

MINUTES

Audit and Risk Committee

F22/55/05 – D24/38200

Date: Tuesday 16 July 2024 at 2pm
Venue: Council Chambers, 63 Miranda Street, Stratford

Present

Mr P Jones (the Chair), the District Mayor N C Volzke, Councillors: G W Boyde and V R Jones.

In attendance

The Deputy Mayor M McKay (*Part meeting*).

Councillors: S J Beck, E E Hall and A M C Dudley.

The Chief Executive – Mr S Hanne, the Director – Corporate Services – Ms T Radich, the Director – Assets – Mrs V Araba, the Acting Director – Community Services – Mrs E Bishop (*part meeting*), the Committee Secretary – Ms E Coulton, the Services Assets Manager – Mr J Cooper (*part meeting*), the Corporate Accountant – Mrs C Craig, the Projects Manager – Mr S Taylor, the Health and Safety/Emergency Management Advisor – Mr O Konkin (*part meeting*), and the Communications Manager – Ms G Gibson (*part meeting*).

Via Audio/Visual Link – Ms P Thomson and Mr L van der Walt (part meeting)

1. Welcome

The opening karakia was read.

The Chair welcomed the District Mayor, Councillors, staff and the media to the meeting.

The Chair reiterated the health and safety message and emergency procedures.

2. Apologies

An apology was received from Councillor J M S Erwood.

Recommendation

THAT the apologies be received.

VOLZKE/BOYDE
Carried
A&R/24/23

3. Announcements

Recommendation

THAT the tabled report be received.

P JONES/V JONES
Carried
A&R/24/24

4. Declarations of Members Interest

The Chair requested councillors to declare any real or perceived conflicts of interest relating to items on this agenda.

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

At this point in the meeting approval was given to move item 13 forward for discussion due to the availability of the external presenters.

13. Decision Report – Annual Report 2023/24 Administration Matters D24/33498 Page 72

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received including any tabled documents.
2. THAT the audited Annual Report 2023/24 for Stratford District Council be adopted no later than 31 December 2024, taking advantage of the extension under the Water Services Acts Repeals Act 2024.
3. THAT the audited Annual Report 2023/24 for Percy Thomson Trust be delivered to Council after the legislative deadline for Council Controlled Organisations of 30 September, but no later than 31 December 2024, in line with Council's Annual Report. A draft Annual Report 2023/24 must be provided to Council by 30 September 2024 and a final audited Annual Report by 30 November.
4. THAT the audit engagement letter and the Audit proposal letter be signed by the Chief Executive and the District Mayor when the negotiation of the fees have been undertaken.

BOYDE/McKAY
Carried
A&R/24/25

Recommended Reason

An extension for the adoption date for both Annual Reports is requested as a one-off for the 2023/24 year only.

The Director – Corporate Services noted:

- The late attachments to the item have been circulated via email on the 12th of July and include the audit proposal letter, the engagement letter and the planning report which have been provided by the auditors.
- This has been classified as a decision report as it contains a resolution to extend the timeline for the adoption of the audited Annual Report for Council and the delivery of the audited Annual Report for Percy Thomson Trust, due to the extension provided by legislation as a result of the Water Services Repeals Act.
- Council are wanting to take advantage of the extension for various reasons including resourcing over the next 5 months, asset revaluation for roading, 3 waters and the delay in the Long Term Plan adoption.
- It is looking likely that the auditing process on these documents will begin in October, in comparison to typical years where the process would begin in late July/early August.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The Chairman invited the auditors via audiovisual link to express their thoughts on the three circulated documents.
- Ms Thompson noted that she would like to begin by talking about the audit plan. She noted that page 6 of the audit plan highlights the main areas of focus within the audit process and emphasised that they remain largely unchanged to previous years focuses. However, she noted that there are aspects that are different to what has happened prior. She noted that a prime example of difference for this year is the valuation in assets due to Council recording their assets at fair value in accordance with the standards. An annual assessment needs to be undertaken for the movement and change in fair value on a cyclical basis, council has adopted this cycle as every 3 years. She expressed that this year is big year in terms of the full valuations. The roading valuation together with the 3 waters asset infrastructure valuations will also be undertaken and performed by BECA, she noted that Deloitte are responsible for reading the valuations, having touchpoints with the valuers and assessing the critical assumptions used in the valuations.
- Ms Thompson noted that within the last 2 financial years, there was an emphasis of matter surrounding 3 waters and the changes proposed. She expressed that she is aware that this is due to change again but has highlighted that this will most likely continue to have an emphasis of matter due to requiring clarity around what it will look like going forward.
- Mr. Van Der Walt emphasized that, for key focus areas, the statement of service performance, council's method of non-financial reporting, is crucial for all public sector entities, particularly in an LTP year. He outlined how auditors assess this by sampling what they determine to be key performance measures through a risk assessment process. This includes measures mandated by legislation as well as those decided by councillors. Once the measures are selected, auditors conduct a thorough review to understand the systems and processes behind the reporting. They test and evaluate the data used to ensure its accuracy before finalising their assessment.
- The Chairman noted that within the audit proposal the estimated hours have a large number of hours dedicated to revaluation. He expressed that the number of hours indicatively signalled to be spent on revaluation seems to be excessive, he sought clarification as to what is being planned for the auditing of the revaluation that will take up the estimated hours proposed. Mrs Thompson noted that she appreciates that 50 hours for each revaluation seems like a large number of hours allocated, but clarified that each revaluation has to go through 3 reviews at the auditors and that the 50 hours includes various aspects such as conversations with the valuer.
- The Chairman acknowledged that the work has to be reviewed 3 times as per Deloitte expectations but reiterated that it still seems like a rather large amount of time. Mrs Thompson noted that when creating the audit proposal they checked the proposed number against other councils revaluation hours to make sure it is consistent. It was clarified that the cross referencing of hours spent on revaluation were done on councils of similar size.
- Councillor Jones noted that in the key focus area it states each activity that is being audited, he asked if the committee would be able to receive a breakdown of the hours proposed for each aspect of the activity. Mrs Thompson noted that typically that information is not shared with the wider committee, but is happy to answer any specific questions regarding it. Councillor Jones asked as to why that information is not typically shared. Mrs Thompson noted that it is not just something that can be sent without having a conversation first. The Director – Corporate Services noted that in previous years there has been discussion of similar nature with a PowerPoint provided with a table of the breakdown of hours included, she expressed that this was helpful and maybe this could be explored to be done this year also. Mrs Thompson noted that this is something that can be provided to Mrs Radich and Mr Hanne.
- The Chairman noted that he is struggling with the cost of the audit, particularly for a small council. He noted that the \$250,000 proposed is just under 2% of Stratfords rates. He expressed that council has been asked to cut costs by a number of people and within the auditing space, all the council are seeing no efficiencies and more hours at higher costs than previous years. Mrs Thompson noted that this will be the third year doing SDCs audit and highlighted that within the audit proposal letter, there was a big difference in last years budgeted hours vs actual hours. She expressed that they are trying to keep down the hours as much as possible but due to the added revaluations this does add extra hours not seen last year. Mr Van Der Walt emphasised that these hours are just an estimate and that they do track as they go and he is happy to share this tracking of actual vs estimated as the auditing process goes

along to management. He emphasised that they are always trying to look for efficiencies throughout which is why they engage with management early.

- The Chairman noted that he is aware that Deloitte are wanting to have this discussion with management only but expressed that elected members need to understand it as well as management does. He noted that we are seeing a \$50,000 or 25% increase from the previous year and he is struggling with it. He asked the Chief Executive what happens if the committee do not agree with the fee. The Chief Executive noted that it would come down to the auditor general invoking relevant legislation.
- The Chairman asked if the OAG has signed off on the proposed fee. Mrs Thompson clarified that the OAG is in the process of reviewing the letter to give feedback so it has not been signed off as of yet.
- It was rediscussed as to why elected members are unable to be provided a breakdown of the hours spent on specific aspects of the areas of focus. It was clarified that Mrs Thompson will be able to provide Mrs Radich and Mr Hanne the information requested, but has to check with the OAG that the information can be distributed to the wider committee.
- The Chairman asked the Director – Corporate Services if there was anything else within her report that needed discussion. He noted that if there was nothing else to discuss should the committee consider adding in a fourth recommendation to allow the Chief Executive and the District Mayor to sign and approve the proposal letter when it comes back from the OAG. Agreeance was shared around the table.

Via Audio/Visual Link – Ms P Thomson and Mr L van der Walt left the meeting at 2.40 pm

- It was discussed that whilst audit fees are increasing, this is not an issue unique to Stratford District Council as many other Councils are experiencing the same. Councillor Boyde expressed that he acknowledges this, but when the fees are up 25% and the rates have had to go up 2% to compensate, it is difficult to remain positive.
- Councillor Hall noted that it does not feel like authentic accountability on the auditors part. She noted that they can do what they please and we have to agree to it because legally, we need to be audited. She further expressed that whilst we may raise areas of concern, it feels as if they do not take it into account as seriously as they could.

5. Attendance Schedule

Page 9

The attendance schedule for Audit and Risk Committee meetings was attached.

6. Programme of Works

D21/42807 Page 10

Recommendation

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee's rolling programme of works up to September 2025 be received. With amendments.

P JONES/BOYDE
Carried
A&R/24/26

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following:

- The annual report update has been brought forward from September.
- Insurance renewal is currently underway so that needs to be brought forward.
- The internal audit report is to be pushed out to November.
- Reminder that this is the opportunity for any committee members to add something to the programme of works.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The Chairman noted that on the programme of works, there is no mention of a risks deep dive into 3 waters. He expressed that due to the potential bill this should be brought to the September meeting. The Chief Executive noted that the elected members will be invited to a workshop in the near future to discuss the options we have in front of us, he expressed that because it is externally controlled he is unsure as to when and what will brought forward to elected members. He noted that he believes that the risk environment has not changed since the last one. The Chief Executive noted that after the workshop, it is anticipated that multiple reports should be formally brought to elected members that will delve into multiple risks, he also noted that we have committed to the community in the Long Term Plan stating that we will not make any decisions on three waters until we consult with them. The Chairman expressed that he is interested in seeing a report with an extract of the key risks associated with the decision to date and the potential emerging risks that need to be considered.
- The District Mayor suggested that if a report should be provided by the Chief Executive regarding the risk of 3 waters, stranded overheads should be included. Councillor Hall sought clarification as to what stranded overheads are. The Chief Executive noted that each activity has associated costs which create overheads. It was explained that if 3 waters is being removed, we will lose aspects of overheads such as vehicles and staff members, he noted that some costs will be scalable and others will require to be distributed. The District Mayor reiterated this by expressing that a cost without a home, is a stranded overhead.
- Councillor Boyde noted that we are looking at training to take place in October 2025, he asked if this needs to be added to the programme of works. The Director – Corporate Services noted that she already has it recorded.

7. Confirmation of Minutes

- a. **Audit and Risk Committee – 21 May 2024**
D24/12999 Page 11

Recommendation

THAT the minutes of the Audit and Risk Meeting, including the public excluded section, held on Tuesday 21 May 2024 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

McKAY/VOLZKE
Carried
A&R/24/27

8. Matters Outstanding
D18/27474 Page 18

Recommendation

THAT the matters outstanding be received.

BOYDE/JONES
Carried
A&R/24/28

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

McKAY/JONES
Carried
A&R/24/29

Questions/Points of clarification:

- Councillor Boyde noted that section 4.4 notes incidents in relation to threatening and aggressive behaviour to staff, he highlighted that this is currently a growing widespread issue with increasing incident numbers and asked as to how the Council is mitigating the risk to staff. The Health and Safety/Emergency Management Advisor noted that is a challenging area as we can't eliminate the full risk in terms of the staff's connection to the public within those public facing roles. He noted that we currently provide de-escalation training and a number of other mitigation processes, but struggles to see as to what else can be done at this current time to further decrease the risk.
- Councillor Jones questioned if the Chair is aware of any prosecutions that have been filed on the basis of threatening behaviour to council staff at other councils throughout the country. The Chair clarified that he is only aware of one council where prosecution has been successful but noted that he is aware of multiple trespassing's at multiple councils, including SDC.
- The Chair noted that under section 4.1 contractor incidents and accidents, recent actions undertaken, it notes ongoing site audits. He suggested that it may be beneficial for the number to be listed. The Health and Safety/Emergency Management Advisor noted that the number of site visits conducted are noted in the report in a different section. The Chair expressed that he is aware of this but notes that having it under the recent actions undertaken section of the report will make it stand out and easily accessible. The Health and Safety/Emergency Management Advisor noted this.
- The Chief Executive noted that elected members have expressed that they would like to see a list of emerging risks based off incidents that have appeared in other council spaces within the report.
- Councillor Hall expressed that collaboration on this list may be helpful, to get input from the District Mayor and the Chair as to what they may have seen as well.
- Councillor Boyde asked what D4H training is. The Health and Safety/Emergency Management Advisor clarified that it is the computer software used for Civil Defence operations.

The Health and Safety/Emergency Management Advisor left the meeting at 3.02 pm.

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

Recommended Reason

To provide an update to the Audit and Risk Committee of any risk events or threats in relation to significant risks on Council's risk register, as part of Council's risk management processes.

McKAY/VOLZKE
Carried
A&R/24/30

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following:

- The report indicates Stratford District Council significant risks.
- The report notes a server failure, clarified that the incident was a non-event but is included in the report for future monitoring purposes.
- Typically, an update is provided on government legislation and the impact on local councils but this has not been included in the most recent report. She updated the committee and notified them that the local government review has been abandoned and a number of reviews are being conducted such as the public works act and the building control act.
- We are seeing more work on three waters regionally on shared services and councils have been asked to contribute financially and in terms of resourcing. She noted that this is something we need to be mindful of the risks and benefits associated with it. The Chief Executive clarified that it is not just regional work around three waters, but it is also work around a handful of activities. The Director – Corporate Services noted that NPDC have been driving this regional exploration of shared services and it has been identified as a risk by The Director - Corporate Services.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The District Mayor noted some recent changes to policy that affect risk 78, Government Policy Impacting on Local Government. He listed off a number of policy changes that will have major financial implications, Waka Kotahi Emergency Works, Waka Kotahi Minor Works, Waka Kotahi Uneconomic Roads and Waka Kotahi Resilience Following Major Disasters. He expressed that collectively the changes to those policies collate to over \$100 million a year and is something that it is an ongoing worry and suspects that there is more to come.
- The Chairman noted that he has seen discussion on changing how building inspections are being done. The District Mayor noted that whilst the new laws surrounding granny flats may be good for those building them, they are not great for councils due to no longer requiring building consents. The Chairman noted that granny flats have a high capital value, he highlighted that if these are not requiring building consents, how are they being rated?
- The District Mayor noted that this is called a SUIP. He questioned as to how we are identifying SUIP, particularly new SUIPs, he noted that we currently have a system that identifies some but not all. He mentioned that he has seen a growing number of sleepouts, large caravans and other similar non-permanent housing arrangements on people's properties. He noted that we need to consider investigating a system to put in place to identify and define what a SUIP is.
- Councillor Jones expressed that risk 72 notes the mitigation of the risk of elected members and their decision making, he noted that the mitigation of this risk is jeopardised, and the risk factor is increased when elected members have rushed decisions to make and not all the information has been presented to them. Councillor Jones used the pedestrian crossing as an example as to where risk has been heightened within decision making. He also pointed out that the risk is further heightened when officers verbally note the expected outcome of a situation, but the actual physical outcome does not align. This discrepancy can lead to uncertainty about whether the decision was correct due to the potential misjudgement in verbal response.
- The Chief Executive noted that he fully agrees that the shortened processes can create a heightened risk. He noted that before elected members are willing to go into the decision making process it is important that they ask all of the necessary questions. He expressed that if points of conversation are an important part of the decision, it needs to be added into the resolution, as resolutions are the only binding items. The Chief Executive reiterated that the mitigation of the risk comes from asking an adequate number of questions to make an informed decision and adding important governance matters into the resolution.
- Councillor Boyde expressed that he shares Councillor Jones concern surrounding short timeframes for decisions. He noted that elected members do tend to ask a substantial amount of questions but sometimes receive two different answers, he used the pedestrian crossing as an example of this. He highlighted that within the pedestrian crossing decision making process, parameters changed without warning and extra options were added for consideration without consulting elected members in a meeting space. The understanding of the tight timeline was expressed but he noted that the inconsistency in information across the two meetings made it more difficult for elected members to make an informed decision.
- The Chief Executive clarified that the officer genuinely gave elected members the options as to what was on offer and the parameters associated with it based on the information provided by NZTA at that moment in time. SDC contacted NZTA after public consultation to see if any further

options could be explored based on the feedback received and they gave extra options and more relaxed parameters. The Chief Executive noted that we were trying to deliver on what was expressed by the community. He also expressed that there was an option to not take the funding due to the timeline being tight, but elected members decided to move forward with the decision making process.

- The District Mayor expressed that initially, SDC were told the pedestrian crossings were to be in between the two roundabouts but changed their plans based on the community feedback. He highlighted that this was a decision from NZTA not the officer. The District Mayor also noted that the extra options were based off the community consultation. He noted that he does not see it as a criticism but sees it as the council listening to the community.

11. Information Report – Procurement Policy Review
D24/33615 Page 37

Recommendations

1. THAT the report be received.
2. THAT the proposed amendments to the Procurement Policy be reviewed by the Committee, with appropriate consideration given to procurement risks.

BOYDE/JONES
Carried
A&R/24/31

Recommended Reason

Feedback by the Committee on the proposals for amendments to the policy will contribute to a final draft policy that will be presented to the Policy and Services Committee in August.

The Director - Corporate Services noted the following:

- This policy was brought to Audit and Risk Committee to place a risk lense over the policy and make sure that any amendments that have been proposed are not exposing the council to any new risks as the policy is identified as a higher risk policy.
- The policy has been presented to a select few staff members for consultation and their views have been collated and placed into a draft updated policy.
- They are wanting feedback from the committee on what they would like added and removed from the draft.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- The District Mayor expressed that a proposed change within the policy that he likes is the unbundling of contracts to make it easier for local contractors to get council work. He noted that whilst it may be more expensive to have multiple smaller contracts instead of one, it will help grow small businesses and keep the money in the region which are two major positives. The District Mayor also noted that he likes the section of the policy that gives capacity to Māori business, he expressed that it aligns well with some tasks that have come up within the community wellbeing.
- Councillor Beck noted that he too was also excited to read that and it is a great addition to the policy. He expressed that it empowers local business and shows the councils support.
- Councillor Jones noted that it mentions about advertising on the website, he expressed that he likes this idea so people are able to access and see what the council is up to. He questioned as to how many contracts SDC have had that are over \$250,000, due to the fact the financial delegation section states that these should be brought forward to Policy and Services meetings however, he does not recall any instances where this has happened. The Chairman noted that he has a question to add to this question, he asked as to why there are delegations within this

policy as typically these two things are separate as delegations tend to be easier to update than policy.

- The Director – Assets answered Councillor Jones’s question, she noted that all large contracts have been obtained several years ago. She noted that they are placed into the asset report.
- Councillor Jones asked if when the contract gets placed into the report, if it is just the price or if who has won the contract is added as well. The Chief Executive noted because we are transparent to the unsuccessful tenderers on who has won the contract, we are able to put this within our reports.
- The Chairman expressed that his personal preference is that delegations do not belong within a policy. The Chief executive noted that he believes this is not a delegation, he believes that its intention is to provide guidance during the process. The Director – Corporate Services has been tasked to alter the wording within the policy to make this clear.
- The District Mayor noted when looking at this policy from a risk perspective, a substantial risk surrounding procurement is fraud and other similar matters. He noted that when looking at our safeguarding protocols he believes that we have adequate risk protection.
- The Chairman noted that within the policy he did not see a mention of the utilization of a probity auditor, he noted that it should be discussed as to when, what and how a probity auditor should be considered as getting a contract wrong poses a significant risk to council in terms of financials.
- The Chairman noted that something that he believes requires more work is the refining of the definition of the term whole of life costs. The Director – Corporate Services noted that she will refine the definition. The Director – Corporate Services clarified that there is also a procurement manual that sits under the policy.
- Councillor Jones noted that item 12 has a series of xx next to it, he asked if this was meant for elected members to provide feedback on. There was discussion surrounding the dollar value that should be allocated to item 12 and the Chairman noted that his recommendation is to leave it at \$25,000 so it is consistent with the act.

12. Information Report – LTP 2024-34 Debrief
D24/33297 Page 60

Recommendation

THAT the report be received.

McKAY/BOYDE
Carried
A&R/24/32

Recommended Reason

To present to the Audit and Risk Committee an internal assessment of the development of the Long Term Plan 2024-34 and any associated learnings.

The Director – Corporate Services noted the following:

- There have been a lot of improvements since the last debrief in 2021. Despite adopting the LTP a month later, our processes were better throughout the duration of the LTP process.
- The overall goal of the LTP was to make sure that every decision made links back to our community outcomes. She clarified that Iwi did contribute in the creation of the community outcomes but did not have direct input into the LTP.
- The debrief aims to capture the strengths and weaknesses found within the LTP process. She noted that it would be helpful for elected members to provide feedback that can be of use in the next LTP year.
- A weakness indicated within the debrief is that a significant portion of time was allocated to lower priority items and other higher priority items were given less time.

Questions/Points of Clarification:

- Councillor Jones noted that it was a well captured debrief.
- The District Mayor agreed with Councillor Jones as to how well captured the debrief was. He noted that one comment that caught his eye was noted in weakness and it mentioned that there were too many workshops that delved into too much detail and the process was weighed down with focus on low level expenditure. He highlighted that this tends to lead elected members to make rushed decisions on high level expenditure having spent too much time on seemingly trivial activities.
- The Chairman commended council as they did well to only miss the deadline by a small amount of time, he expressed that he knows of a number of councils that have had their dates moved significantly.
- The Chairman identified a risk within the LTP process undertaken by council. He noted that the use of spreadsheets is a risk, he used an example to back this up. He suggested that based on the level of expected change within local government in the next 3 – 6 years, it may be a worthwhile investment to look into new software. The Director - Corporate Services noted that whilst it is good to take a step back and look at the recommendations that are coming through, it is important to highlight that our current spreadsheet system is an asset that has been refined over the years and is free. She expressed that if we were to purchase software there would be an upfront capital cost and an ongoing lease cost, she highlighted that we would be paying a lot more for the same result as auditors have not found a problem with our current system. The Chairman noted that in future if SDC are to continue using the current system, he would like to see an outline as to how we are mitigating the associated risks.
- Councillor Boyde noted that it mentions within the debrief that Diligence files are to be uploaded on the Friday before a meeting/workshop, he was under the impression that it was a Thursday. He also noted that he has had multiple instances where he has received files the day or night before a meeting, he expressed that this makes it hard to make an informed decision. The Director – Corporate Services explained that legislation requires agendas and supporting documents to be provided by Thursday for meetings and Friday at the latest for workshops. She noted that Officers are trying to find a balance of what reports are urgent and need to be tabled and what can be brought up later.
- Councillor Hall noted that whilst she was not a part of the last LTP decision making process where items were discussed based on activity, she enjoyed going through the capital but suggested to mitigate the rushed decisions towards the end and the time allocated to lesser important items, maybe the process should loop back to activities nearing the closing of the process to tie it up.
- The Deputy Mayor noted that when analysing the report from a risk perspective, a risk she identified that should be noted in the report were the multiple meetings that ended at 9/10 pm at night. She expressed that in future LTP discussions this needs to be avoided at all costs as it is unfair and this needs to be highlighted in the report for future reference.
- The Deputy Mayor also noted that within the strengths column business cases for significant expenditure was listed, she expressed that she marginally disagrees with this. She noted that when the business cases were received there was a question of what was the alternative and for a majority, there was none. She reminded elected members of the roading report that was received that was well done, she highlighted that this report had the consequences associated with each level of budget that may be allocated based on elected members decisions. She noted that it would be good to see a tiered system within other business cases like this, as it made allocating budget to roading really easy. The Director – Corporate Services noted that she will add this to the opportunity for improvement within the debrief.

The Deputy Mayor left the meeting at 4.05 pm.

14. Correspondence

7.1 Letter to Stakeholders to Accompany 2024-27 Statement of Intent – LGFA

- The Director - Corporate Services noted that this correspondence is an update on the Statement of Intent from LGFA, forecasting the next 3 years.

7.2 Percy Thomson – Audit Matters

- The Director - Corporate Services noted that this is in response to the request made via the Audit and Risk Committee to the Percy Thomson Trust about auditing matters. She noted that there has been no response received from the Trust as of yet.
- Councillor Hall noted that the Trust has until the 19th of July to provide a response. The Chairman further noted that this is 3 days away.
- Councillor Boyde questioned as to how the response will be circulated once received. The Chief Executive noted that it will be placed in correspondence.
- It was discussed and decided to place this on Matters Outstanding.

18. Resolution to Exclude the Public

Recommendation

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

Agenda Item No: 19

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

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution to each matter	Grounds under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Insurance Framework and options	The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information <i>and</i> to enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist, under section 6 and section 7 of the Act - specifically Section 7(2)(b)(ii) and Section 7(2)(h). (Section 48(1)(a) Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

BOYDE/P JONES
Carried
A&R/24/33

19. Public Excluded Item

Recommendation

THAT the open meeting resume.

P JONES/BOYDE
Carried
A&R/24/35

15. General Business

There was no general business.

16. Questions

There were no questions.

17. Closing Karakia

D21/40748 Page 83

The Closing karakia was read.

The meeting closed at 4.52pm.

P Jones
Chairman

Confirmed this 17th day of September 2024.

N C Volzke
District Mayor