

Theme 1: Early Intervention, Effective Regulation and Stronger Penalties

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
1.1 Early Intervention Powers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Act provides the means to regulate the conduct of local government staff and council members and sets out powers to scrutinise the affairs of local government. The Act provides certain limited powers to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suspend or dismiss councils ○ Appoint Commissioners ○ Suspend or, order remedial action (such as training) for individual councillors. • The Act also provides the Director General with the power to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conduct Authorised Inquiries ○ Refer allegations of serious or recurrent breaches to the State Administrative Tribunal ○ Commence prosecution for an offence under the Act. • Authorised Inquiries are a costly and a relatively slow response to significant issues. Authorised Inquiries are currently the only significant tool for addressing significant issues within a local government. • The Panel Report, City of Perth Inquiry, and the Select Committee Report made various recommendations related to the establishment of a specific office for local government oversight. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed to establish a Chief Inspector of Local Government (the Inspector), supported by an Office of the Local Government Inspector (the Inspectorate). • The Inspector would receive minor and serious complaints about elected members. • The Inspector would oversee complaints relating to local government CEOs. • Local Governments would still be responsible for dealing with minor behavioural complaints. • The Inspector would have powers of a standing inquiry, able to investigate and intervene in any local government where potential issues are identified. • The Inspector would have the authority to assess, triage, refer, investigate, or close complaints, having regard to various public interest criteria – considering laws such as the <i>Corruption, Crime and Misconduct Act 2003</i>, the <i>Occupational Safety and Health Act 1984</i>, the <i>Building Act 2011</i>, and other legislation. • The Inspector would have powers to implement minor penalties for less serious breaches of the Act, with an appeal mechanism. • The Inspector would also have the power to order a local government to address non-compliance with the Act or Regulations. • The Inspector would be supported by a panel of Local Government Monitors (see item 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u></p> <p>Items 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 generally align with WALGA Advocacy Position 2.6.8 - ‘Establish Office of Independent Assessor’</p> <p><i>The Local Government sector supports:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Establishing an Office of the Independent Assessor to replace the Standards Panel to provide an independent body to receive, investigate and assess complaints against Elected Members and undertake inquiries.</i> 2. <i>Remove the CEO from being involved in processing complaints.</i> 3. <i>That an early intervention framework of monitoring to support Local Governments be provided with any associated costs to be the responsibility of the State Government.</i> 4. <i>An external oversight model for local level behavioural complaints made under Council Member, Committee Member and Candidate Codes of Conduct, that is closely aligned to the Victorian Councillor Complaints Framework.</i> <p>Comment</p> <p>The Local Government sector is in favour of early intervention and a swift response to potentially disruptive or dysfunctional behaviours. The Proposed Reforms state ‘Local Governments would still be responsible for dealing with minor behavioural complaints’ and therefore do not go as</p>

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>1.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing Local Government Standards Panel would be replaced with a new Conduct Panel (see item 1.3). • Penalties for breaches to the Local Government Act and Regulations will be reviewed and are proposed to be generally strengthened (see item 1.4). • These reforms would be supported by new powers to more quickly resolve issues within local government (see items 1.5 and 1.6). 	<p>far as the Sector’s recent request for an external oversight model for the independent assessment of local level complaints (State Council Res: 264.5/2021 – September 2021). However this will be mitigated with the Inspector able to respond to a Local Government having unresolved matters by appointing a monitor to assist the Local Government.</p> <p>It is expected the Local Government Inspector would be funded by the State Government, however it is noted that the cost of the Local Government Monitors and the Conduct Panel would be borne by the Local Government concerned.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the proposed reforms as they align with the sectors position on external oversight and support. 2. Request the Minister to explore alternate mechanisms for resolving local level complaints. <p>The City of Kwinana supports the comments of WALGA and makes the following additional points for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recently enacted <i>Local Government (Model Code of Conduct) Regulations 2021</i> required all local governments to expend resources implementing a mandatory Code of Conduct directed at Elected Members, in addition to a complaints management policy.

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>Any proposed reform to this area should, as far as practicable, aim to minimise the resourcing obligations on respective local governments for implementing such changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information should be provided to local governments to facilitate feedback in relation to the types of complaints intended to still be dealt with internally by local governments versus those which are proposed to be handled by either the Inspector or Standards Panel (to be renamed as a Conduct Panel). The City considers that lower level complaints should continue to be handled internally by local governments, potentially with a mechanism to appeal to the Inspector or Conduct Panel. Having to provide information and respond to external bodies in relation to relatively minor complaints (as occurs presently with complaints to the Ombudsman, for example), is likely to create additional workload and use greater resources than simply allowing local governments to address such complaint internally in the first instance. • In relation to funding, it is important to the sector that clarification be provided as to how Monitors and the Conduct Panel are proposed to be funded by local government. Consideration should be given as to a cost sharing arrangement between local governments, with the intention of avoiding individual local governments being faced with significant expenditure.
<p>1.2 Local Government Monitors</p>		

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently no legislative powers for the provision of monitors/ temporary advisors. • The DLGSC provides support and advice to local governments, however there is no existing mechanism for pre-qualified, specialised assistance to manage complex cases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A panel of Local Government Monitors would be established. • Monitors could be appointed by the Inspector to go into a local government and try to resolve problems. • The purpose of Monitors would be to proactively fix problems, rather than to identify blame or collect evidence. • Monitors would be qualified specialists, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Experienced and respected former Mayors, Presidents, and CEOs - to act as mentors and facilitators ○ Dispute resolution experts - to address the breakdown of professional working relationships ○ Certified Practising Accountants and other financial specialists - to assist with financial management and reporting issues ○ Governance specialists and lawyers - to assist councils resolve legal issues ○ HR and procurement experts - to help with processes like recruiting a CEO or undertaking a major land transaction. • Only the Inspector would have the power to appoint Monitors. • Local governments would be able to make requests to the Inspector to appoint Monitors for a specific purpose. <p>Monitor Case Study 1 – Financial Management The Inspector receives information that a local government is not collecting rates correctly under the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>. Upon initial review, the Inspector identifies that there may be a problem. The Inspector appoints a Monitor who specialises in financial management in local</p>	<p>As above</p> <p>As above, noting that the role of the Monitor is similar to the Mentor Program already provided by WALGA. The City is supportive of such proposal provided there is no requirement for the cost of Monitors to be met by local governments or their elected members.</p>

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>government. The Monitor visits the local government and identifies that the system used to manage rates is not correctly issuing rates notices. The Monitor works with the local government to rectify the error, and issue corrections to impacted ratepayers.</p> <p>Monitor Case Study 2 – Dispute Resolution The Inspector receives a complaint from one councillor that another councillor is repeatedly publishing derogatory personal attacks against another councillor on social media, and that the issue has not been able to be resolved at the local government level. The Inspector identifies that there has been a relationship breakdown between the two councillors due to a disagreement on council.</p> <p>The Inspector appoints a Monitor to host mediation sessions between the councillors. The Monitor works with the councillors to address the dispute. Through regular meetings, the councillors agree to a working relationship based on the council's code of conduct. After the mediation, the Monitor occasionally makes contact with both councillors to ensure there is a cordial working relationship between the councillors.</p>	
1.3 Conduct Panel		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Government Standards Panel was established in 2007 to resolve minor breach complaints relatively quickly and provide the sector with guidance and benchmarks about acceptable standards of behaviour. Currently, the Panel makes findings about alleged breaches based on written submissions. The City of Perth Inquiry report made various recommendations that functions of the Local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Standards Panel is proposed to be replaced with a new Local Government Conduct Panel. The Conduct Panel would be comprised of suitably qualified and experienced professionals. Sitting councillors will not be eligible to serve on the Conduct Panel. The Inspector would provide evidence to the Conduct Panel for adjudication. The Conduct Panel would have powers to 	<p>As above</p> <p>As above, noting that as the conduct panel has the power to impose such strong penalties, the person subject to the complaint should be provided the opportunity to have a support person when addressing the Conduct Panel. Such support should have the ability to make submissions of the respondent's behalf should they be unable to do so themselves and possess legal qualifications</p>

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<p>Government Standards Panel be reformed.</p>	<p>impose stronger penalties – potentially including being able to suspend councillors for up to three months, with an appeal mechanism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For very serious or repeated breaches of the Local Government Act, the Conduct Panel would have the power to recommend prosecution through the courts. • Any person who is subject to a complaint before the Conduct Panel would have the right to address the Conduct Panel before the Panel makes a decision. 	<p>and/or experience.</p> <p>An example of where this should occur is instances where a respondent is not very articulate or suffers from a mental illness or anxiety which could cause distress if they were to appear before the Panel unrepresented.</p> <p>Consideration should be given as to who should be responsible for funding a support person, where one is deemed appropriate.</p>
<p>1.4 Review of Penalties</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently limited penalties in the Act for certain types of non-compliance with the Local Government Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Penalties for breaching the Local Government Act are proposed to be strengthened. • It is proposed that the suspension of councillors (for up to three months) is established as the main penalty where a councillor breaches the Local Government Act or Regulations on more than one occasion. • Councillors who are disqualified would not be eligible for sitting fees or allowances. They will also not be able to attend meetings, or use their official office (such as their title or council email address). • It is proposed that a councillor who is suspended multiple times may become disqualified from office. • Councillors who do not complete mandatory training within a certain timeframe will also not be able to receive sitting fees or allowances. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Items 1.4 and 1.5 <u>expand upon</u> Advocacy Position 2.6.9 - 'Stand Down Proposal'</p> <p><i>WALGA supports, in principle, a proposal for an individual elected member to be 'stood down' from their duties when they are under investigation, have been charged, or when their continued presence prevents Council from properly discharging its functions or affects the Council's reputation, subject to further policy development work being undertaken. Further policy development of the Stand Down Provisions must involve active consultation with WALGA and specific consideration of the following issues of concern to the Sector:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Department of Local Government endeavour to ensure established principles of natural justice and procedural fairness are embodied in all aspects of the proposed Stand

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p><i>Down Provisions; and</i></p> <p>2. <i>That activities associated with the term ‘disruptive behaviour’, presented as reason to stand down a defined Elected Member on the basis their continued presence may make a Council unworkable, are thoroughly examined and clearly identified to ensure there is awareness, consistency and opportunity for avoidance.</i></p> <p>Comment The Local Government sector has long-standing advocacy positions supporting stronger penalties as a deterrent to disruptive Council Member behaviours. Clear guidance will be required to ensure there is consistent application of the power given to Presiding Members.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the above comments of WALGA, with particular emphasis on the ability to standing down Elected Members in instances of repeated conduct breaches or when their conduct brings Council into disrepute (including through social media).</p> <p>Care should be taken to avoid the potential for inconsistent or subjective application of such power by local governments.</p>
1.5 Rapid Red Card Resolutions		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, local governments have different local laws and standing orders that govern the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that Standing Orders are made consistent across Western Australia (see item 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City supports Mayors having the ability to</p>

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<p>way meetings run. Presiding members (Mayors and Presidents) are reliant on the powers provided in the local government standing orders local laws.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences between local governments is a source of confusion about the powers that presiding members have to deal with disruptive behaviours at council meetings. • Disruptive behaviour at council meetings is a very common cause of complaints. Having the Presiding Member be able to deal with these problems should more quickly resolve problems that occur at council meetings. 	<p>2.6). Published recordings of all meetings would also become standard (item 3.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed that Presiding Members have the power to “red card” any attendee (including councillors) who unreasonably and repeatedly interrupt council meetings. This power would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Require the Presiding Member to issue a clear first warning ○ If the disruptions continue, the Presiding Member will have the power to “red card” that person, who must be silent for the rest of the meeting. A councillor issued with a red card will still vote, but must not speak or move motions ○ If the person continues to be disruptive, the Presiding Member can instruct that they leave the meeting. • Any Presiding Member who uses the “red card” or ejection power will be required to notify the Inspector. • Where an elected member refuses to comply with an instruction to be silent or leave, or where it can be demonstrated that the presiding member has not followed the law in using these powers, penalties can be imposed through a review by the Inspector. 	<p>address disruptive councillors, noting however there is the potential for such power to be misused and applied where it is not fair and reasonable in the circumstances.</p> <p>Care should be taken to ensure a sufficiently comprehensive definition of “unreasonably and repeatedly interrupt” in order to avoid the potential for inconsistent or subjective application of such power by local governments.</p> <p>The term “red card” is associated with sporting events and is not seen as being consistent with the professional image the City seeks to portray in relation to the conduct of its meetings. Consideration should be given to an alternative term.</p>
<p>1.6 Vexatious Complaint Referrals</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No current provisions. • The Act already provides a requirement for Public Question Time at council meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local governments already have a general responsibility to provide ratepayers and members of the public with assistance in responding to queries about the local government’s operations. Local governments should resolve queries and complaints in a respectful, transparent and equitable manner. • Unfortunately, local government resources can become unreasonably diverted when a 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Item 1.6 expands upon Advocacy Position 2.6.11 – ‘Vexatious complainants in relation to FOI applications’</p> <p><i>WALGA advocates for the Freedom of Information Act 1992 (WA) to be reviewed, including consideration of:</i></p>

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>person makes repeated vexatious queries, especially after a local government has already provided a substantial response to the person's query.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that if a person makes repeated complaints to a local government CEO that are vexatious, the CEO will have the power to refer that person's complaints to the Inspectorate, which after assessment of the facts may then rule the complaint vexatious. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Enabling the Information Commissioner to declare vexatious applicants similar to the provisions of section 114 of the Right to Information Act 2009 (QLD);</i> <i>Enabling an agency to recover reasonable costs incurred through the processing of a Freedom of Information access application where the application is subsequently withdrawn; and</i> <i>Modernisation to address the use of electronic communications and information.</i> <p>Comment The Act has been expanded significantly in recent years to permit an increased level of public involvement, scrutiny and access to information relating to the decisions, operations and affairs of Local Government in WA. Introducing a means to limit capacity for unreasonable complainants to negatively impact Local Governments will provide a necessary balance between the openness and transparency of the sector and the reasonable entitlement of citizens to interact with their Local Government.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City is supportive of implementing a consistent approach between local governments in relation to handling of vexatious complainants. However, consideration should be given to a tiered approach such that CEOs should retain the ability to declare a complainant as vexatious, with complainants having a right to appeal such decision to the Inspector within a set timeframe. Such approach would minimise resources</p>

Local Government Reform – City of Kwinana Submissions

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>required by the Inspector to investigate and respond to each instance a complainant is declared vexatious. Particularly on the basis that no data exists to suggest that the wrongful declaration of complainants as vexatious by CEOs is a widespread issue amongst local governments.</p>
<p>1.7 Minor Other Reforms</p>		

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other minor reforms are being considered to enhance the oversight of local government. Ministerial Circulars have traditionally been used to provide guidance to the local government sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential other reforms to strengthen guidance for local governments are being considered. For example, one option being considered is the potential use of sector-wide guidance notices. Guidance notices could be published by the Minister or Inspector, to give specific direction for how local governments should meet the requirements of the Local Government Act and Regulations. For instance, the Minister could publish guidance notices to clarify the process for how potential conflicts of interests should be managed. It is also proposed (see item 1.1) that the Inspector has the power to issue notices to individual local governments to require them to rectify non-compliance with the Act or Regulations. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Item 1.7 aligns with Advocacy Position 2.6 - 'Support DLGSC as service provider / capacity builder'</p> <p><i>WALGA supports the continuance of the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries as a direct service provider of compliance and recommend the Department fund its capacity building role through the utilisation of third party service providers. In addition, WALGA calls on the State Government to ensure there is proper resourcing of the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries to conduct timely inquiries and interventions when instigated under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995.</i></p> <p>Comment Operational guidance from the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries leads to consistent understanding and application of statutory provisions by Local Government. The proposed reform that the Inspector issue non-compliance notices appears to replicate the Minister's powers under Section 9.14A – 'Notice to prevent continuing contravention'</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA, though recommends consideration be given to guidance notices being prepared by former CEOs and experts with practical expertise in the administration of local governments.</p>

CURRENT PROVISIONS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>In relation to Inspector issued notices, further information is required in order for the City to provide a substantive response. However, consideration should be given as to appropriate timeframes and penalties for non-compliance, which should correlate to the nature and severity of the non-compliance.</p>

Theme 2: Reducing Red Tape, Increasing Consistency and Simplicity

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
2.1 Resource Sharing		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Act does not currently include specific provisions to allow for certain types of resource sharing – especially for sharing CEOs. Regional local governments would benefit from having clearer mechanisms for voluntary resource-sharing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are proposed to encourage and enable local governments, especially smaller regional local governments, to share resources, including Chief Executive Officers and senior employees. Local governments in bands 2, 3 or 4 would be able to appoint a shared CEO at up to two salary bands above the highest band. For example, a band 3 and a band 4 council sharing a CEO could remunerate to the level of band 1. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Item 2.1 aligns with Advocacy Position 2.6 – Local Government Legislation – ‘Avoid red tape and ‘de-clutter’ the extensive regulatory regime that underpins the Local Government Act’ and Advocacy Position 2.3.1 - ‘Regional Collaboration’.</p> <p><i>Local Governments should be empowered to form single and joint subsidiaries, and beneficial enterprises. In addition, compliance requirements of Regional Councils should be reviewed and reduced.</i></p> <p>Comment The proposed reforms will rely upon statutory provisions that enable and enhance regional collaboration. Recent over-regulation of Regional Subsidiaries in 2016 resulted in no subsidiaries being formed since that time.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City agrees with the comments of WALGA in relation to over-regulation. The City further notes there is no legislative barrier to local governments sharing resources presently. Any reform in this area should therefore focus on greater encouragement of local governments to do so.</p>
2.2 Standardisation of Crossovers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approvals and standards for crossovers (the section of driveways that run between 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed to amend the <i>Local Government (Uniform Local Provisions)</i> 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Comment</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<p>the kerb and private property) are inconsistent between local government areas, often with very minor differences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This can create confusion and complexity for homeowners and small businesses in the construction sector. 	<p><i>Regulations 1996</i> to standardise the process for approving crossovers for residential properties and residential developments on local roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Crossover Working Group has provided preliminary advice to the Minister and DLGSC to inform this. The DLGSC will work with the sector to develop standardised design and construction standards. 	<p>WALGA developed the Template Crossover Guideline and Specification resource in 2017 and have been part of the Minister’s working group on red tape reduction that has been looking at standardisation of crossovers.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City has no position with respect to the standardisation of crossover requirements. However, consideration should be given to removing the requirement of local governments to contribute to crossovers. This is on the basis that such expenditure provides no benefit to the greater community.</p>
<p>2.3 Introduce Innovation Provisions</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> currently has very limited provisions to allow for innovations and responses to emergencies to (such as the Shire of Bruce Rock Supermarket). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New provisions are proposed to allow exemptions from certain requirements of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>, for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short-term trials and pilot projects Urgent responses to emergencies. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u></p> <p>There is currently no advocacy position in relation to Item 2.3.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>It is arguable communities expect all levels of Government will apply innovative solutions to complex and emerging issues difficult to resolve by traditional means. Exemptions constructed with appropriate checks and balances, particularly where expenditure of public funds are concerned, has potential to facilitate efficient and effective outcomes.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City suggests an allowance be given for</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>greater flexibility of oversight where appropriate. For example, in the event of an emergency local governments might be granted the ability to override the need for planning requests.</p> <p>Consideration should further be given to allowing local governments to maintain an interest in corporations in certain circumstances.</p>
<p>2.4 Streamline Local Laws</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local laws are required to be reviewed every eight years. The review of local laws (especially when they are standard) has been identified as a burden for the sector. Inconsistency between local laws is frustrating for residents and business stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that local laws would only need to be reviewed by the local government every 15 years. Local laws not reviewed in the timeframe would lapse, meaning that old laws will be automatically removed and no longer applicable. Local governments adopting Model Local Laws will have reduced advertising requirements. 	<p>Current Local Government Position Items 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 expand upon Advocacy Position 2.6.35 - 'Local law-making process should be simplified'.</p> <p><i>The Local Law making process should be simplified as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The requirement to give state-wide notice should be reviewed, with consideration given to Local Governments only being required to provide local public notice;</i> <i>Eliminate the requirement to consult on local laws when a model is used;</i> <i>Consider deleting the requirement to review local laws periodically. Local Governments, by administering local laws, will determine when it is necessary to amend or revoke a local law; and</i> <i>Introduce certification of local laws by a legal practitioner in place of scrutiny by Parliament's Delegated Legislation Committee.</i> <p>Comment Proposed reforms meet the Sector's preference for simplified local law-making processes. Model local laws are supported, whilst recognising the models themselves will require review by State</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>Government departments with the relevant head of power. For example, the Model Local Law (Standing Orders) 1998 formed the basis of many Local Government meeting procedures local laws but no review was completed. This model was superseded by individual local laws with added contemporary provisions. This pattern will repeat itself if model local laws are not reviewed to remain contemporary to the Sector's requirements.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the recommendation, including the extended 15-year timeframe for reviewing local laws as well as the automatic lapsing of aged local laws.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the Department extending standardisation across local governments with respect to policies and local laws where appropriate (for example, matters common to all local governments such as cat and dog local laws).</p>
<p>2.5 Simplifying Approvals for Small Business and Community Events</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency between local laws and approvals processes for events, street activation, and initiatives by local businesses is frustrating for business and local communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed reforms would introduce greater consistency for approvals for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> alfresco and outdoor dining minor small business signage rules running community events. 	<p>As above</p> <p>Whilst the City supports greater consistency and less red tape in principle, further consultation should occur with local governments regarding the specific approvals process proposed.</p> <p>Any attempt to standardise approvals in this area should continue to permit, where appropriate, individual local governments to respond to the</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		unique community expectations they may face within their district.
2.6 Standardised Meeting Procedures, Including Public Question Time		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments currently prepare individual standing order local laws. The <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> and regulations require local governments to allocate time at meetings for questions from the public. Inconsistency among the meeting procedures between local governments is a common source of complaints. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide greater clarity for ratepayers and applicants for decisions made by council, it is proposed that the meeting procedures and standing orders for all local government meetings, including for public question time, are standardised across the State. Regulations would introduce standard requirements for public question time, and the procedures for meetings generally. Members of the public across all local governments would have the same opportunities to address council and ask questions. 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City supports the standardisation of meeting procedures in-principle, noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential audits/reviews of local government should be considered in this area for the purpose of maintaining oversight. If only Band 1 and 2 local governments are obliged to live stream and recording meetings, consideration should be given as to how the different requirements for each band will be reflected within any mandated standing orders. In relation to question from members of the public, the City's considers all such questions should be provided in writing for the purpose of maintaining the accuracy of recorded minutes, to prevent excessively lengthy question time and to avoid questions intended to 'ambush' local governments. The requirement for all questions to be provided in writing should be as simple as possible so as to not act as a barrier to questions being asked. Local government officers should assist where required. Consideration should be given, in extenuating circumstances, to an officer of the City assisting members of the public to complete a public question time form. Further, additional questions which were not included on the form should be accepted in the event that the Presiding Member considers it appropriate.

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any standardised standing orders should incorporate a requirement for due courtesy to be extended whenever addressing Council. Questions which are considered by the Presiding Member to be inappropriate, offensive, vexatious, an expression of an opinion rather than a question or would likely divert a substantial and unreasonable portion of the City’s resources away from its other functions, should not be recorded or responded to. Standing orders should clearly prescribe that (apart from public question time), members of the public are not permitted to participate in meetings. No expression of dissent or approval, conversational or interruption to the proceedings should take place. Members of the public who interrupt or cause a disturbance may be asked to leave. Recording of Council meetings should not be permitted by members of the public under proposed standing orders. To support this, a requirement should be imposed that mobile telephones and similar devices should not be switched on or used during meetings.
2.7 Regional Subsidiaries		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiatives by multiple local governments may be managed through formal Regional Councils, or through less formal “organisations of councils”, such as NEWROC and WESROC. These initiatives typically have to be managed by a lead local government. In 2016-17, provisions were introduced to allow for the formation of Regional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work is continuing to consider how Regional Subsidiaries can be best established to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable Regional Subsidiaries to provide a clear and defined public benefit for people within member local governments Provide for flexibility and innovation while ensuring appropriate transparency and accountability of ratepayer funds Where appropriate, facilitate financing of 	<p>Current Local Government Position Item 2.7 <u>aligns</u> with Advocacy Position 2.3.1 - ‘Regional Collaboration’</p> <p><i>Local Governments should be empowered to form single and joint subsidiaries, and beneficial enterprises. In addition, compliance requirements of Regional Councils should be reviewed and reduced.</i></p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<p>Subsidiaries. Regional Subsidiaries can be formed in line with the <i>Local Government (Regional Subsidiaries) Regulations 2017</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So far, no Regional Subsidiary has been formed. 	<p>initiatives by Regional Subsidiaries within a reasonable and defined limit of risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure all employees of a Regional Subsidiary have the same employment conditions as those directly employed by member local governments. 	<p>Comment</p> <p>Under the Regional Subsidiary model, two or more Local Governments are able to establish a regional subsidiary to undertake a shared service function on behalf of its constituent Local Governments. The model provides increased flexibility when compared to the Regional Local Government model because regional subsidiaries are primarily governed and regulated by a charter rather than legislation. While the regional subsidiary model's governance structure is primarily representative, the model also allows independent and commercially focussed directors to be appointed to the board of management.</p> <p>A key advantage of the regional subsidiary model is the use of a charter, as opposed to legislation, as the primary governance and regulatory instrument. Accordingly, the legislative provisions governing the establishment of regional subsidiaries should be light, leaving most of the regulation to the regional subsidiary charter, which can be adapted to suit the specific circumstances of each regional subsidiary.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City agrees with the comments of WALGA above.</p>

Theme 3: Greater Transparency & Accountability

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
3.1 Recordings and Live-Streaming of All Council Meetings		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, local governments are only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed that all local governments will 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u></p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<p>required to make written minutes of meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While there is no legal requirement for livestreaming or video or audio recording of council meetings, many local governments now stream and record their meetings. • Complaints relating to behaviours and decisions at meetings constitute a large proportion of complaints about local governments. • Local governments are divided into bands with the largest falling in bands 1 and 2, and smaller local governments falling bands 3 and 4. The allocation of local governments into bands is determined by The Salaries and Allowances Tribunal based on factors¹ such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Growth and development ○ Strategic planning issues ○ Demands and diversity of services provided to the community ○ Total expenditure ○ Population ○ Staffing levels. 	<p>be required to record meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Band 1 and 2 local governments would be required to livestream meetings, and make video recordings available as public archives. • Band 1 and 2 are larger local governments are generally located in larger urban areas, with generally very good telecommunications infrastructure, and many already have audio-visual equipment. • Band 1 and 2 local governments would be required to livestream meetings, and make video recordings available as public archives. • Several local governments already use platforms such as YouTube, Microsoft Teams, and Vimeo to stream and publish meeting recordings. • Limited exceptions would be made for meetings held outside the ordinary council chambers, where audio recordings may be used. • Recognising their generally smaller scale, typically smaller operating budget, and potential to be in more remote locations, band 3 and 4 local governments would be required to record and publish audio recordings, at a minimum. These local governments would still be encouraged to livestream or video record meetings. • All council meeting recordings would need to be published at the same time as the meeting minutes. Recordings of all confidential items would also need to be submitted to the DLGSC for archiving. 	<p>Item 3.1 expands upon Advocacy Position 2.6 – ‘Promote a size and scale compliance regime’ and Advocacy Position 2.6.31 - ‘Attendance at Council Meetings by Technology’</p> <p><i>A review of the ability of Elected Members to log into Council meetings should be undertaken.</i></p> <p>Comment Local Governments introducing electronic meeting procedures and the means for remote public attendance in response to the COVID-19 pandemic led to a swift uptake of streaming Council meetings. The proposed reform that Band 1 and 2 Local Governments will only be problematic where technical capability such as reliable bandwidth impact the district.</p> <p>Recommendation Supported</p> <p>The City is supportive of livestreaming meetings, in the interest of openness and transparency. Increasing accessibility of meetings may also encourage greater community participation and engagement.</p> <p>The City is not supportive of submitting recordings of confidential items to the Department. Confidential items may include legal advice which is subject to legal privilege. Such privilege is at risk of being lost by the dissemination of the advice. Furthermore, confidential items may relate to disputes (or potential disputes) against the Department, for</p>

¹ See page 3 of the [2018 Salaries and Allowance Tribunal Determination](#)

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>which it may prejudice the City to disclosure information. A suggested alternative proposal is for local governments to retain confidential recordings, to be accessed upon request of the Department.</p> <p>Note, the City has begun implementation of livestreaming, with an anticipated commencement date of February 2022.</p>
3.2 Recording All Votes in Council Minutes		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local government is only required to record which councillor voted for or against a motion in the minutes of that meeting if a request is made by an elected member at the time of the resolution during the meeting. The existing provision does not mandate transparency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To support the transparency of decision-making by councillors, it is proposed that the individual votes cast by all councillors for all council resolutions would be required to be published in the council minutes, and identify those for, against, on leave, absent or who left the chamber. Regulations would prescribe how votes are to be consistently minuted. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is currently no advocacy position in relation to Item 3.2.</p> <p>Comment There is an evolving common practice that Council Minutes record the vote of each Council Member present at a meeting.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports such proposals, noting the City's current practice is to record all votes only upon request of an Elected Member.</p>
3.3 Clearer Guidance for Meeting Items that may be Confidential		

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Act currently provides broad definitions of what type of matters may be discussed as a confidential item. There is limited potential for review of issues managed as confidential items under the current legislation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognising the importance of open and transparent decision-making, it is considered that confidential meetings and confidential meeting items should only be used in limited, specific circumstances. It is proposed to make the Act more specific in prescribing items that may be confidential, and items that should remain open to the public. Items not prescribed as being confidential could still be held as confidential items only with the prior written consent of the Inspector. All confidential items would be required to be audio recorded, with those recordings submitted to the DLGSC. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u></p> <p>There is currently no advocacy position in relation to Item 3.3.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>Clarifying the provisions of the Act has broad support within the sector. New reforms requiring Local Governments to video or audio record Council meetings (Item 3.1) will add to the formal record of proceedings that includes written Minutes. While being supported, the requirement to provide audio recordings of confidential matters to the DLGSC is queried on the basis that written and audio records can be readily accessed from a Local Government if required.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City has concerns regarding any requirement to provide DLGSC or the Inspector with material relating to confidential matters. Such a requirement removes the autonomy of respective local governments.</p> <p>In the City's view, local governments are able to determine what matters are both required and appropriate to be dealt with confidentially and the need for (and benefit of) reform in this area is unclear.</p> <p>Should a requirement be introduced for local governments to seek Inspector approval for all non-prescribed items to be dealt with confidentially, consideration should be given to</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		ensuring the process is as expedient as possible in order to avoid excessive delays.
3.4 Additional Online Registers		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments are required to provide information to the community through annual reports, council minutes and the publication of information online. Consistent online publication of information can substitute for certain material in annual reports. Consistency in online reporting across the sector will provide ratepayers with better information. These registers supplement the simplification of financial statements in Theme 6. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed to require local governments to report specific information in online registers on the local government’s website. Regulations would prescribe the information to be included. The following new registers, each updated quarterly, are proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lease Register to capture information about the leases the local government is party to (either as lessor or lessee) Community Grants Register to outline all grants and funding provided by the local government Interests Disclosure Register which collates all disclosures made by elected members about their interests related to matters considered by council Applicant Contribution Register accounting for funds collected from applicant contributions, such as cash-in-lieu for public open space and car parking Contracts Register that discloses all contracts above \$100,000. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is currently no advocacy position in relation to Item 3.4.</p> <p>Comment This proposal follows recent Act amendments that ensure a range of information is published on Local Government websites. WALGA has sought clarity that the contracts register excludes contracts of employment.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City does not oppose publicising such registers via its website, noting such information is already accessible to members of the public through the City’s annual reports.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
3.5 Chief Executive Officer Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) be Published		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a requirement of the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> that CEO performance reviews are conducted annually. • The Model Standards for CEO recruitment and selection, performance review and termination require that a local government must review the performance of the CEO against contractual performance criteria. • Additional performance criteria can be used for performance review by agreement between both parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide for minimum transparency, it is proposed to mandate that the KPIs agreed as performance metrics for CEOs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be published in council meeting minutes as soon as they are agreed prior to (before the start of the annual period) ○ The KPIs and the results be published in the minutes of the performance review meeting (at the end of the period) ○ The CEO has a right to provide written comments to be published alongside the KPIs and results to provide context as may be appropriate (for instance, the impact of events in that year that may have influenced the results against KPIs). 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is currently no advocacy position in relation to Item 3.5.</p> <p>Comment In principle, this proposal has some merit and would be particularly effective if all CEO KPIs consistently reflect Strategic Community Plans and Corporate Business Plans of Local Governments, together with KPIs reflective of the CEO’s statutory functions under Section 5.41 of the Act. This approach would inform the community of the CEO’s performance related to the strategic direction and operational function of the Local Government.</p> <p>In practice, the drafting of statutory provisions will require sensitive consideration of certain KPIs i.e. those relating to issues affecting the workplace or identified risk-based concerns, to reflect the way Audit Committees currently deal with some internal control, risk and legislative compliance issues confidentially. This approach will protect the interests of Local Governments and other parties associated with such KPIs. It would be prudent for exemptions to be provided, based on matters of confidentiality.</p> <p>The proposed reforms and recent Act amendments signal a clear intent to permit closer community involvement and scrutiny of Local Government. However, negative consequences are likely if Local Government Council’s responsibility as the employing authority of the CEO became blurred due to perceived community entitlement to comment, question and influence KPIs and the performance review</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>process.</p> <p>Additionally, the publication of CEO KPI's will elevate this employment position to a high degree of public scrutiny seldom evident in the public or private sector, if at all. It is worth investigating whether the proposed reforms considered whether this factor could impact on the recruitment of CEO's, particularly from outside the Local Government sector.</p> <p>The results of performance reviews should be confidential information between the employer and employee and should not be published and should remain within the confidential human resource records of the organisation.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conditionally Support the reporting of CEO KPIs that are consistent with the strategic direction and operational function of the Local Government, subject to exemptions for publishing KPI's of a confidential nature; 2. Do not support the results of performance reviews being published. <p>The City opposes publishing of CEO KKPI's. It would not be appropriate on the basis that it may result in personal information or sensitive information on internal working of the City being disclosed. Furthermore, it may result in the review being politicised review, being carried in a public arena.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
4.1 Community and Stakeholder Engagement Charters		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently no requirement for local governments to have a specific engagement charter or policy. • Many local governments have introduced charters or policies for how they will engage with their community. • Other States have introduced a specific requirement for engagement charters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed to introduce a requirement for local governments to prepare a community and stakeholder engagement charter which sets out how local government will communicate processes and decisions with their community. • A model Charter would be published to assist local governments who wish to adopt a standard form. 	<p>Current Local Government Position Items 4.1 and 4.2 generally align with Advocacy Position 2.6.34 - ‘Support responsive, aspirational and innovative community engagement principles’</p> <p><i>The Local Government sector supports:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Responsive, aspirational and innovative community engagement principles</i> 2. <i>Encapsulation of aims and principles in a community engagement policy, and</i> 3. <i>The option of hosting an Annual Community Meeting to present on past performance and outline future prospects and plans.</i> <p>Comment As indicted in Item 4.1 commentary, many Local Governments have already developed stakeholder engagement charters, or similar engagement strategies, that reflect their unique communities of interest. The development of guidance by the DLGSC, based on standards such as the International Standard for Public Participation practice, is supported in favour of taking a prescriptive approach or conducting a survey for the sake of a survey. Item 4.2 has potential to provide benchmarking of community satisfaction levels across Band 1 and 2 Local Governments.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City has an existing charter addressing community and stakeholder engagement and supports the adoption of any model charter being</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		optional to local governments, noting each local government addresses engagement based on their specific community needs.
4.2 Ratepayer Satisfaction Surveys (Band 1 and 2 local governments only)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many local governments already commission independent surveying consultants to hold a satisfaction survey of residents/ratepayers. These surveys provide valuable data on the performance of local governments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed to introduce a requirement that every four years, all local governments in bands 1 and 2 hold an independently-managed ratepayer satisfaction survey. Results would be required to be reported publicly at a council meeting and published on the local government's website. All local governments would be required to publish a response to the results. 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City supports such proposal, noting satisfaction surveys are already undertaken across the District.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the standardisation of the survey format for the purpose of greater enabling a result comparison between local government districts.</p>
4.3 Introduction of Preferential Voting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current voting method for local government elections is first past the post. The existing first-past-the-post does not allow for electors to express more than one preference. The candidate with the most votes wins, even if that candidate does not have a majority. Preferential voting better captures the precise intentions of voters and as a result may be regarded as a fairer and more representative system. Voters have more specific choice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferential voting is proposed be adopted as the method to replace the current first past the post system in local government elections. In preferential voting, voters number candidates in order of their preferences. Preferential voting is used in State and Federal elections in Western Australia (and in other states). This provides voters with more choice and control over who they elect. All other states use a form of preferential voting for local government. 	<p>Current Local Government Position Item 4.3 does not align with Advocacy Position 2.5.1 – ‘First Past the Post voting system’</p> <p><i>The Local Government sector supports:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Four year terms with a two year spill Greater participation in Local Government elections The option to hold elections through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online voting Postal voting, and In-person voting Voting at Local Government elections to be voluntary The first past the post method of counting votes <p>Comment It should be noted that the sector's advocacy against compulsory voting and “All in All out” 4</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>year terms has been successful and these items are not included in the reform proposals.</p> <p>The introduction of preferential voting will be a return to the system of voting prior to the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>. The Local Government Advisory Board reported on voting systems in 2006 (<i>Local Government Structural Reform in Western Australia: Ensuring the Future Sustainability of Communities</i>) and provided the following comments in support of both first past the post voting and preferential voting: <i>‘Comments in support of retaining first past the post include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Quick to count. Preferential voting is time consuming to count.</i> • <i>Easily understood.</i> • <i>Removes politics out of campaigning. Preferential will encourage alliances formed for the distribution of preferences and party politics into local government.</i> • <i>Preferential voting allows election rigging through alliances or ‘dummy’ candidates.</i> • <i>In a preferential system, the person that receives the highest number of first preference votes does not necessarily get elected.’</i> <p><i>‘Comments in support of replacing first past the post include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Preferential voting is more democratic and removes an area of confusion.</i> • <i>Preferential voting ensures that the most popular candidates are elected who best reflect the will of the voters.</i> • <i>Preferential system should be introduced. In FPP elections, candidates work together to get votes for each other. Preferential would make it more difficult for this practice to take place.</i>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>FPP does not adequately reflect the wishes of electors when there are three candidates or more.</i> • <i>FPP is unsuitable when there is more than one vacancy.</i> • <i>Allows for a greater representation from a range of interest groups and prevents domination of elections by mainstream party politics.'</i> <p>The Sector supports first past the post voting for its simplicity and fundamental apolitical nature, therefore the proposed reforms are not supported. Feedback is sought to ensure the advocacy position for first past the post elections remains the preferred option.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Not currently supported - Local Government feedback requested</p> <p>The City does not support adopting a preferential voting system. The City has utilised the 'first past the post' method for many years and this remains the preferred approach.</p> <p>Despite select advantages, the City considers that preferential voting is prohibitively complex, both in relation to the casting of votes as well as their counting.</p> <p>Voter turnout in local government elections is significantly low compared to other jurisdictions. Adding complexity to the voting system may further diminish community participation.</p> <p>Over the course of its last four elections, the City has required to undertake three vote re-counts.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		Employing a preferential voting system would result in re-counts being significant more time consuming and complex.
4.4 Public Vote to Elect the Mayor and President		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Act currently allows local governments to have the Presiding Member (the Mayor or President) elected either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ by the electors of the district through a public vote; or ○ by the council as a resolution at a council meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mayors and Presidents of all local governments perform an important public leadership role within their local communities. • Band 1 and 2 local governments generally have larger councils than those in bands 3 and 4. • Accordingly, it is proposed that the Mayor or President for all band 1 and 2 councils is to be elected through a vote of the electors of the district. Councils in bands 3 and 4 would retain the current system. • A number of Band 1 and Band 2 councils have already moved towards Public Vote to Elect the Mayor and President in recent years, including City of Stirling and City of Rockingham. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Item 4.4 does not align with Advocacy Position 2.5.2 - 'Election of Mayors and Presidents be at the discretion of Local Government.'</p> <p><i>Local Governments should determine whether their Mayor or President will be elected by the Council or elected by the community.</i></p> <p>Comment There are 43 Band 1 and 2 Local Governments with 22 popularly electing the Mayor or President: Band 1 - 15 Band 2 - 7</p> <p>The remaining 21 Local Governments have a Council-elected Mayor or President. The cited examples of the City of Rockingham and City of Stirling electors determining by referendum to change the process for electing the Mayor are examples of the current system working as intended. There is no evidence of elector support for uniform direct election of Mayors.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Not currently supported - Local Government feedback requested</p> <p>The City does not support a requirement for the role of Mayor or President to be determined by electors. The City considers that its current system of having the Mayor elected directly by</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>Council assists in ensuring the Mayor has the support of the majority of Council. Further, it assists in avoiding party politics.</p> <p>If the Mayor is to be determined by way of public vote, the City considers that the number of elected members should increase</p> <p>A review of all recent election results for the City shows that City’s chosen Mayor (in election years during which they are a candidate) has received the highest number of votes from the community for their seat as a Councillor.</p> <p>The City is supportive of introducing further ability of local governments to address and stand down ‘rogue’ Mayors.</p>
4.5 Tiered Limits on the Number of Councillors		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of councillors (between 5-15 councillors) is decided by each local government, reviewed by the Local Government Advisory Board, and if approved by the Minister. The Panel Report recommended electoral reforms to improve representativeness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed to limit the number of councillors based on the population of the entire local government. Some smaller local governments have already been moving to having smaller councils to reduce costs for ratepayers. The Local Government Panel Report proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a population of up to 5,000 – five councillors (including the President) population of between 5,000 and 75,000 – five to nine councillors (including the Mayor/President) population of above 75,000 – nine to fifteen councillors (including Mayor). 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Item 4.5 does not align with Advocacy Position 2.5.1 – ‘<i>Councils consist of between six and 15 (including the Mayor/President)</i>’</p> <p><i>Local Governments being enabled to determine the number of Elected Members required on the Council between six and 15 (including the Mayor/President)</i></p> <p>Comment The proposed reform to restrict Local Governments with populations under 5,000 to 5 Council Members does not reflect the varied communities of interest within this grouping. Some Local Governments are essentially regional centres such as the Shires of Katanning (9), Dandaragan (9), Merredin (9), Moora (9) and Northampton (9) (current Councillor numbers</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>bracketed). Local Governments such as the Shire of Ngaanyatjarraku (9) manage substantial land areas, manage isolated communities such as the Shire of Meekatharra (7) and culturally diverse communities such as the Shire of Christmas Island (9). Some Local Governments with populations up to 5,000 warrant a greater number of Councillors to effectively share the representative role that Council Members play within their communities.</p> <p>The additional proposed reforms in population categories over 5,000 generally reflect the current Councillor numbers.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Recommend 5 to 7 Council Members for populations up to 5,000 and support the remaining proposed reforms.</p> <p>The City supports such proposals, though considers a cap of 12 Councillors should be considered, on the basis that 15 may be excessive.</p>
<p>4.6 No Wards for Small Councils (Band 3 and 4 Councils only)</p>		

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A local government can make an application to be divided into wards, with councillors elected to those wards. Only about 10% of band 3 and 4 local governments currently have wards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that the use of wards for councils in bands 3 and 4 is abolished. Wards increase the complexity of elections, as this requires multiple versions of ballot papers to be prepared for a local government's election. In smaller local governments, the population of wards can be very small. These wards often have councillors elected unopposed, or elect a councillor with a very small number of votes. Some local governments have ward councillors elected with less than 50 votes. There has been a trend in smaller local governments looking to reduce the use of wards, with only 10 councils in bands 3 and 4 still having wards. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There are no advocacy positions in relation to Items 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 or 4.9.</p> <p>Comment The proposed reform to discontinue wards in Band 3 and 4 Local Governments brings alignment with the majority and provides that affected Local Governments will no longer have to conduct 8 year ward reviews or make representation to the Local Government Advisory Board to revert to a no wards system. Remaining proposed reforms will improve and clarify election processes.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA.</p>

4.7 Electoral Reform – Clear Lease Requirements for Candidate and Voter Eligibility		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A person with a lease in a local government district is eligible to nominate as a candidate in that district. A person with a lease in a local government district is eligible to apply to vote in that district. The City of Perth Inquiry Report identified a number of instances where dubious lease arrangements put to question the validity of candidates in local government elections, and subsequently their legitimacy as councillors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reforms are proposed to prevent the use of “sham leases” in council elections. Sham leases are where a person creates a lease only to be able to vote or run as a candidate for council. The City of Perth Inquiry Report identified sham leases as an issue. Electoral rules are proposed to be strengthened: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum lease period of 12 months will be required for anyone to register a person to vote or run for council. Home based businesses will not be eligible to register a person to vote or run 	<p>As above</p> <p>As above</p>

	<p>for council, because any residents are already the eligible voter(s) for that address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarifying the minimum criteria for leases eligible to register a person to vote or run for council. ● The reforms would include minimum lease periods to qualify as a registered business (minimum of 12 months), and the exclusion of home based businesses (where the resident is already eligible) and very small sub-leases. ● The basis of eligibility for each candidate (e.g. type of property and suburb of property) is proposed to be published, including in the candidate pack for electors. 	
4.8 Reform of Candidate Profiles		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Candidate profiles can only be 800 characters, including spaces. This is equivalent to approximately 150 words. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Further work will be undertaken to evaluate how longer candidate profiles could be accommodated. ● Longer candidate profiles would provide more information to electors, potentially through publishing profiles online. ● It is important to have sufficient information available to assist electors make informed decisions when casting their vote. 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City supports efforts to ensure sufficient information is provided to electors to allow them to make an informed decision. Consistency in profile requirements would also ensure candidates are provided an equal opportunity to promote themselves.</p> <p>The City considers that 1000 words is sufficient for profiles, with candidates seeking to provide further information having the option to refer people to their website/online profile.</p>
4.9 Minor Other Electoral Reforms		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Other minor reforms are proposed to improve local government elections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Minor other electoral reforms are proposed to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The introduction of standard processes for vote re-counts if there is a very small margin between candidates (e.g. where 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City supports any efforts to standardise and simplify vote re-counts. This would benefit local governments, WAEC and candidates involved.</p>

	<p>there is a margin of less than 10 votes a recount will always be required)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The introduction of more specific rules concerning local government council candidates' use of electoral rolls. 	
--	---	--

Theme 5: Clear Roles and Responsibilities

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
5.1 Introduce Principles in the Act		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Act does not currently outline specific principles. • The Act contains a short “Content and Intent” section only. • The Panel Report recommended greater articulation of principles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed to include new principles in the Act, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The recognition of Aboriginal Western Australians ○ Tiering of local governments (with bands being as assigned by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal) ○ Community Engagement ○ Financial Management. 	<p>Current Local Government Position Item 5.1 <u>generally aligns</u> with Advocacy Position 2.6 - Legislative Intent</p> <p><i>Provide flexible, principles-based legislative framework.</i></p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports such recommendations.</p>
5.2 Greater Role Clarity		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Act provides for the role of council, councillor, mayor or president and CEO. • The role of the council is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ govern the local government’s affairs ○ be responsible for the performance of the local government’s functions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <u>Local Government Act Review Panel</u> recommended that roles and responsibilities of elected members and senior staff be better defined in law. • It is proposed that these roles and responsibilities are further defined in the legislation. • These proposed roles will be open to further consultation and input. • These roles would be further strengthened through Council Communications Agreements (see item 5.3). 	<p>Current Local Government Position Item 5.2 <u>aligns</u> with Advocacy Position 2.6.36 - ‘Roles and Responsibilities’</p> <p><i>That clarification of roles and responsibilities for Mayors/ Presidents, Councillors and CEOs be reviewed to ensure that there is no ambiguity.</i></p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports such recommendations.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>5.2.1 - Mayor or President Role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of the Mayor or President. • While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that the Mayor or President is responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Representing and speaking on behalf of the whole council and the local government, at all times being consistent with the resolutions of council ○ Facilitating the democratic decision-making of council by presiding at council meetings in accordance with the Act ○ Developing and maintaining professional working relationships between councillors and the CEO ○ Performing civic and ceremonial duties on behalf of the local government ○ Working effectively with the CEO and councillors in overseeing the delivery of the services, operations, initiatives and functions of the local government. 	<p>As above</p> <p>As above</p>
	<p>5.2.2 - Council Role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of the Council, which is the entity consisting of all of the councillors and led by the Mayor or President. • While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that the Council is responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Making significant decisions and determining policies through democratic deliberation at council meetings ○ Ensuring the local government is adequately resourced to deliver the local 	<p>As above</p> <p>As above</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>governments operations, services and functions - including all functions that support informed decision-making by council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Providing a safe working environment for the CEO; ○ Providing strategic direction to the CEO; ○ Monitoring and reviewing the performance of the local government. 	
	<p>5.2.3 - Elected Member (Councillor) Role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of all elected councillors. • While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that every elected councillor is responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Considering and representing, fairly and without bias, the current and future interests of all people who live, work and visit the district (including for councillors elected for a particular ward) ○ Positively and fairly contribute and apply their knowledge, skill, and judgement to the democratic decision-making process of council ○ Applying relevant law and policy in contributing to the decision-making of the council ○ Engaging in the effective forward planning and review of the local governments' resources, and the performance of its operations, services, and functions ○ Communicating the decisions and resolutions of council to stakeholders and the public ○ Developing and maintaining professional working relationships with all other 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City suggests a model position description for Elected Members should be considered.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>councillors and the CEO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maintaining and developing their knowledge and skills relevant to local government ○ Facilitating public engagement with local government. ● It is proposed that elected members should not be able to use their title (e.g. “Councillor”, “Mayor”, or “President”) and associated resources of their office (such as email address) unless they are performing their role in their official capacity. 	
	<p>5.2.4 - CEO Role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> requires local governments to employ a CEO to run the local government administration and implement the decisions of council. ● To provide greater clarity, it is proposed to amend the Act to specify the roles and responsibilities of all local government CEOs. ● While input and consultation will inform precise wording, it is proposed that the Act is amended to generally outline that the CEO of a local government is responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordinating the professional advice and assistance necessary for all elected members to enable the council to perform its decision-making functions ○ Facilitating the implementation of council decisions ○ Ensuring functions and decisions lawfully delegated by council are managed prudently on behalf of the council ○ Managing the effective delivery of the services, operations, initiatives and functions of the local government determined by the council ○ Providing timely and accurate information 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City notes that the Functions of the CEO are already contained within the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i> at section 5.41.</p> <p>The City requests further details of such proposal in order to provide substantive comment.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>and advice to all councillors in line with the Council Communications Agreement (see item 5.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overseeing the compliance of the operations of the local government with State and Federal legislation on behalf of the council ○ Implementing and maintaining systems to enable effective planning, management, and reporting on behalf of the council. 	

5.3 Council Communication Agreements

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Act provides that council and committee members can have access to any information held by the local government that is relevant to the performance of the member in their functions. • The availability of information is sometimes a source of conflict within local governments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In State Government, there are written Communication Agreements between Ministers and agencies that set standards for how information and advice will be provided. • It is proposed that local governments will need to have Council Communications Agreements between the council and the CEO. • These Council Communication Agreements would clearly specify the information that is to be provided to councillors, how it will be provided, and the timeframes for when it will be provided. • A template would be published by DLGSC. This default template will come into force if a council and CEO do not make a specific other agreement within a certain timeframe following any election. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is no advocacy position in relation to Item 5.3.</p> <p>Comment The availability of information not already in the public domain to Councillors under Section 5.92 of the Act can become contentious in the absence of a clear statement in support of the function the Council Member is performing. This can place CEO's in the invidious position of ruling on the availability of a record of the Local Government, when it is also their function under Section 5.41(h) of the Act to <i>'ensure that records and documents of the local government are properly kept for the purposes of this Act and any other written law'</i>.</p> <p>Consistent availability of information motivates this proposed reform and it does not appear that individual Council Communication Agreements will be a means to that end. There is a better case for a uniform approach in the form of a regulated Agreement, in much the same way that the Communication Agreements between Ministers and agencies are based on provisions of the</p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>Public Sector Management Act 1994.</i></p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Support a consistent, regulated Communications Agreement.</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA and suggests a consistent approach be set across local governments.</p>
<p>5.4 Local Governments May Pay Superannuation Contributions for Elected Members</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elected members are eligible to receive sitting fees or an annual allowance. Superannuation is not paid to elected members. However, councillors can currently divert part of their allowances to a superannuation fund. Councils should be reflective and representative of the people living within the district. Local governments should be empowered to remove any barriers to the participation of gender and age diverse people on councils. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that local governments should be able to decide, through a vote of council, to pay superannuation contributions for elected members. These contributions would be additional to existing allowances. Superannuation is widely recognised as an important entitlement to provide long term financial security. Other states have already moved to allow councils to make superannuation contributions for councillors. Allowing council to provide superannuation is important part of encouraging equality for people represented on council – particularly for women and younger people. Providing superannuation to councillors recognises that the commitment to elected office can reduce a person’s opportunity to undertake employment and earn superannuation contributions. 	<p>Current Local Government Position There is no advocacy position in relation to Item 5.4.</p> <p>Comment WALGA was in the process of consulting with the sector when this reform was announced. The feedback to date from Local Governments varied. The proposed discretionary approach will permit Local Governments to exercise general competence powers to make their own determination on paying superannuation to Council Members.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports such recommendation, though considers the payment of Elected Member entitlements should be determined by the Department given the conflict of interest in Elected Members making such determination themselves.</p> <p>For taxation purposes, consideration should be given to establishing, through legislation, that</p>

		Elected Members are not considered employees of the City.
5.5 Local Governments May Establish Education Allowances		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local government elected members must complete mandatory training. There is no specific allowance for undertaking further education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments will have the option of contributing to the education expenses for councillors, up to a defined maximum value, for tuition costs for further education that is directly related to their role on council. Councils will be able to decide on a policy for education expenses, up to a maximum yearly value for each councillor. Councils may also decide not to make this entitlement available to elected members. Any allowance would only be able to be used for tuition fees for courses, such as training programs, diplomas, and university studies, which relate to local government. Where it is made available, this allowance will help councillors further develop skills to assist with making informed decisions on important questions before council, and also provide professional development opportunities for councillors. 	<p>Current Local Government Position Item 5.5 <u>generally aligns</u> with Advocacy Position 2.8 - Elected Member Training</p> <p><i>Support Local Governments being required to establish an Elected Member Training Policy to encourage training and include budgetary provision of funding for Elected Members;</i></p> <p>Comment The proposal augments recent Act amendments that require Local Governments to adopt a professional development policy for Council Members. Many Local Governments now budget for training requirements that align with the policy statement.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The proposed reform reflects the City's current practice. Details of allowances are set out in the Elected Members Training and Development Policy and Elected Members Allowances Expenses and Gifts Policy.</p>
5.6 Standardised Election Caretaker period		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently no requirement for a formal caretaker period, with individual councils operating under their own policies and procedures. • This is commonly a point of public confusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statewide caretaker period for local governments is proposed. • All local governments across the State would have the same clearly defined election period, during which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Councils do not make major decisions with criteria to be developed defining ‘major’ ○ Incumbent councillors who nominate for re-election are not to represent the local government, act on behalf of the council, or use local government resources to support campaigning activities. ○ There are consistent election conduct rules for all candidates. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is no advocacy position in relation to Item 5.6</p> <p>Comment WALGA developed a template Caretaker Policy in 2017 on request for a consistent approach. There are no know instances where Caretaker Policy have led to unforeseen or unmanageable consequences impacting on decision-making functions.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports such proposals, having previously adopted an Election Caretaker Period Policy aligned to the proposed reform.</p>
<p>5.7 Remove WALGA from the Act</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) is constituted under the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>. • The Local Government Panel Report and the Select Committee Report included this recommendation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Government Panel Report recommended that WALGA not be constituted under the <i>Local Government Act 1995</i>. • Separating WALGA out of the Act will provide clarity that WALGA is not a State Government entity. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is no advocacy position in relation to Item 5.7.</p> <p>Comment WALGA is conducting its own due diligence on this proposal, previously identified in the Local Government Review Panel Report. The outcome of this reform would require a transition of WALGA from a body constituted under the Act to an incorporated association. It is important to the Local Government sector that the provisions relating to the mutual self-insurance scheme and tender exempt prequalified supply panels remain in the Act and are not affected by this proposal. Further work is being carried out by WALGA to fully understand the effect this proposal will have on WALGA and the sector.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>WALGA to undertake its due diligence on this proposal and advise the sector accordingly.</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA and suggests that consideration be given to allowing WALGA to retain panels for the purpose of ensuring their continued income.</p>
---	--	---

5.8 CEO Recruitment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent amendments introduced provisions to standardise CEO recruitment. The recruitment of a CEO is a very important decision by a local government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that DLGSC establishes a panel of approved panel members to perform the role of the independent person on CEO recruitment panels. Councils will be able to select an independent person from the approved list. Councils will still be able to appoint people outside of the panel with the approval of the Inspector. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is no advocacy position in relation to Item 5.8.</p> <p>Comment The proposed reform augments the CEO Standards in relation to recruitment introduced in February 2021.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports such, on the proviso that safeguards ensure the process remains independent.</p> <p>Consideration should be given regarding limiting the number of persons on a CEO recruitment panel. Having all elected members of a local government sit on the panel is unnecessary, unnecessarily prolongs the process and can be distracting for interviewees. It is suggested that the number be limited to four or five, plus an independent person.</p>

Theme 6: Improved Financial Management and Reporting

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
6.1 Model Financial Statements and Tiered Financial Reporting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The financial statements published in the Annual Report is the main financial reporting currently published by local governments. Reporting obligations are the same for large (Stirling, Perth, Fremantle) and small (Sandstone, Wiluna, Dalwallinu) local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Minister strongly believes in transparency and accountability in local government. The public rightly expects the highest standards of integrity, good governance, and prudent financial management in local government. It is critically important that clear information 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Items 6.1 and 6.2 generally align with Advocacy Position 2.6 – Support a size and scale compliance regime and Advocacy Position 2.6.24 – Financial Management and Procurement.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<p>governments, even though they vary significantly in complexity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Office of the Auditor General has said that some existing reporting requirements are unnecessary or onerous - for instance, information that is not relevant to certain local governments, or that is a duplicate of other published information. 	<p>about the financial position of local governments is openly available to ratepayers. Financial information also supports community decision-making about local government services and projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments differ significantly in the complexity of their operations. Smaller local governments generally have much less operating complexity than larger local governments. The Office of the Auditor General has identified opportunities to improve financial reporting, to make statements clearer, and reduce unnecessary complexity. Recognising the difference in the complexity of smaller and larger local governments, it is proposed that financial reporting requirements should be tiered – meaning that larger local governments will have greater financial reporting requirements than smaller local governments. It is proposed to establish standard templates for Annual Financial Statements for band 1 and 2 councils, and simpler, clearer financial statements for band 3 and 4. Online Registers, updated quarterly (see item 3.4), would provide faster and greater transparency than current annual reports. Standard templates will be published for use by local governments. Simpler Strategic and Financial Planning (item 6.2) would also improve the budgeting process. 	<p><i>The Local Government sector:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Requests the Minister for Local Government to direct the Department of Local Government to prepare a Model set of Financial Statements and Annual Budget Statements for the Local Government sector, in consultation with the Office of the Auditor General.</i> <i>Requests the Department of Local Government to re-assess the amount of detail required to be included in annual financial reports, in particular for small and medium sized entities as suggested by the Office of Auditor General.</i> <p>Comment The Sector has a long-standing position for a broad review of the financial management and reporting provisions of the Act, which remain largely unchanged since commencing in 1996.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA.</p>
6.2 Simplify Strategic and Financial Planning		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements for plans are outlined in the Local Government Financial Management and Administration Regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having clear information about the finances of local government is an important part of enabling informed public and ratepayer 	<p>As above</p> <p>The City proposes that Asset Management Plans</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is also the Integrated Planning and Reporting (IPR) framework. • While many councils successfully apply IPR to their budgeting and reporting, IPR may seem complicated or difficult, especially for smaller local governments. 	<p>engagement and input to decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The framework for financial planning should be based around information being clear, transparent, and easy to understand for all ratepayers and members of the public. • In order to provide more consistency and clarity across the State, it is proposed that greater use of templates is introduced to make planning and reporting clearer and simpler, providing greater transparency for ratepayers. • Local governments would be required to adopt a standard set of plans, and there will be templates published by the DLGSC for use or adaption by local governments. • It is proposed that the plans that are required are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Simplified Council Plans that replace existing Strategic Community Plans and set high-level objectives, with a new plan required at least every eight years. These will be short-form plans, with a template available from the DLGSC ○ Simplified Asset Management Plans to consistently forecast costs of maintaining the local government’s assets. A new plan will be required at least every ten years, though local governments should update the plan regularly if the local government gains or disposes of major assets (e.g. land, buildings, or roads). A template will be provided, and methods of valuations will be simplified to reduce red tape ○ Simplified Long Term Financial Plans will outline any long term financial management and sustainability issues, and any investments and debts. A template will be provided, and these plans will be required to be reviewed in detail at least 	<p>should be required each four years and align with the Strategic Community Plan.</p> <p>The City suggests that consultation should occur with the The Institute of Public Works Engineering Australasia (IPWEA WA).</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
	<p>every four years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A new Rates and Revenue Policy (see item 6.3) that identifies the approximate value of rates that will need to be collected in future years (referencing the Asset Management Plan and Long Term Financial Plan) – providing a forecast to ratepayers (updated at least every four years) ○ The use of simple, one-page Service Proposals and Project Proposals that outline what proposed services or initiatives will cost, to be made available through council meetings. These will become Service Plans and Project Plans added to the yearly budget if approved by council. This provides clear transparency for what the functions and initiatives of the local government cost to deliver. Templates will be available for use by local governments. 	
6.3 Rates and Revenue Policy		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local governments are not required to have a rates and revenue policy. • Some councils defer rate rises, resulting in the eventual need to drastically raise rates to cover unavoidable costs – especially for the repair of infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Rates and Revenue Policy is proposed to increase transparency for ratepayers by linking rates to basic operating costs and the minimum costs for maintaining essential infrastructure. • A Rates and Revenue Policy would be required to provide ratepayers with a forecast of future costs of providing local government services. • The Policy would need to reflect the Asset Management Plan and the Long Term Financial Plan (see item 6.2), providing a forecast of what rates would need to be, to cover unavoidable costs. • A template would be published for use or adaption by all local governments. • The Local Government Panel Report included this recommendation. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Item 6.3 generally aligns with Advocacy Position 2.1.6 - Rate Setting and WALGA's Rate Setting Policy Statement.</p> <p><i>Councils' deliberative rate setting processes reference their Integrated Planning Framework – a thorough strategic, financial and asset management planning process – and draw upon the community's willingness and capacity to pay.</i></p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
6.4 Monthly Reporting of Credit Card Statements		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No legislative requirement. Disclosure requirements brought in by individual councils have shown significant reduction of expenditure of funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statements of a local government’s credit cards used by local government employees will be required to be tabled at council at meetings on a monthly basis. This provides oversight of incidental local government spending. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> There is no advocacy position in relation to Item 6.4.</p> <p>Comment This proposed reform reflects widespread common practice for credit card transactions to be included in monthly financial reports and lists of accounts paid.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA.</p>
6.5 Amended Financial Ratios		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments are required to report seven ratios in their annual financial statements. These are reported on the MyCouncil website. These ratios are intended to provide an indication of the financial health of every local government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial ratios will be reviewed in detail, building on work already underway by the DLGSC. The methods of calculating ratios and indicators will be reviewed to ensure that the results are accurate and useful. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u> Item 6.5 aligns with Advocacy Position 2.6.25 - Review and reduce financial ratios.</p> <p><i>Advocate to the Minister for Local Government to amend the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 to prescribe the following ratios:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Operating Surplus Ratio, Net Financial Liabilities Ratio, Debt Service Coverage Ratio, and Current Ratio. <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the proposed reform in principle, though suggests further consultation with local governments is required.</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
6.6 Audit Committees		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments must establish an Audit Committee that has three or more persons, with the majority to be council members. The Audit Committee is to guide and assist the local government in carrying out the local government’s functions in relation to audits conducted under the Act. The Panel Report identified that Audit Committees should be expanded, including to provide improved risk management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure independent oversight, it is proposed the Chair of any Audit Committee be required to be an independent person who is not on council or an employee of the local government. Audit Committees would also need to consider proactive risk management. To reduce costs, it is proposed that local governments should be able to establish shared Regional Audit Committees. The Committees would be able to include council members but would be required to include a majority of independent members and an independent chairperson. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u></p> <p>Item 6.6 <u>does not align</u> with Advocacy Position 2.2.4 – Accountability and Audit</p> <p><i>That audit committees of Local Government, led and overseen by the Council, have a clearly defined role with an Elected Member majority and chair.</i></p> <p>Comment The Sector’s view is well established, that the Council must maintain, and be seen by the community to have, majority involvement and investment in the purpose of an Audit Committee. There is sector support for some independent members on the Audit Committee, however not a majority.</p> <p>The dual effect of the proposed reform is to guarantee a place for a majority of independent persons on Audit Committees, with the additional requirement that an independent person Chair this Committee. Presently, not all Local Government Audit Committees are able to include an independent person. This may be for a variety of reasons not least of which is a lack of suitable, available candidates with the required qualification, skill and experience.</p> <p>It would be counter-productive if the proposed reforms led to the appointment of unsuitable independent persons to a skills-based role. The concept of Regional Audit Committees has apparent merit in this case but there is no detail</p>

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>regarding practicalities; for example, is the Regional Audit Committee intended to include the same independent persons who will meet separately with each Local Government within the region?</p> <p>There is too little certainty that the imperative question of appropriate representation will be managed as a consequence of the proposed reforms for it to be supported.</p> <p>The proposal for the Audit Committees to also consider proactive risk management is supported.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not support majority independent members of the Audit Committee 2. Support Audit Committees of Local Government with an Elected Member majority including independent members, and to consider proactive risk management issues. <p>The City does not support a requirement for a majority of members to be independent. Such members currently receive remuneration for their services, which ensures high quality candidates are attracted to the role. In order to minimise the cost to local governments, a requirement for two independent members to be appointed to audit and risk committees should be considered. The City also considers that an independent member should act as chairperson.</p>
<p>6.7 Building Upgrade Finance</p>		

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local government sector has sought reforms that would enable local governments to provide loans to property owners to finance for building improvements. This is not currently provided for under the Act. The Local Government Panel Report included this recommendation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reforms would allow local governments to provide loans to third parties for specific building improvements - such as cladding, heritage and green energy fixtures. This would allow local governments to lend funds to improve buildings within their district. Limits and checks and balances would be established to ensure that financial risks are proactively managed. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u></p> <p>Item 6.7 <u>aligns</u> with Advocacy Position 2.6.26 - Building Upgrade Finance.</p> <p><i>The Local Government Act 1995 should be amended to enable a Building Upgrade Finance mechanism in Western Australia.</i></p> <p>Comment Building Upgrade Finance would enable Local Governments to guarantee finance for building upgrades for non-residential property owners. In addition to building upgrades to achieve environmental outcomes, Local Governments have identified an opportunity to use this approach to finance general upgrades to increase the commercial appeal of buildings for potential tenants. In this way, BUF is viewed as means to encourage economic investment to meet the challenges of a soft commercial lease market and achieve economic growth.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA.</p>
6.8 Cost of Waste Service to be Specified on Rates Notices		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No requirement for separation of waste changes on rates notice. Disclosure will increase ratepayer awareness of waste costs. The Review Panel Report included this recommendation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is proposed that waste charges are required to be separately shown on rate notices (for all properties which receive a waste service). This would provide transparency and awareness of costs for ratepayers. 	<p><u>Current Local Government Position</u></p> <p>There is no advocacy position in relation to Item 6.8.</p> <p>Comment This proposed reform will require a relatively simple calculation,</p>

Local Government Reform – City of Kwinana Submissions

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED REFORMS	COMMENTS
		<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>The City supports the comments of WALGA.</p>

