....	27
S/1.8. COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM - REGIONAL ENHANCEMENT FUND - JUMPSTART CITY HEART.....	35
S/1.9. INSURANCE SERVICES	40
S/1.10. OPERATIONAL PLAN - QUARTER 1 REPORT	43

S/1. OFFICERS' REPORTS

S/1.1. AMENDED COUNCIL MEETING PROCEDURES POLICY

Responsible Officer: General Manager Finance Governance and Risk

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: CM28.2

Purpose:

To provide Council with a revised Council Meeting Procedures Policy incorporated the recent amendments to the *Local Government Act 2009* and the *Local Government Regulation 2020*.

Officer's Recommendation:

That Council:

1. Repeal P-2018-27 – Councillor Meeting Procedures Policy; and
2. Adopt P-2020-19 – Councillor Meeting Procedures Policy.

Background:

On 12 October 2020 amendments to the *Local Government Act 2009* (“the Act”) and the *Local Government Regulation 2012* (“the Regulation”) came into force.

The amendments impact the way Local Governments prepare for and hold Council meetings, in particular:

- the declaration and management of conflicts of interest;
- the preparation and publication of meeting agendas and minutes; and
- meeting procedures.

To compliment the legislative amendments the Department of Local Government Racing and Multicultural Affairs (DLGRMA) also released amended Model Meeting Procedures and Standing Orders.

The Act (s150G) requires Council to either:

- (a) adopt the Model Procedures; or
- (b) prepare and adopt other procedures for the conduct of its meetings and meetings of its committees.

Where Council does not adopt the Model Procedures and adopts other procedures in accordance with s150G(b) of the Act, the procedures must not be inconsistent with the model procedures.

The proposed P-2020-19 incorporates the legislative amendments and aligns with the DLGRMA’s Model Meeting Procedures and Best Practice Standing Orders for Local Government and Standing Committee Meetings.

A copy of the following is attached for Council’s reference:

1. Current P-2018-27 Council Meeting Procedures Policy;
2. Marked up proposed P-2020-19 Council Meeting Procedures Policy; and

3. Clear copy proposed P-2020-19 Council Meeting Procedures Policy.

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

In order for Council to remain compliant with the provisions of the Act, Council must either:

1. adopt DLGRMA's Model Meeting Procedures; or
2. adopt other procedures that are not inconsistent with the Model Meeting Procedures.

The proposed P2020-19 Council Meeting Procedures Policy is consistent with the Model Meeting Procedures and has the added benefit of incorporating standing orders, based on DLGRMA's Best Practice Standing Orders for Local Government and Standing Committee Meetings, providing one policy resource for Council Meetings.

If Council were not of a mind to adopt the proposed Council Meeting Procedures, Council may prefer to repeal P-2018-27 and adopt DLGRMA's Model Meeting Procedures in their entirety. If this were the case, Council would also need to adopt a separate set of standing orders.

Communication and Consultation:

Consultation has occurred internally with the Chief Executive Officer and General Managers. A review of the external documents developed by the State Government has occurred with relevant information incorporated into the proposed policy.

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

Council is required to adopt meeting procedures in accordance with s150G(b) of the Act.

Financial and Resource Implications:

The adoption of the proposed P2020-19 Council Meetings Procedures Policy will not have any additional budgetary or resource impact.

Summary:

Nil.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

6 November 2020.

Attachments:

1. Current P-2018-27 Council Meeting Procedures Policy;
2. Marked up proposed P-2020-19 Council Meeting Procedures Policy; and
3. Clear copy proposed P-2020-19 Council Meeting Procedures Policy.

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Manager Governance

S/1.2. AUDIT RISK AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE POLICY REVIEW

Responsible Officer: General Manager Finance Governance and Risk

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: CM28.2, CM26.2

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to present a draft revision of the Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Policy for consideration and approval.

Officer's Recommendation:

That Council:

1. Repeal P-2018-28 – Business Improvement Committee Policy; and
2. Adopt P-2020-15 – Audit Risk and Improvement Committee Policy as Addendum 1.

Background:

The Committee has the responsibility to consider and comment on the content of Council's policy on the operation of the Committee. While Council's review cycle for policies is three yearly, the decision by Council to change the name of the committee to the Audit Risk and Improvement Committee has caused a review earlier than the usual review cycle.

Discussions have occurred with the committee and suggested feedback received has been reviewed and taken into consideration in the proposed revision to the policy. A summary of the proposed changes are:

- Revision to administrative arrangements to incorporate current processes including incorporating Conflict of Interest provisions
- Revision and realignment of responsibilities sections to be captured under headings for main functional areas
- Self-assessment to occur annually instead of every two years
- Inclusion of Mayor as non-voting ex-officio member for clarity
- Adjustment to name of committee in relevant sections.

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Given the change in name of the committee, it is prudent that a revised policy be adopted by Council to accurately reflect the committee's information. While the revision has resulted in several changes to the drafting of the policy, there is minimal impact on the operations of the committee. The main change is for the committee to undertake self-assessment every year instead of every two years.

If Council is comfortable with the proposed revision to the policy, the officer's recommendation can be adopted.

Alternatively, if Council wishes to make additional amendments, the suggested resolution is:

That Council:

1. *Repeal P-2018-28 – Business Improvement Committee Policy; and*
2. *Adopt P-2020-15 – Audit Risk and Improvement Committee Policy subject to the following amendments:*
 - a. *<insert details>.*

Communication and Consultation:

Proposed revisions to the policy have been consulted on with senior leaders internally who routinely attend and contribute content provided to the Committee. The Audit Risk and Improvement Committee has also reviewed the changes at the last committee meeting with feedback included in the revised draft.

In addition, a review of several other Local Governments audit committee policies has occurred to inform and influence the proposed revision presented.

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

Council is required by the *Local Government Act 2009* to establish an audit committee with this policy articulating how the audit committee for Gladstone Regional Council is to function and operate. The proposed changes reflect current operations except for the inclusion of an annual self-assessment by the committee.

Financial and Resource Implications:

The inclusion of an annual self-assessment by the Committee will result in a small amount of additional operational resources to facilitate this review each year. It is anticipated that this can occur with existing operational resources.

Summary:

Councils change in the audit committee's name has resulted in an earlier review of the policy for the committee's operation. Changes reflect current practice however if adopted, will result in an annual self-assessment of the committee to occur instead of every two years.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

Within one month of resolution.

Attachments:

1. Proposed P-2020-15 – Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Policy
2. Current P-2018-28 – Business Improvement Committee Policy
3. Proposed P-2020-15 – Audit, Risk and Improvement Committee Policy – tracked changes.

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Specialist Adviser – Governance & Risk

S/1.3. CONTRACT STAFF REMUNERATION POLICY

Responsible Officer: General Manager Finance Governance and Risk

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: CM28.2

Purpose:

To propose that Council adopts a policy position for contract staff remuneration principles and contract duration terms.

Officer's Recommendation:

That Council adopt P-2020-14 Contract Staff Remuneration Policy.

Background:

Historically, there has not been an adopted policy position on the remuneration or duration of terms for contract positions (including the CEO position) which does not provide clarity or consistency of application when recruiting to fill contract positions. As Gladstone Regional Council competes in a dynamic regional labour market with not only other local government but also local industries (with most individual contract positions able to work across industries with very few bound to the local government sector), it is prudent for Council to adopt a policy on contract staff remuneration to provide direction and clarity to Mayor and Councillors when recruiting for the CEO's position, and the CEO / General Managers when recruiting for other contract positions.

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Currently there is a risk that individual contract staff positions are not being remunerated against a consistent benchmark which can lead to poor staff morale or an inability to successfully recruit for positions. The proposed policy aims to clarify Council's position in the market based on a nationwide remuneration survey which provides transparent consistent data.

The policy also clarifies the delegation for approving remuneration levels of positions and any annual review decisions. The Mayor is proposed to have delegation to approve the CEO remuneration with all other contract positions remuneration determined by the CEO.

Council may choose to adopt a different benchmark proposed in the policy.

Communication and Consultation:

The policy has been developed by the General Manager People, Culture and Safety with input from the Chief Executive Officer. General Managers have been provided the opportunity to contribute feedback on the policy with the governance team ensuring relevant policy development processes have been applied.

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

The adoption of the policy is expected to provide clarity on Council's position for offering remuneration and contract duration terms for individual contract staff positions. The policy aligns to the principles of the *Local Government Act 2009* which provide for the local government to appoint the CEO (and individual contract terms) whilst the CEO has accountability for employment of all other positions in Council.

Financial and Resource Implications:

There are minimal financial implications associated with the proposed policy. A recent survey undertaken of contract positions identified most positions within the proposed benchmark.

Summary:

A new Contract Staff Remuneration Policy is proposed to be adopted to provide clarity and consistency to the remuneration and contract duration term offered when recruiting for individual contract staff positions.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

Within two weeks of resolution.

Attachments:

1. Proposed P-2020-14 - Contract Staff Remuneration Policy

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Specialist Adviser – Governance & Risk

S/1.4. NAMING OF INFRASTRUCTURE ASSETS POLICY

Responsible Officer: General Manager Finance Governance and Risk

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: CM28.2

Purpose:

To consider the changes proposed to the Naming of Infrastructure Assets Policy.

Officer's Recommendation:

That Council:

1. Repeal P-2018-09 Naming of Infrastructure Assets Policy; and
2. Adopt P-2020-17 Naming of Infrastructure Assets Policy provided as Attachment 1.

Background:

At the General Meeting of 05 November 2019, Council resolved that a review of the Naming of Infrastructure Assets Policy be undertaken. At that meeting, Councillors expressed an appetite to:

- allow applications where the name is of persons still active in their service, position or community; and
- for the naming of roads – allow two words.

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Under the current policy, for the naming of roads, names must consist of one word, be easily read, spelt and pronounced. Officers practically apply this by restricting the name to less than 10 characters where the infrastructure asset is a road (including spaces and excluding road type suffix).

With the proposed change in policy to allow two-word names, it is likely that 10 characters will regularly be exceeded. Accordingly, officers propose in the draft policy that, for the naming of roads, names generally consist of less than 15 characters (including spaces and excluding road type suffix).

When considering an exception, regard should be had to the:

- the maximum length of a sign;
- the types of letters which make up the name; and
- whether a second line or plate would be required to accommodate the length of the name.

For the naming of all other infrastructure asset types, no change in policy is proposed to the less than 35 characters (including spaces and excluding infrastructure asset type).

Communication and Consultation:

Asset Governance subject matter experts have contributed to the review. A review has also been undertaken of the Naming of Infrastructure Assets Corporate Standard to ensure alignment with the proposed policy.

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

Under section 60 of the *Local Government Act 2009*, Council has control of all roads in its local government area except for State-controlled roads and public thoroughfare easements. This control includes being able to approve the naming and numbering of private and other roads.

Financial and Resource Implications:

It is anticipated that little or no additional resource or financial implications will be incurred under the draft policy given applications regarding the naming of infrastructure assets are currently received and assessed by Council.

Summary:

Nil.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

Within two weeks of resolution.

Attachments:

1. Draft P-2020-17 Naming of Infrastructure Assets Policy;
2. Draft P-2020-17 Naming of Infrastructure Assets Policy (Tracked Changes version);
and
3. Current P-2018-09 Naming of Infrastructure Assets Policy.

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Governance Officer

S/1.5. CHANGES TO DELEGATIONS AND ANNUAL REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS - COUNCIL TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Responsible Officer: General Manager Finance Governance and Risk

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: CM9.2

Purpose:

Seeking Council's annual review of all statutory delegations to the Chief Executive Officer incorporating delegations from legislative changes that have occurred in the first half of 2020.

Officer's Recommendation:

That the powers contained in Attachment 1 'Delegations Register – Exercise of Statutory Powers – Council to CEO' are hereby delegated by Council to the Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 257 of the *Local Government Act 2009*.

Background:

There are many pieces of legislation that Council has an obligation to administer or enforce either in whole or in part.

In many instances the power to make decisions under legislation is given to 'Local Government' or 'Council' or 'the entity'. Where a power is given in this way, it is expected that the power is to be exercised by the elected body of Council (i.e. via Council resolution at a Council Meeting). Council can share in the exercise of its powers through delegation to the Chief Executive Officer who may further sub-delegate to other positions within the organisation (except where legislation specifically prohibits delegation and sub-delegation).

It is important to note that Council as an elected body is not giving away this power by delegating; it can still exercise any power in its own right. The process of Council sharing its legislative powers through delegation and sub-delegation allows staff to administer legislative responsibilities and make decisions efficiently without the need for a Council resolution.

There have been several legislative changes in 2020 that impact on delegations. These changes are presented as tracked changes in red text in Attachment 1. The entries in green text are new powers as a result of new legislation, or legislation that has not previously been included in the LGAQ delegation registers.

A summary of the changes are listed below:

1. *Transport Infrastructure (State Controlled Roads) Regulation 2017* – This delegation relates to Section 50(2)(a) of the *Transport Infrastructure Act 1994* and allows the CEO to provide to the Department of Transport and Main Roads, any information they may require when Council is applying for an approval to carry out '*ancillary works and encroachments*' on or near State controlled roads. Ancillary works and encroachments include structures and other things such as an advertising device, a bridge, a pipeline, a

rest area, etc.

2. *Biosecurity Regulation 2016* – This delegation allows the CEO to make a biosecurity management plan if required. The *Biosecurity Act 2014* requires entities to register and produce a management plan when keeping plants or animals identified under the Biosecurity Act. For example, Show Society's may be required to register as a biosecurity entity for the duration of their annual show as 'designated animals' are to be kept on-site for the period of the show (ie. pigs, sheep, goats, etc). Council's pound facility may be required to register as a biosecurity entity when holding impounded 'identified animals' under the Act for a period time.
3. *Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020* – This regulation is only in force until the 31 December 2020 and enacts the powers associated with the Government's strategies for managing rental accommodation during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly as it relates to those that suffer excessive hardship because of the COVID-19 emergency.
4. *Environmental Protection Act 1994* – These delegations are also associated with the COVID-19 emergency and provide for the assessing authority to grant *temporary authorities* if it is a necessary and reasonable response due to the effects of the COVID-19 emergency.
5. *Heavy Vehicle National Law (Qld)* – There is only one new delegable power contained in this amendment, which allows Council to make application to the Regulator for a statement of reasons associated with a decision made on heavy vehicles under the Law.
6. *Local Government Act 2009* – the amendments included in the Register are mainly minor wording changes, however, there is one new power under Section 237 of the Act. Sub-section (1) if delegated allows the CEO to bring a legal proceeding in the name of Council. The commentary to the LGA states the following in relation to sub-section (2) - '*Subsection (2) now allows Councils to take advantage of the Justice Act provisions by commencing prosecutions proceedings in the name of an appropriate officer, but nevertheless as a proceeding started and conducted by the Council as prosecuting agency, rather than by the officer personally. The proceeding should state that the complainant commences the proceeding as a public officer, on behalf of the Council, and that the officer is acting under this section*'.
7. *Local Government Regulation 2012* – The amendments to delegations in the Regulation relate to public access to real-time viewing or listening to Council meetings where the meeting is conducted by teleconferencing. There is an amendment requiring Council to publicly notify about Councillor discretionary funds and publish the information on its website. There has also been notes added to Section 235 and 236 which deals with sole-supplier and disposal of asset resolutions.
8. *Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Regulation 2017* – One new power has been included relating to the monitoring of risk.
9. *Planning Regulation 2017* – Three delegated powers have been removed from the Regulation relating to decision making in Schedule 11 – Assessment benchmarks in relation to Koala habitat in SEQ region.
10. *Acquisition of Land Act 1967* – It is suggested that the new power under this Act be retained by Council as it relates to determining an amount of compensation.

11. *Building Regulation 2006* – The only change to the Building Regulation delegations is the inclusion of a note to alert those exercising powers that the provision only applies if Council owns a building jointly with a private entity and the private entity owns more than 50% of the building.
12. *Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995* – This delegation will allow the CEO to seek security (a bank guarantee, a bond, an insurance policy, a letter of undertaking) for the reimbursement of any expenses it may incur in assisting the department with investigating, preventing or remediating marine pollution.
13. *Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003* – There are two new delegable powers included in the Act relating to Council being able to provide information to insurers regarding suitable duties during worker rehabilitation and return to work.
14. *Water Fluoridation Regulation 2020* – These delegations are not necessary at this point in time given that the region's water supply is not currently fluoridated. However, should that change in the future, the delegations identified would provide the opportunity for Council to quickly and efficiently deal with the operational and reporting requirements associated with a fluoridated water supply.

Under the *Local Government Act 2009*, Council must each year, review all delegations to the Chief Executive Officer. The last annual review by Council was conducted in August 2019. This report requests that Council review all delegations to the Chief Executive Officer as presented in Attachment 1 and if supported, consider the adoption of the Officer recommendation

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Option 1 – Recommendation

The risk of not reviewing and renewing delegations to the CEO is that Council would be in breach of its statutory obligation under Section 257(5) of the *Local Government Act 2009*. There has been some case law where delegated decisions have been challenged on the basis that Council has not conducted an annual review of delegations to the CEO.

Option 2 – Amend the Delegations presented in Attachment 1

Should Council elect not to delegate all the powers listed in the Attachment 1 to the Chief Executive Officer as per the recommendation, it may wish to pass an alternative resolution which excludes some powers. The resolution to read as follows:

'That subject to the exclusion of the following powers:

- *Insert power to be excluded*
- *Insert power to be excluded*

the remaining powers contained in Attachment 1 'Delegations Register – Exercise of Statutory Powers – Council to CEO' are hereby delegated by Council to the Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 257 of the *Local Government Act 2009*.'

Communication and Consultation:

Council's Governance Team review legislative delegation updates as produced by King and Company under contract to the Local Government Association of Queensland (generally every 6 months). Officers recommend that the majority of powers be shared with the Chief Executive Officer with the exception of those that Council has previously indicated should be solely exercised by elected representatives of Council. These are generally the high-level strategic decisions such as determining compensation for acquisition of land, deciding to

take appeal action in Court, the removal or acceptance of trusteeship of public land, powers to appoint audit committee members, etc. The powers that Council may wish to retain are highlighted in orange in Attachment 1. Once the amended delegation register is prepared it is reviewed by the General Manager Finance Governance and Risk and the Chief Executive Officer.

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

Section 257 of the *Local Government Act 2009*, allows Council to delegate powers to the Chief Executive Officer, who may further delegate under Section 259 with the exception of those powers that legislatively cannot be further delegated, or that Council has requested not be further sub-delegated. Section 257(5) requires that Council review all delegations to the CEO annually.

Financial and Resource Implications:

There are no direct costs to Council in delegating statutory powers to the Chief Executive Officer. Delegating powers to the Chief Executive Officer results in time and resource savings in the operations of Council as it allows those matters that Council is comfortable being managed operationally, to be actioned in an efficient and effective manner.

Summary:

Under the provisions of the *Local Government Act 2009* Council is required to review its delegations to the CEO annually. Attachment 1 presents the current delegations from Council with some amendments and inclusions arising out of legislative change in the first half of 2020.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

10 November 2020

Attachments:

1. Attachment 1 – Register of Delegations – Exercise of Statutory Powers – Council to CEO

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Governance Advisor

S/1.6. SERVICE AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR THE PHILIP STREET COMMUNITIES AND FAMILIES PRECINCT

Responsible Officer: General Manager Community Development and Events

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: ED6.1; PRJ - 076

Purpose:

For Council to consider the service and facility management model proposed for the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct.

Anticipated Outcome:

That Council:

1. Undertake the service and facility management responsibilities for the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct, with the intent to evaluate the effectiveness of the model within a period of 24 months.
2. Under s264 1(b) of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, establish and appoint an Advisory Committee (of community members and key stakeholders) as a formal governing body to advise Council on strategic planning, management and service delivery regarding the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct.
3. Collaborate with The Salvation Army (Queensland) to undertake an Expression of Interest (EOI) calling for human and social services providers with interest in delivery and co-location at the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct.

Background:

In 2009, the Gladstone Region Social Infrastructure and Strategic Plan (SISP), developed in partnership with the former Gladstone Economic and Industry Development Board (GEIDB) and the former Department of Infrastructure and Planning (DIP), recommended that the number one priority social infrastructure objective for Gladstone was the co-location and integration of human and social services and facilities to address the fragmentation of the community support system.

On 19 June 2018, Council approved (vide G/18/3421) an original Life of Project (LoP) cost of \$16.4m (and revised in February 2020 to \$17.9m) for the construction of Stage 1 of the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct (the Precinct).

Part 3c of June 2018 resolution authorised the Chief Executive Officer to investigate options surrounding the operation of the Precinct for future Council consideration. The Philip Street Working Group (PSWP) was then established with a mandate to consider and recommend a suitable service and facility management model for the Precinct.

To support the PSWP, Queensland Government Department, Community Hubs and Partnerships (CHaPS) were engaged to facilitate the collaborative service model planning

process. Key partnerships formed for the Precinct are tabled below, noting the interests of each stakeholder.

Organisation	Interests
Gladstone Regional Council (GRC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver the Master Plan developed for Lot 7 Philip Street, West Gladstone. • Project management of the construction of the Precinct with Stage 1 consisting of internal roads and trunk infrastructure, four fit-for-purpose buildings, carpark, parklands and landscaping. • Establish a partnership governance arrangement. • Possible coordination of an integrated service hub to enhance service delivery and achieve positive social outcomes for the Gladstone Region.
The Salvation Army	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of two buildings within the Precinct. • Provision of services from the Precinct and possible coordination or management role.
Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committed to selling the existing neighbourhood centre property at 105 Toolooa Street, South Gladstone and transferring the proceeds of the sale to GRC. • Fund the NGO to operate from the Neighbourhood Centre to be housed in the Precinct.
Maxine Brushe, community leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community advocate to promote engagement with key stakeholders and the community to ensure that community needs are understood and met. • Consistently involved in planning for the Precinct from original vision to construction and operation.

In May 2020, Council contracted a consultant to undertake community engagement to explore various operating model options. The original consultation plan was significantly impacted by COVID-19 and the scheduled community forums were cancelled. In place, individual interviews were held allowing for stakeholder input into the operating model, however didn't allow for collective decision making.

The report (attached) provided four (4) models of service, an Incorporated Association, Statutory Committee established by Council, Advisory Committee established by Council and a Lead Agency model.

The report was engaged to inform Council's decision making and of the 4 models identified, three (3) were considered feasible for further investigation. The three (3) entity types considered (as noted below) form the basis of the 3 service and facility management options detailed in this report.

1. Advisory Committee and Gladstone Regional Council

An Advisory Committee established under the conditions of s264 1(b) of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, consisting of key stakeholders and community members driving the strategic intent of the precinct. Council's involvement would include asset management, lease management, grant attraction, secretariat support

to the Advisory Committee, and existing resources to facilitate the intended 'welcoming front door' approach.

In addition to this model, Gladstone Regional Council could relocate its Engagement & Partnerships team currently in the former Community Advisory Service building, to enable the delivery of community programs in a community precinct.

2. External Service Provider (Lead Agency)

This model intends to engage an existing lead agency where the building lease is taken by a large organisation that then manages the premises with assistance from the management committees of the small organisations involved.

3. Establish an Incorporated Association

This form of legal entity is used by community and not-for-profit groups to form a common management model for facilities. This is not a council committee however Councillors can be a part of the Committee. The incorporated association could be given the authority to manage the asset and/or make decisions about it through a lease or management agreement.

Feedback from the interviews indicated the most preferred operating structure was an Incorporated Association model, largely for its ability to attract private and public funding.

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Taking into consideration the scope and function identified for the entity, the table below is a summary of considerations given to the options provided. A detailed options analysis and risk assessment is attached to this report.

Model Assessment	Option 1 –Advisory Committee and Council	Option 2 – Lead Agency (Existing Agency)	Option 3 – Incorporated Association (To be established)
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to commence service delivery by proposed facility opening date. Utilisation of existing Council skill sets to operate and maintain the facility. (Maintenance, legal, grant attraction, community referral) Establishment of a formal Advisory Committee to define the strategic direction of the precinct, governance, and quality control of tenancy and services mix operating from the Precinct. Original vision for a community-led facility can be temporarily accommodated through an Advisory Committee consisting of community members and key stakeholders providing informed recommendations to Council for endorsement. Provides community entity opportunity to establish operating model, governance, framework and operational functionality, whilst observing the learnings of the facility in an operational environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single operational contact with Council Precinct operated by industry professionals with sector experience and qualifications. Resourcing cost devolved to service provider and covered under appropriate Industry Award. Option consistent with other fee for service arrangements for Council owned community assets (e.g. Aquatic Centre). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highest eligibility to seek philanthropic and charitable funding programs for future infrastructure and program development. Precinct operated by representatives of key community members with knowledge of local human and social services sector (community owned and led). Community preferred option Option meets the original intent of the facility Community led. Builds community capacity.

Model Assessment	Option 1 –Advisory Committee and Council	Option 2 – Lead Agency (Existing Agency)	Option 3 – Incorporated Association (To be established)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to regulatory or legal obligations. • Asset management in line with Council's Asset Management System. • Reduced operating cost opportunities through utilisation of Engagement & Partnerships existing resources. • Reduced interruption to council program and service delivery • Enables Engagement & Partnerships team to easily connect with target sectors of the community supporting effective community development program design and delivery. 		
<p style="text-align: center;">Constraints</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional annual operating costs for maintenance of grounds and facilities. • Reduced space to co-locate/diversify external service providers. • Initial reduced eligibility to seek philanthropic and charitable funding programs for future infrastructure development and program delivery. • Possibility of adverse sentiment towards Council for occupying a facility that could otherwise be made available to the human and social services sector. (Originally the facility design planned to have E&P (CAS) located at the precinct) • Additional layer of governance requiring resource (Secretariat to Advisory Committee) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New operating expense (Third Party Management Fee) additional to annual budget for CD&E function/services. • Precinct may have delay in opening with short time frame to engage a Lead Agency. • Council has reduced level of input / influence in tenancy/service mix, facility management and program delivery • Potential reduced quality control • Commercial returns may drive unwanted behaviours (Lead Agency issue leases that meet criteria rather than balanced needs). • Council ceases to have a role in the management of the Precinct outside of conditions negotiated in the Management Lease Agreement. • Perception of reduced collaboration. • 2 of the 4 buildings will operate under a lease agreement with The Salvation Army that may cause conflict/confusion depending on who the Lead Agency is. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires seed and ongoing operational funding to establish. • Committee reliant on community resources, ie. positions called may not attract the skills required to manage the facility. • Limitations of an incorporated association in terms of annual elections and officeholders being drawn from and chosen by majority of members, limited succession planning, risk associated with staff turnover within membership • Limited influence for Council for facility management and program delivery • Risk of conflict and/or duplication of services with The Salvation Army controlled buildings • Management success: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heavily reliant on attraction and retention of experienced and capable committee members. – Dependent on how well committee is facilitated in accordance with its objectives and operating within its remit. • Potential for inadequate management practices that breaches regulatory and legislative requirements. • Likely risk of limited cross sector representation on the committee. • Turnover of committee members reduces continuity. • 2 of the 4 buildings will operate under a lease agreement with The Salvation Army that may cause conflict/confusion.

To inform the recommendation of this report, the options were assessed against Council's Risk Management Framework to determine a residual risk profile. The table below is a summary of this risk assessment.

Risk Profile	Option 1 – Council and Advisory Committee			Option 2 – Lead Agency			Option 3 – Incorporated Association		
	Risk	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk	Likelihood	Consequence	Risk	Likelihood	Consequence
Health, Safety and Wellbeing	Medium	Possible	Minor	Medium	Possible	Minor	Medium	Possible	Minor
Financial	Medium	Likely	Minor	Medium	Almost Certain	Minor	Medium	Possible	Moderate
Reputation	Medium	Likely	Negligible	Low	Unlikely	Minor	Low	Possible	Negligible
Environment	Low	Rare	Negligible	Low	Unlikely	Negligible	Low	Unlikely	Negligible
Regulatory and Legal	Low	Unlikely	Negligible	Medium	Possible	Minor	Medium	likely	Negligible
Service Delivery	Low	Possible	Negligible	Medium	Possible	Minor	Medium	Possible	Minor

Whilst the level of risk is similar across the options, the areas of most impact are on service delivery, regulatory and legal, and financial. Option 1 has presented as having the lowest risk compared to options 2 and 3.

Option 1 – Advisory Committee & Gladstone Regional Council

Under this option, Council is committing to:

- Accepting facility management and service coordination responsibilities for a period of 24 months, followed by a review of the operating model successes and challenges and determination of transfer opportunities.
- Transferring all or part of Council's existing Engagement & Partnerships team to provide referral services, precinct coordination, stakeholder management and the delivery of existing development and engagement programs within Council's community precinct. This was the original intent in the design of the precinct, as indicated in the floor plans of the CAS Building 01A.
- Establish a formal Advisory Committee consisting of community members and key stakeholders to connect the community to the precinct, inform future service activity and infrastructure development. The Committee will make informed recommendations to Council for decision. A Councillor will be appointed to the Advisory Committee.
- Collaborate with The Salvation Army to seek Expression of Interests for identified service and program providers with interest in delivering services in an integrated manner.

precinct is operational from opening. The arrangements would be reviewed within 24 months to assess future options as the facility matures.

Whilst the stakeholder interviews at the time recommended an incorporated association as the operating model for Philip Street, the Advisory Committee and Council operating model aligns with Council's risk profile and delivers the majority of benefits of an incorporated association model.

In short, Option 1 is the recommended model as it:

- Aligns with the vision of the Philip Street Communities & Families Precinct.
- Aligns with Council's risk appetite and strategic asset management plans.
- Aligns to legal advice to align with Council's risk management framework and appetite.
- Ensures operational readiness upon completion of construction.
- Ensures appropriate service level provision from opening.
- A Councillor would be appointed as a member of the Advisory Committee.
- Provides opportunity to gather data and information to form a review of the model's effectiveness within a 24-month period.
- Presents budgetary and resource efficiencies by using existing skills and resources. to establish the initial start-up, maintenance and coordination of the facility.
- Aligns with community feedback of a community-led governing body.

Based on the level of analysis undertaken that has included a benefits and constraints review, corporate risk assessment and the consideration of community engagement outcomes reported, it is the recommendation of this report that Option 1 be favourably considered as the service and facility management model for the Precinct.

Should Council wish to consider the alternative models identified in this report, a summary of considerations of the further two models is provided below.

Option 2 – External Service Provider (Lead Agency).

Under this option, Council would be committing to:

- The procurement of a suitability qualified service provider to undertake the service and facility management of the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct.
- The Chief Executive Officer being authorised to negotiate the terms and conditions of the management lease like those undertaken for community and recreational facilities.

Option 2 offers Council the ability to engage an industry professional where delivery of human and social services is core to its business. Council has engaged in such type of management arrangement in the past including The Gladstone Housing Company and Rosebery Qld for managing Council's community housing assets. Similarly, Council has also devolved service and facility management of certain recreational assets most notable being with BlueFit for the region's aquatic recreation facilities.

A Lead Agency arrangement provides Council with a level of confidence to have industry professionals operate under agreed terms and conditions to achieve the desired levels of service.

Whilst this arrangement has its benefits, Council will have reduced level of influence over the service mix and general management of the Precinct. Should the service and management direction taken by the Lead Agency deviate from community expectations, this could result in dissatisfaction and reputational impact on Council. This could be managed through lease conditions and effective contract management.

Due to limited revenue opportunities (hirer/rental and leasing income) at the Precinct to cover cost of service delivery and facility management functions, there is a risk of disproportionately high management fee and negotiated operating and maintenance cost imposed on Council to devolve service and facility management functions to a Third Party Provider.

To establish the Precinct as intended, officers agreed that this option does not align with community expectation or offer enough of a conservative approach to ensure that the external management of such a new community asset will deliver on the Council's and community's vision.

Option 3 – Incorporated Community Association

Under this option, Council would be committing under s40 Part 1 of the *Local Government Act 2009*, authorising the Chief Executive Officer to conduct a Beneficial Enterprise to:

- Establish a Not for Profit Incorporated Community Association with authority to oversee the service and facility management of an integrated human and social services development known as the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct.
- Determine the objects and rules of the Constitution, inclusive of charitable objectives.
- Enter into a Lease Management Agreement with the entity for the Precinct.
- Appoint a Councillor to the Management Committee established for this entity.

In keeping with the objective of community connectedness, the establishment of a community-based incorporated association with the authority to manage and make decisions about the Precinct through a lease or management agreement is considered preferable by external stakeholders.

Option 3 could be considered for future management when the facility is more mature however the initial costs and resources required to ensure the Precinct's operational readiness at completion of construction would be significant and unlikely to be achieved within the current timeframes.

Whilst this option provides the opportunity for genuine community ownership and community led service delivery at the Precinct, officers agreed that this option places significant risks on Council in the early establishment of the facility. In addition, there would be a higher level of expected resources and ongoing operational support invested, additional to current resource levels to ensure effective leadership, governance, management and intent is upheld.

Irrespective of the entity selected, the primary scope of service and facility coordination will be the same. That it includes:

- Consulting with human and social services sector representatives to strategically plan, and coordinate services and programs that meet current future service needs of the community.
- Engage with human and social services/program providers to coordinate services in an integrated manner.
- Establish referral pathways with Primary and Allied Health Services.
- Facilitate sector interagency collaboration and consultation.
- Provide customer engagement coordination, way finding and information services.

- Manage long term tenancies, periodic and/or visiting service arrangements of office space, community meeting amenities and outdoor community space.
- Coordination of grounds and building management and maintenance.



IMAGE 1: Philip Street Communities & Families Precinct - Stage 1 site layout

Out of scope of the service and management intent are the services and programs delivered by the Salvation Army who have entered into an Agreement to Lease with Council for the purpose-built Neighbourhood Centre Building (Community Centre) and Communities for Children facility (Playgroup).

Both Salvation Army buildings will offer office space to service providers that align and complement their programs with the integrated service vision for the Precinct.

Service mapping has commenced with the key stakeholders, defining Council delivered services, Salvation Army services, Department of Community, Disabled and Disability Services, and a gap analysis to further build on community engagement findings. Once completed this will inform an Expression of Interest (EOI) process, which will be managed by

Gladstone Regional Council and Salvation Army in partnership. Planning the EOI process has commenced and is estimated to be finalised at a Working Group meeting on the 3rd November 2020.

Communication and Consultation:

Internal

- General Manager Community Development and Events
- General Manager Strategic Assets Performance
- General Manager Strategy and Transformation
- General Manager Finance, Governance and Risk
- Manager Engagement and Partnerships
- Manager Governance (Acting)
- Manager Asset Governance
- Property Acquisition and Disposal Specialist (Acting)
- Senior Legal Advisor
- Strategic Project Specialist
- Cost Analyst
- Community Development Specialist
- Neighbourhood Centre Coordinator

Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) from across the business were consulted to understand the risks and opportunities with each option, and internal stakeholders are supportive of Option 1.

External

- Philip Street Communities & Families Precinct Working Group
 - Community Hubs and Partnerships (ChaPs)
 - The Salvation Army Queensland
 - Department of Communities, Disability Services and Seniors
 - Maxine Brushe, Community Leader
- Engagement Plus (Consultant)

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

Legal considerations undertaken on operationalising the Precinct is complex. Council has entered into a partnership with the Salvation Army (Queensland) Property Trust for the construction and lease of two (2) fit for purpose buildings, including predetermined service and operating conditions.

This arrangement has inherently established precedent conditions for service delivery which have been considered as part of determining the recommendation of this report.

Development of a service and facility management model for the Precinct was a strategic objective for Council as captured in the 2019/2020 Operational Plan (1.2a).

Financial and Resource Implications:

On 18 February 2020, Council approved a revised Life of Project (LoP) cost (from \$16.4m to \$17.9m) increasing Council's capital funding contribution from \$9.950m to \$11.818m. Council covering increase cost of construction and reduced funding proponent capital contributions. The revised project budget (tabled below) was effective 1 July 2020.

Funding Streams	Original June 2018	Revised Jul 2020	Fund Expiry
Regional Jobs and Investment Package (Australian Government)	\$3,082,016	\$3,082,016	30/06/2021
Gladstone Foundation - The Salvation Army (Qld)	\$3,000,000	\$2,700,000	
Dept. Communities (State Government)	\$400,000	\$300,000	
Council Contribution	\$9,950,000	\$11,817,984	
TOTALS	\$16,432,016	\$17,900,000	

Construction of the Precinct is scheduled to be complete on 30 June 2021, and ideally operational by 1 July 2021.

Council has allocated budget in 20/21 to cover establishment expenses (exclusions) outside of the Stage 1B Contract. Expenses forecast include:

- Procurement and installation of ICT hardware, infrastructure and connectivity;
- Office furnishing and equipment; and
- Relocation expenses.

Average annual cost estimates (tabled below) for asset management, maintenance and depreciation have been developed for the Precinct under Option 1.

	Community Advisory Service	Community Meeting Place	Neighbourhood Centre	Child and Family Centre	Precinct Civils (Roads, trunk infrastructure, open space facilities)
Management	\$47,000	\$49,000	\$41,000	\$47,000	\$314,000
Maintenance	\$19,000	\$20,000	\$ 17,000	\$19,000	\$142,000
Depreciation	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,000	\$18,000	\$122,000
TOTAL	\$84,000	\$87,000	\$74,000	\$84,000	\$578,000

These estimates are based on QTC whole of life models that define management cost as operational activities necessary to operate the facility. Maintenance is defined as regular maintenance activities necessary to keep the asset at the desired levels of condition.

Based on this modeling, the estimated average annual management and maintenance cost for 2 Council controlled buildings (Community Advisory Service and Community Meeting Place buildings) and for Precinct common areas is \$591,000. As the asset owner, Council is responsible for all costs of depreciation associated with the Precinct.

The Salvation Army is responsible for the annual operating and maintenance cost forecast for the Neighborhood Center and Child and Family Centre buildings. Conditions of this arrangement are detailed under an executed Agreement to Lease between Parties.

Whilst the proposed budget has been developed with broad engagement across the business, it should be noted, that until the precinct is fully functional and tenure arrangements are in place, it is difficult to predict an accurate annual operational budget.

Budget estimates have been provided to manage the Council owned building, land, water, sewerage, transport, drainage, stormwater and park assets within the precinct.

These budget estimates do not cover costs associated with internal fit-outs. As the asset management maturity progresses within Council a dedicated asset management plan will be developed for the precinct.

Council have invested a significant amount of funding into the new facility and should maintain a level of involvement in partnership with the community for continued successful operation of the Precinct.

Summary:

This report has been prepared to allow Council to consider information to reach a decision on an appropriate service and facility management model for the Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct (the Precinct).

The business has investigated three (3) model options assessing benefits and constraints, corporate risk impacts and community sentiment to come to the recommendation that Council:

- Undertake the service and facility coordination responsibilities for the Precinct for a period of 24 months with the intent to evaluate the effectiveness of the model; and
- Establish an Advisory Committee as the formal governing body to advise Council on strategic planning, management and service delivery for the Precinct.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

Pending favourable consideration of the recommendation of this report, Officers will have seven (7) months to implement in readiness for the Precinct to be operational by July 2021.

Should a resolution not be achieved and Council requests further investigations into an alternative recommendation, it is likely that Council will have to assume service and operational management in order to be operational by July 2021.

A minimum six (6) month period of management would not be unreasonable to allow the business to establish and seek Council resolution, pending favorable adoption, development of governance and implement.

Attachments:

1. Engage Plus – Report on Operational Plan for Philip Street Communities and Families Precinct.
2. Philip Street Service and Facility Management Options Analysis and Risk Assessment
3. Forecast Operational Expenditure Budget

Report Prepared by: Strategic Projects Specialist in collaboration with Subject Matter Experts

S/1.7. COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM - REGIONAL ENHANCEMENT FUND - ENVIRONMENTAL CARE

Responsible Officer: General Manager Community Development and Events

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: GS3.1

Purpose:

Consider the recommendations of the Community Investment Panel on applications received under the Regional Enhancement Fund – Environmental Care funding initiative.

Officer's Recommendation:

That Council: -

1. Adopt the Community Investment Panel recommendation of funding for applications received under the category of funding tabled below:

Applicant	Project	Recommendation
Creative Recycling Centre Inc	Fix It, Don't Ditch It!	<u>\$2000.00</u>
Tangaroa Blue Foundation	Curtis Island Community Beach Clean-ups	<u>\$2000.00</u>
Boyne Tannum Football Club	Waste segregation stations	<u>\$2000.00</u>
Gladstone And District Wildlife Carers Association	Management and Care of Flying Foxes regional training	<u>\$2000.00</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$8000.00</u>

2. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer (or delegate) to finalise and execute a grant and/or funding agreement (detailing entitlements and conditions) with each successful applicant.

Background:

In May 2019, Council adopted a new Community Investment Policy (the Policy) and implemented a new Community Investment Program on 1 July 2019. The Community Investment Program offers six (6) key funding streams including the Regional Enhancement Fund.

On 1 January the Regional Enhancement Fund – Environmental Care was open for application and closed on 29 February. A total of two applications were received. Assessment of these applications was put on hold due to restrictions in place from COVID-19. Funds unspent from the Community Investment Program were redirected to support the Gladstone Region Rise Up initiative as part of Council's COVID-19 Recovery Package. The assessment of these applications has been aligned to the most recent round of Environmental Care applications as described below.

On 1 August, the Regional Enhancement Fund – Environmental Care initiative was open for application and closed 31 August. A total of two (2) applications were received.

Eligible applications are assessed by a Community Investment Panel (the Panel) with recommendations presented to Council at a General Meeting for decision. A total of four (4) applications were assessed. The dollar value of combined applications is greater than the annual budget allocation for this funding stream. Recommendations to support each application have been made with this information in mind. Applications received in the Jan/Feb round are marked with an * for Council's reference.

Regional Enhancement Fund - Environmental Care

Environmental Care funding is to provide assistance to the community to undertake initiatives that conserve or enhance the environment across the region. This includes application fees for the annual Tidy Towns competition.

The Environmental Care objectives are;

- *Protect and enhance the quality of the environment.*
- *Promote and/or deliver waste reduction and increase in use of recycling across the region.*
- *Provide opportunities for the organisation and community to increase their skills and knowledge via education and training in environmental care.*
- *Promote and/or deliver environmental activities and encourage community participation.*

The details of the four (4) applications are tabled below:

Applicant	Project	Location	Date	Request	Total Project Cost
Creative Recycling Centre Inc	Fix It, Don't Ditch It!	Gladstone Central	N/A	\$2,500.00	\$3,750.00
Tangaroa Blue Foundation	Curtis Island Community Beach Clean-ups	Curtis Island	10 & 11 October 2020	\$2,356.44	\$7,500.00
Boyne Tannum Football Club*	Waste segregation stations	Boyne Island	NA	\$2,500.00	\$2,583.45
Gladstone And District Wildlife Carers Association*	Management and Care of Flying Foxes regional training	Boyne Island	To be confirmed.	\$2,490.00	\$2,490.00

Panel Assessment Process

In accordance with the Community Investment Policy (P-2019-08) and Community Investment Corporate Standard (CS-2019-09), eligible applications are assessed by the Panel.

Panel assessment is undertaken using an assessment matrix to score each application against Key Selection Criteria (KSC) - derived from the funding objectives to determine an order of merit.

The overall score (ranking) is used to inform the recommendation. The tables below define the KSC, weighting and definition of scores applied in the assessment matrix.

Funding Category	Key Selection Criteria	Weighting (Out of 100%)
Regional Enhancement Fund – Environmental Care	KSC 1: Protect and enhance the quality of the environment.	30
	KSC 2: Promote and/or deliver waste reduction and increase in use of recycling across the region.	30
	KSC 3: Provide opportunities for the organisation and community to increase their skills and knowledge via education and training in environmental care. KSC 4: Promote and/or deliver environmental activities and encourage	20
	KSC 4: Promote and/or deliver environmental activities and encourage community participation	20
Overall Score	Definition	
65% and above	An overall score of 65.5% and above demonstrates that an application has met or exceeded all KSCs. The Assessment Panel may favourably recommend the application.	
Between 50.5% to 65%	An overall score between 51% to 65% demonstrates that an application has met or exceeded a KSCs but mostly marginal evidence in others. The Assessment Panel may choose to recommend funding the application based on scores received for KPIs with high weighting and overall alignment to Community Celebration Fund objectives.	
50% or Less	An overall score of 50% or less demonstrates that an application has mostly provided marginal evidence across all KSCs. The Assessment Panel may still choose to recommend the application for part funding based on some evidence of meeting the objectives of the Community Celebration Fund objectives.	

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Panel assessment was undertaken in October 2020. Individual Panel scores are captured in the Assessment Matrix attached.

OPTION 1 – Officer’s Recommendation – Partially fund all projects:

While the Panel has recommended that all applications be fully funded, Council’s current budget is limited to \$8,000 for the Regional Enhancement Fund – Environmental Care initiative. In order to support each project, equal distribution of funds between the successful applicants is recommended. The panel was satisfied that based on the applications all projects could continue in a part funded capacity.

Applicant	Project	Location	Request	Panel Score	Recommendation
Creative Recycling Centre Inc	Fix It, Don't Ditch It!	Gladstone Central	\$2,500.00	95%	<u>\$2,000.00</u>
Tangaroa Blue Foundation	Curtis Island Community Beach Clean-ups	Curtis Island	\$2,356.44	88%	<u>\$2,000.00</u>
Boyne Tannum Football Club	Waste segregation stations	Boyne Island	\$2,500.00	87%	<u>\$2,000.00</u>
Gladstone & District Wildlife Carer's Association	Management and Care of Flying Foxes regional training	Boyne Island	\$2,490.00	66%	<u>\$2,000.00</u>

OPTION 2 – FULLY FUND THE TOP THREE SCORING APPLICATIONS

If Council were of a mind to fully fund as many applications as possible, the three (3) highest scoring applications could be fully funded, leaving funds in the amount of \$640 available for Gladstone & District Wildlife Carer's Association.

The below table is reflective of the outcomes associated with Option 2.

Applicant	Project	Location	Request	Panel Score	Recommendation
Creative Recycling Centre Inc	Fix It, Don't Ditch It!	Gladstone Central	\$2,500.00	95%	<u>\$2,500.00</u>
Tangaroa Blue Foundation	Curtis Island Community Beach Clean-ups	Curtis Island	\$2,356.44	88%	<u>\$2,356.44</u>
Boyne Tannum Football Club	Waste segregation stations	Boyne Island	\$2,500.00	87%	<u>\$2,500.00</u>
Gladstone & District Wildlife Carer's Association	Management and Care of Flying Foxes regional training	Boyne Island	\$2,490.00	66%	<u>\$640.00</u>

PANEL COMMENTARY

The table below includes a summary of the Panel's assessment.

Project Name: Fix It, Don't Ditch It!	
Location:	Gladstone Region
Applicant:	Creative Recycling Centre Inc
Funding Request:	<p>\$2,500.00 for use toward:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video production by a Central Queensland videographer. • Marketing and promotions of the Fix It, Don't Ditch It video. • Business co-ordination and script writing.
Project Summary:	<p>Creative Recycling Centre will produce a Fix It Don't Ditch It! video encouraging residents, to repair common household and everyday items and reduce their disposal at landfill. The benefits of repairing these items and the environmental issues associated with waste will be highlighted in a local context. The video will also showcase and promote local businesses who provide repair services for household items.</p> <p>What is the need of the project and how has it been identified? Gladstone Regional Council's Waste Management and Resource Recovery Strategy 2019 identified household waste as one of the major waste streams in the Gladstone Region. Our throwaway society and increased consumerism have resulted in a significant increase of short-lived disposable goods, and with clever advertising, a view that new is better than old. Many householders, particularly younger generations, are quick to dispose of an item that is broken or damaged either without much thought as to whether it can be repaired or restored or the have the knowledge, skills or time to do so. The Waste and Resource Recovery Strategy 2019 listed waste education as the number one priority area to achieve a reduction in household waste</p>

	generation, littering and illegal dumping in the region. This project addresses this need for community education relating to household waste reduction.
Assessment Score	95%
Panel Comment	This application's high assessment score reflects the detail and effort that has gone in to submitting this high-quality application. The application was able to genuinely address and provide evidence on how this project will reach each KSC of the Environmental Care Fund. The Panel were particularly impressed with the effort that had gone into ensuring the project linked with the Waste and Resource Recovery Strategy 2019. The Panel commented that Creative Recycling Centre should be congratulated on the collaborative approach taken to tackle this continued trend in society.
Panel Recommendation	The Panel recommends full funding for this project to the value of \$2,500.00.

Project: Curtis Island Community Beach Clean Up	
Location:	Curtis Island
Applicant:	Tangaroa Blue Foundation
Funding Request:	\$2,356.44 for use toward:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barge transfer fees to transport volunteers, volunteer vehicles and trailers to the island for the Curtis Island Community Clean Up (6 vehicles, 1 trailer) • Hire of two 4WD vehicles for volunteer transportation.
Project Summary:	The Curtis Island Community Beach Clean-up is one of 3 events that will be facilitated in the Gladstone Region, the other two being Facing Island and Bustard Bay (Eurimbula National Park). All three are part of the ReefClean Project which is a 5-year project focused on the removal and prevention of marine debris impacting the Great Barrier Reef. The event will be used to highlight the significance of the area by engaging volunteer community members in marine debris removal, data collection and entry into the AMDI Database. The data will then be used to help identify its source and in the development of source reduction projects that prevent from being released in the first place. Tangaroa Blue Foundation's local staff members, who are based in Boyne Island, will facilitate and coordinate the events in the Gladstone region. What is the need of the project and how has it been identified? Curtis Island is the second largest island in Queensland, with a large proportion of the island designated as National Park. The island bounds the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and has significant turtle nesting habitat, wetlands and mangrove systems important for fish and bird life. Marine debris has a significant negative impact on the Great Barrier Reef and ecosystems with ongoing removal, monitoring and source reduction projects all being vital in reducing its impact.
Assessment Score	88%

Panel Comment	This application scored well across all KSCs. The panel identified that the event would take place before the recommendation for support would be presented to Council and noted there was still appetite to support funding this project retrospectively. The panel did check the eligibility of this project in accordance with the guidelines and determined that at the time of the application being lodged the project had not commenced so the application would remain eligible. The Panel noted that activities on of this nature on Curtis Island are challenging due to logistics and were supportive of encouraging the opportunity for the wider community to complete this activity in this location and opportunity for locals of Curtis Island to participate in events more easily organised on the mainland. The Panel were confident this application aligns with the intent of Environmental Care fund.
Panel Recommendation	The Panel recommends full funding of this application to the value of \$2,356.44 as per the application request. The funding is to be provided retrospectively.

Project Name: Waste Segregation Stations	
Location:	Jacaranda Drive, Boyne Island
Applicant:	Boyne Tannum Football Club
Funding Request:	\$2,500.00 for use toward:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase of 6 x 240L Wheelie Bins <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 x Recycling Lids for bottles and cans - 3 x Dual Station Wheelie Bin posts and installation material.
Project Summary:	<p>The Boyne Tannum Football Club are seeking to install 3 waste stations at the club. This projects scope is to secure 2 x 240L bins at each station. These will be clearly marked segregate recyclable material from general waste. The Club aims to engage patrons and members in segregating waste by providing the opportunity and making it easier for them to do so.</p> <p>What is the need of the project and how has it been identified? Currently the bins at the club facility are not secured and have been knocked over, broken, and stolen. Currently there is no segregation and much of the waste going to landfill is recyclable material.</p>
Assessment Score	87%
Panel Comment	The Panel scored this application highly across all KSCs noting the application has been well prepared. This application scored particularly well in in meeting KSC 2 and 4 relating to the promotion and/or delivery of waste reduction and increase in use of recycling across the region along with promoting and or delivery environmental activities and encouraging community participation in these activities. The Panel commends the organisation on sending in a strong application with an innovative solution for problems with waste and recycling facilities at the club and generating a passive income for the Club.
Panel Recommendation	The Panel recommends funding this project to the value of \$2,500.00 conditional on a letter of consent being provided to the organisation detailing mutually agreeable locations for the bins within their leased site.

Project Name: Management & Care of Flying Foxes Regional Training	
Location:	Training to be held @ Boyne Island Environmental Education Centre
Applicant:	Gladstone & District Wildlife Carers Association
Funding Request:	\$2,490.00 for use toward. - Professional costs of a training facilitator/technical advisor. - Catering for the workshop. - PPE for participants. - The workshop is planned to be hosted in November
Project Summary:	Gladstone Wildlife is seeking to build our capacity to respond and care for flying foxes. The group have successfully received funding for vaccinations and a small amount of equipment from a Queensland Government Grant. However, they wanting to provide specialist training and professional development opportunities for their carers and veterinary staff to improve outcomes for the rescue of flying foxes (and bats) and seek technical advice as to establishing response guidelines for extreme weather events such as heat stress. What is the need of the project and how has it been identified? There is a very limited regional capacity for responding to flying fox and bats rescues and even less regional capacity to provide rehabilitation care for flying foxes and bats. This has led to many challenges for the Gladstone Wildlife team.
Assessment Score	66%
Panel Comment	The Panel commended this organisation on the submission of an excellent detailed application. The Panel scored this application highly across KSC related to the protection and enhancement of the quality of the environment and providing opportunities for the organisation and the community to increase their skills and knowledge via education and training in environmental care. The Panel were agreed that as the Region is home to several large colonies of Flying Foxes this was a great initiative to increase community understanding of the local flying fox population and their importance to regional ecology. The initiative aligns well with the intent of the Environmental Care grant.
Panel Recommendation	The Panel recommends full funding of this project to the value of \$2490.00.

Communication and Consultation:

The Panel membership that undertook the assessment consisted of the following delegated Officers:

- General Manager Community Development & Events
- General Manager Operations
- Manager Engagement & Partnerships
- Community Development Specialist
- Property Acquisitions and Disposals Specialist

Additional communication/consultation was undertaken with the following.

- Manager Environment and Conservation
- Manager, Brand
- Senior Program Support Officer
- Listed applicants (external)

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

All applications are assessed against Council's Community Investment Program (P-2019-08), Community Investment Corporate Standard (CS-2019-09) and published funding guidelines.

On favorable adoption of the Panel's recommendations detailed in this report, authorised officers will proceed to enter into a grant and or funding agreement (detailing entitlements and conditions) with successful applicants.

Financial and Resource Implications:

In 2020/21, Council budgeted \$268,000 to fund recommended applications received through the Regional Enhancement Fund, with specifically \$8,000.00 allocated to the Environmental Care initiative.

Upon endorsement of either of the officer's recommendations within in this report the Budget for this fund will be exhausted. Future application rounds for this initiative that were scheduled to open in January 2021 will no longer be offered.

Summary:

Nil.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

30 November 2021

Attachments:

1. Regional Enhancement Fund – Environmental Care – Guidelines
2. 2020-21 Assessment Matrix – Environmental Care

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Community Investment Officer

S/1.8. COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM - REGIONAL ENHANCEMENT FUND - JUMPSTART CITY HEART

Responsible Officer: General Manager Community Development and Events

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: GS3.1

Purpose:

Consider the recommendations of the Community Investment Panel on applications received under the Regional Enhancement Fund – Jumpstart City Heart initiative.

Officer's Recommendation:

That Council: -

1. Adopt the Community Investment Panel recommendation of funding for applications received under the category of funding tabled below:

Regional Enhancement Fund – Jumpstart City Heart

Applicant	Project	Request	Recommendation
Gladstone Area Promotional Development Limited	Artisans of Goondoon Mini Market	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Ban Thai Bar and Restaurant	Deck/Street Front Beautification	\$2,000.00	-

2. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer (or delegate) to finalise and execute a grant and/or funding agreement (detailing entitlements and conditions) with the successful applicant.

Background:

In May 2019, Council adopted a new Community Investment Policy (the Policy) and implemented a new Community Investment Program on 1 July 2019. The Community Investment Program offers six (6) key funding streams including the Regional Enhancement Fund.

On 1 September, the Regional Enhancement Fund – Jumpstart City Heart initiative was open for application and closed 30 September. A total of two (2) applications were received.

Eligible applications are assessed by a Community Investment Panel (the Panel) with recommendations presented to Council at a General Meeting for decision.

Regional Enhancement Fund – Jumpstart City Heart

Jumpstart City Heart funding supports initiatives of community organisations, CBD businesses, and individuals that contribute to encouraging visitation, overall aesthetics of the CBD, stimulate economy, and engage community and visitors.

The Jumpstart City Heart objectives are: -

- *Re-establishing Goondoon Street as Gladstone's main street by improving economic and development opportunities within the CBD.*
- *Creating a CBD destination that provides entertainment for the entire Gladstone Region.*
- *Creating a unique identity for the CBD and achieving a sense of arrival.*
- *Recognising the city's heritage as an important asset and improving the quality of public spaces and streets.*
- *Investigating alternative transport options for ease of access into and throughout the CBD.*
- *Converting grey space to green space and improving connectivity to active open spaces.*

The details of the two (2) applications are tabled below;

Applicant	Project	Location	Request
Gladstone Area Promotional Development Limited	Artisans of Goondoon Mini Market	Gladstone CBD	\$2000.00
Ban Thai Bar and Restaurant	Deck/Street Front Beautification	Gladstone CBD	\$2000.00

Panel Assessment Process

In accordance with the Community Investment Policy (P-2019-08) and Community Investment Corporate Standard (CS-2019-09), eligible applications are assessed by the Panel.

Panel assessment is undertaken using an assessment matrix to score each application against Key Selection Criteria (KSC) - derived from the funding objectives to determine an order of merit. The overall score (ranking) is used to inform the recommendation. The tables below define the KSC, weighting and definition of scores applied in the assessment matrix.

Funding Category	Key Selection Criteria	Weighting (Out of 100%)
Regional Enhancement Fund – Jumpstart City Heart	KSC 1: Re-establishing Goondoon Street as Gladstone's main street by improving economic and development opportunities within the CBD.	20%
	KSC 2: Creating a CBD destination that provides entertainment for the entire Gladstone Region	15%
	KSC 3: Creating a unique identity for the CBD and achieving a sense of arrival.	20%
	KSC 4: Recognising the city's heritage as an important asset and improving the quality of public spaces and streets.	15%
	KSC 5: Investigating alternative transport options for ease of access into and throughout the CBD.	10%
	KSC 6: Converting grey space to green space and improving connectivity to active open spaces.	20%
Overall Score	Definition	
65% and above	An overall score of 65.5% and above demonstrates that an application has met or exceeded all KPIs. The Assessment Panel may favourably recommend the application.	
Between 50.5% to 65%	An overall score between 51% to 65% demonstrates that an application has met or exceeded a KPI(s) but mostly marginal evidence in others. The Assessment Panel may choose to recommend funding the application based on scores received for KPIs with high weighting and overall alignment to Community Celebration Fund objectives.	
50% or Less	An overall score of 50% or less demonstrates that an application has mostly provided marginal evidence across all KPIs. The Assessment Panel may still choose to recommend the application for part funding based on some evidence of meeting the objectives of the Community Celebration Fund objectives.	

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Panel assessment was undertaken in October 2020. Individual Panel scores are captured in the Assessment Matrix attached.

The Panel Assessment outcome is summarised within this table.

Applicant	Project	Location	Request	Panel Score	Recommendation
Gladstone Area Promotional Development Limited	Artisans of Goondoon Mini Market	Gladstone CBD	\$2,000.00	53%	\$2,000.00
Ban Thai Bar and Restaurant	Deck/Street Front Beautification	Gladstone CBD	\$2,000.00	48%	\$0.00

Individual Panel comments that support the Panel recommendation are included below.

Artisans of Goondoon Mini Market	
Date:	1 November 2020 – 24 December 2020
Location:	Goondoon Street, Gladstone
Applicant:	Gladstone Area Promotional Development Limited
Funding Request:	\$2000.00 monetary support toward developing merchandising signs, developing market layout and promotional materials. <i>Funding request equates to 40% of the total project cost.</i>
Event Summary:	The Artisans of Goondoon Mini Market is a project GAPDL have had in mind for some time. The market will provide an outlet for our local artisans and stall holders who haven't had the ability to sell their wares due to Covid 19. Both Feast on East and BAM unlikely to be held prior to Christmas our stall holders are in need of a venue to sell their products as Christmas gifts.
Assessment Score	53%
Panel Comment	The panel assessed this application strongly in relation to the KSC related to re-establishing Goondoon Street as Gladstone's main street and recognised this event's potential to improve economic and development opportunities within the CBD. The Panel agreed that this is a good initiative and has the potential to be expanded upon in the future. The panel were advised of alternate locations for the project following consultation with the applicant. The panel encourages the applicant to consider how this pop-up market could continue beyond the festive season. The panel agreed that this application could have scored higher if more detail had been provided on the scope of the market and the level of interest from stallholders and the community.
Panel Recommendation	The panel recommends full funding for this project based to the value requested, \$2,000.00.

Deck / Street Front Beautification	
Date:	Not applicable
Location:	46 Goondoon Street, Gladstone
Applicant:	Ban Thai Bar and Restaurant
Funding Request:	\$2,000.00 monetary support toward garden beds or suitable strong pots to be situated with the current roadside garden bed. <i>Funding request equates to 80% of the total project cost.</i>
Event Summary:	To continue trying to create an appealing aesthetic look for the community the business is trying to add to the look and attraction of the main street CBD area. The restaurant is proposing to add some sort of garden bed / pots on the street side of the deck to continue the beautification project.
Assessment Score	48%
Panel Comment	All members of the panel were able recognise this projects potential to improve the aesthetics of the street front for this restaurant, however, the applicant was not able to satisfactorily address the minimum Key Selection Criteria for this application to be successful.
Panel Recommendation	The panel does not recommend support for this project but invites the applicant to consider resubmission if they are able to obtain the necessary approvals for this project.

Communication and Consultation:

The Panel membership that undertook the assessment consisted of the following delegated Officers:

- General Manager, Community Development & Events
- Manager, Brand as delegated from General Manager Customer Experience
- Economic Development Specialist
- Manager, Engagement & Partnerships
- Manager, Events and Entertainment

Additional communication/consultation was undertaken with the following.

- Listed applicants (external)
- Manager, Roads Program Delivery
- Technical Officer – Engineering Asset Solutions

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

All applications are assessed against Council's Community Investment Program (P-2019-08), Community Investment Corporate Standard (CS-2019-09) and published funding guidelines.

On favorable adoption of the Panel's recommendations detailed in this report, authorised officers will proceed to enter into a grant and or funding agreement (detailing entitlements and conditions) with successful applicants.

Financial and Resource Implications:

In 2020/21, Council budgeted \$268,000 to fund recommended applications received through the Regional Enhancement Fund, with specifically \$15,000 allocated to the Jumpstart City Heart initiative.

Upon endorsement of the officer's recommendations within in this report, \$13,000 will remain in the budget. The officer recommends opening this fund for applications year-round to ensure the remaining budget it expended.

Summary:

Nil.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

30 January 2021

Attachments:

1. Regional Enhancement Fund – Jumpstart City Heart Guideline
2. Jumpstart City Heart Assessment Matrix October 2020

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Community Investment Officer

S/1.9. INSURANCE SERVICES

Responsible Officer: General Manager Finance Governance and Risk

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: PE1.1

Purpose:

This report seeks resolution from Council to make use of the provisions in s234 of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, that allows for exceptions to the requirement for written quotes or tenders if the contract is entered into under an LGA arrangement. The use of this provision is sought in relation to the provision of insurance services.

Officer's Recommendation:

That Council authorises the Chief Executive Officer to enter into negotiations and a subsequent contract (within the approved budget) with LGM Assets for the provision of insurance services in accordance with section 234 of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*.

Background:

Marsh has provided insurance brokerage services to Council since 2014 including comprehensive cover for:

- Industrial Special Risk (Council's bricks and mortar);
- Motor Vehicles and Fleet;
- Group Personal Accident (Regular volunteers);
- Marine Hull;
- Engineering;
- Fine Arts Museum; and
- Local Post Office.

The current contract for insurance services is due to expire on 1 December 2020 and it is essential for Council to maintain current and comprehensive cover for the above assets.

At the General Meeting on 21 January 2020 Council resolved (vide Resolution no. G/20/4063):

"That:

1. *Council resolves, in accordance with Section 235(b) of the Local Government Regulation 2012, that it is satisfied that Marsh Pty Ltd provide insurance brokerage services to Council that are of a specialised nature and it is impractical for Council to invite quotes or tenders for a 12 month period; and*
2. *A report be provided to Council by September 2020 on a review of Council's insurance options. "*

Council's Risk and Insurance Officer has now had the opportunity to undertake a review of Council's insurance options. Options are presented below for Council's consideration.

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

Option 1 – Officer’s Recommendation– Transition brokerage services from Marsh to LGM Assets

Established by the Local Government Association of Queensland Ltd (LGAQ), Local Government Mutual Services (LGMS) has provided cover for liability, workers compensation and asset-based risk exposures to local governments in Queensland for over 20 years.

LGMS provides tailored and local government specific cover through a self-insurance mutual backed by supporting insurance and reinsurance arrangements. Through the scheme, members (all local government and local government-controlled entities) own the mutual.

LGMS provides insurance coverage through its standalone insurance solutions including LGM Liability, LGM Assets and LGW Workcare. LGM Assets is a standalone insurance solution providing cover for assets, motor vehicles, plant & equipment and all other cover required by councils including corporate travel, machinery breakdown and marine.

A comparison of the services offered by Marsh and LGMS/LGM Assets indicate that not only does LGM Assets provide services that are equal to Marsh, the LGMS scheme operates as a not-for-profit mutual with no profit margins and no brokerage fee. It is anticipated that commercial providers would be charging brokerage fees on top of insurance coverage. Engaging LGM Assets would represent a saving of approximately \$30,000.

Further, participation within the Mutual scheme for LGM Assets provides Council with dividend (returns) to offset premium costs, similar to that currently realised within the LGM Public Liability Scheme and the LGW Workers Compensation Scheme. Current returns realised are in the order of 10% of gross premium costs which provides over \$175,000 in value to Council in the current financial year.

In addition, LGM Assets provides risk assessment and management services to members to improve processes, minimise risk and therefore lower contributions. This service is particularly attractive to Council with a renewed focus on risk with the recent adoption of Council’s Risk Management Framework.

As LGM Assets is an LGA arrangement as defined in s234 of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, Council is able to engage LGM Assets directly without the requirement of a competitive process. This approach also suits Council given the imminent expiry of Council’s current insurance policies and the time it would take to approach the market through an Expression of Interest (“EOI”) process.

A failure of Council to renew or negotiate new insurance policies prior to the expiration of the current policies would leave Council without insurance coverage for its assets and represent an Extreme Risk for Council, far beyond Councils Risk Appetite.

On the other hand, there is a risk that if Council engages LGM Assets to provide insurance services without testing the market, Council could miss an opportunity to realise savings in the cost of brokerage services and insurance premiums.

Option 2 – Not Recommended – Test the market through an expression of interest process

If Council were of a mind to test the market, an expression of interest (“EOI”) would be appropriate. In order to undertake an EOI process, it would be necessary for Council to renew the current arrangements with Marsh to provide coverage until the EOI process was complete and suitable arrangements were made for alternative coverage.

Communication and Consultation:

This report was prepared in consultation with:

- Risk and Insurance Officer;
- Manager Contracts & Procurement;
- Senior Legal Advisor;
- General Manager Finance, Governance and Risk

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

It is a requirement of the s225 of the Local Government Regulation 2012, to invite written quotation or tenders where the supply of goods or services costs greater than \$15,000 ex GST. Section 234 of the regulation provides an exception to this requirement which states:

A local government may enter into a contract for goods and services without first inviting written quotes or tenders if the contract is entered into under an LGA arrangement.

An LGA arrangement is defined as an arrangement that has been entered into by LGAQ Ltd, which is the case with LGM Assets.

Financial and Resource Implications:

As negotiations with LGM Assets have not yet taken place, financial implications are currently not known. Should negotiations result in a cost which is in excess of the current approved budget, Council will be asked to consider a budget revision.

The engagement of LGM Assets will be led by Council's Risk and Insurance Officer with support from the Contracts and Procurement Team in accordance with Council's Procurement Policy and Corporate Standard.

Our current budget for property insurances is \$573,000 which is in line with previous year insurance renewal costs.

Summary:

Nil.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

Negotiations with LGM Assets will commence in November 2020.

Attachments:

Nil.

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Manager Governance

S/1.10. OPERATIONAL PLAN - QUARTER 1 REPORT

Responsible Officer: General Manager Strategy and Transformation

Special Meeting Date: 2 November 2020

File Ref: CM14.2

Purpose:

To present the quarterly progress toward implementation of Gladstone Regional Council's 2020/21 Operational Plan for Quarter One - Quarter ending 30 September 2020.

Officer's Recommendation:

That the 2020/21 Operational Plan – Quarter 1 report be noted.

Background:

Endorsed 07 July 2020, the Operational Plan 2020/21 shows what activity is necessary to deliver on the vision and objectives contained in the Gladstone Regional Council Corporate Plan 2018-2023, which was adopted on 3 July 2018.

In accordance with requirements under s. 174(3) of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, the report for the quarter ending 30 September 2020 is presented for Council's information and provides an assessment of the organisation's progress toward the implementation of the action items.

For the 2020/21 year the intent is to incrementally improve our reporting each quarter towards a business summary report which highlights our overall performance, KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) and success stories which are tied to each strategic goal and the detailed performance of each Operational Plan action item.

Options, Risk and Opportunity Analysis:

The 2020/21 Operational Plan has been specifically developed with the underperformance of the last two year's plans in mind. Significant work has been undertaken to understand the high priority, substantial risk and high impact activity needed to continue us towards our Vision & Objectives detailed in the Corporate Plan 2018-2023.

As well as prioritising our activity, resources have been reviewed and support services such as the Transformation Program team allocated where relevant to ensure the best chance of success.

Improved project management tools and support have also been provided to the business to ensure the scope is clear, the outcomes and value are transparent and measurable, and that projects are set up for success from the beginning.

Operational Plan items are now reported monthly to the Executive Leadership team and a framework is in place for Project Managers to raise and rectify issues early. Items in the Operational Plan are communicated as the Council priorities and as such there is a clearer understanding of which projects our people should be spending their time on.

As a result of these improvements all items are currently On Track to be delivered by 30 June 2020 as agreed.

The image below shows Quarter One – September 2020 results.



Communication and Consultation:

Relevant Subject Matter Experts and levels of management have supplied the content for the attached report, which has then been reviewed and approved by the Executive Leadership team.

Legal Strategy and Policy Implications:

Section 174(3) *Local Government Regulation 2012* (Preparation and adoption of annual operational plan) states that: *The Chief Executive Officer must present a written assessment*

of the local government's progress towards implementing the annual operational plan at meetings of the local government held at regular intervals of not more than 3 months.

Financial and Resource Implications:

There are currently no projects that are projecting a need for increased funding to complete the activity.

Over the first quarter some projects have found the need for increased resources at different periods of the project. With our prioritised workplan and this forward view of impacts, our leaders, supported by the Executive Leadership team have been able to pivot resources where necessary to ensure all projects are on track.

Summary:

Improvements in the planning of the 2020/21 Operational Plan including a prioritised workplan as well as a focus on capability enhancements in Project Management for business-lead projects have seen a marked improvement in our performance year to date.

Monthly Reporting will provide the Executive Leadership team with the opportunity to identify issues and concerns and resolve them quickly, to ensure that items remain on track throughout the year and the value and benefits from each project are realised for the Community.

Anticipated Resolution Completion Date:

Not applicable – information report.

Attachments:

1. Operational Plan Quarterly Report – Q1 (2)

Tabled Items:

Nil.

Report Prepared by: Corporate Planning Business Partner

ATTACHMENTS