

I am here today to speak to you about the Operational Risk Summary June 2020 referencing OR12 –Customer Focus (page 19 of the report).

OR12 states, Customer needs not fully met in the absence of a coordinated approach to increasing customer focus in Council's everyday work.

I would like to raise 2 points on this matter.

The first point is that the impact column for OR12 should include external investigations.

An example of an external investigation is the ongoing investigation of the Office of the Ombudsman, reference 561464. This was a two-part investigation, one that was completed in April – which I wrote about in my April update to Council and the second, which is currently ongoing.

I refer you to contract number 2020/C340 in relation to Jacobs listed with this Committee on 18 November 2021. According to CRU, this is the only contract that Council has with Jacobs...there is no mention of a contract prior to or after that date.

In other words, the only contract that Council has with Jacobs is for a Coastal Hazard and Risk Assessment. And Jacobs has yet to deliver on that contract.

However, Council does hold 2 volumes prepared by Jacobs for a Coastal Hazard Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment.

By Council's own admission, Council does not hold any records/documentation such as a contract regarding these 2 volumes.

Council was informed of this situation by CRU in April., mainly, that ratepayers paid for a report that the Council did not commission and did not contract.

As Chair of CRU, I would like to request that this subcommittee undertake an open investigation as how Council received 2 reports without any documentation or contract. Such an investigation would identify processes or lack thereof that led to using ratepayers' monies that paid for these reports. We would welcome a transparent investigation with the findings made public. To that end CRU would make its experts available to present relevant information in assisting an investigation.

I would also like to inquire as to what has been paid to Jacobs regarding their contract 2020/C340.

I would also like to bring to your attention that the Jacobs' reports are not in compliance with NZCPS as they do not undertake a risk assessment and as a result, in our view, it is not fit for the purposes of planning. Yet Volume 2 is being proposed by KCDC planners for use in an RMA regulatory rulemaking under Plan Change 2.

This also puts the Council at further risk.

The second point that I would like to raise in reference to OR12, is the need to include within the risk control column – "accurate information is being provided". This would help mitigate the impacts listed – such as reputational damage and loss of trust.

This is regarding the misinformation posted on the Council's website – Takutai Kapiti. As I have written to the CEO (copied to the Mayor and Mr. Jackson), as well as Tim Power, there are several references to Council commissioning a Susceptibility and Vulnerability Assessment.

As the first part of the investigation of the Office of the Ombudsman, revealed, Council holds no documents supporting this commission.

Corrections to the website, would mitigate the risk and would no longer have an impact.

For your reference, I am tabling contract 2020/C340 with this subcommittee along with a presentation prepared by our experts titled, Coastal Hazards – Risk Identification/Assessment and Hazard Management under the RMA/NZCPS.

In summation, an open investigation under taken by this subcommittee along with assurance that Council will correct the information on the Takutai Kapiti website would avoid the impact of any external investigations moving forward.