

# MINUTES

## SEARTG

### BOARD MEETING 14 NOVEMBER 2013

**SOUTH EAST AVON REGIONAL TRANSITION GROUP  
(S E A R T G)**

**MINUTES**

MEETING OF BOARD MEMBERS

SHIRE OF YORK – COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
9:30AM THURSDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2013

**1. DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS**

**1.1 Opening**

**1.2 Announcement of Visitors**

Invitations extended to:

- Ms Caroline Tuthill - Senior Project Officer - Department of Local Government.
- Mr Tony Brown – Executive Manager, Governance and Strategy – Western Australian Local Government Association.
- Ms Joanne Burges – Regional Cooperation Manager – Western Australian Local Government Association

Cr D Richards, retiring Chairman of the South East Regional Transition Group Board, took the opportunity of welcoming attendees, in particular:

- Cr Matthew Reid – President – Shire of York.
- Mr Dwayne Reese – Business Development Manager Anything Telephones and Data (AT&D).
- Mr David Staeck – Managing Director – Focus Networks.
- Mr Douglas Cusens – Operations Director – Focus Networks.
- Ms Caroline Tuthill - Senior Project Officer - Department of Local Government.
- Ms Jo Burges - Regional Cooperation Manager – Western Australian Local Government Association.

**CONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Cr D Richards then advised that whilst his duties would be minimal at this Meeting, following the recent Local Government elections there was a need for each Participating Local Government to confirm their Members and Deputy Members, as detailed in the Notice Paper which reads as follows:

*"Clause 3.1 of the South East Avon Regional Transition Group (SEARTG) Agreement in part states:*

*'Appoint a Board comprising one Elected Member and one Elected Deputy Member for each Participant, together with such other Members as Participants agree.'*

*The Presiding Officer requests that each Participating Local Government to the SEARTG confirms their Elected Members."*

The following confirmations were then made:

Cunderdin	Member <i>Deputy</i>	Cr Rod Carter <i>Cr Clive Gibsone</i>	Shire President <i>Deputy Shire President</i>
Quairading	Member <i>Deputy</i>	Cr Darryl Richards <i>Cr Brian Caporn</i>	Shire President <i>Deputy Shire President</i>
Tammin	Member <i>Deputy</i>	Cr Scott Uppill <i>To be Advised</i>	Shire President
York	Member <i>Deputy</i>	Cr Matthew Reid <i>Cr Pat Hooper</i>	Shire President <i>Councillor</i>

#### APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON

Cr D Richards then drew attention to the need to appoint a Chairperson, as detailed in the Notice Paper, which reads:

*"The Chairman of SEARTG Cr D Richards has informed the Executive Officer of his resignation as Chairman of the SEARTG Board.*

*Clause 3.2 of the South East Avon Regional Transition Group Agreement in part states:*

#### *'3.2 Appointment of a Chairperson*

*The RTG shall appoint an Elected Member from one of the Participants to be Chairperson of the Board.'*

*The Presiding Officer is to call for nominations at the Meeting, and if there is more than one nomination for the position of Chairperson, shall undertake an election as follows:*

1. *Only the Elected Member of each Participating Local Government shall be entitled to vote.*
2. *Voting is to be by show of hands.*

*The Presiding Officer is to declare the election and announce the Chairperson elect.*

*The Chairperson is to assume the Chair."*

Cr D Richards then nominated Cr R Carter, Cunderdin Shire President, as Chair of the SEARTG Board.

Following Mr R Hooper's suggestion that Cr D Richards detail Present and Apologies, the Executive Officer advised that this is to be done following election of the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson.

There being no further nominations, Cr D Richards declared Cr R Carter Chairperson of the SEARTG Board, and took the opportunity of extending his and the Group's congratulations to Cr R Carter on his appointment.

Cr R Carter then assumed the Chair.

The Chairman advised that it was his honour to accept the position of Chair, whilst taking the opportunity of extending the Group's sincere gratitude to Cr D Richards. Further, that Cr D Richards had undertaken the role with great professionalism and enthusiasm in bringing the Group to where there were today.

Cr D Richards offered his thanks for the Chairman's kind words and for extending the Group's gratitude.

The Chairman further advised that:

- He will approach the role with great enthusiasm,
- It is a worthy cause.
- One way or another the Group will achieve some reform.
- He hopes that this is through the proposed amalgamation.
- If not, the Group will continue to look at other options.
- He looked forward to working with the Executive Officer.

### APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON

The Chairman then drew attention to the need to appoint a Deputy Chairperson, as detailed in the Notice Paper, which reads:

*"The Chairperson is to call for nominations at the Meeting, and if there is more than one nomination, shall undertake an election as follows:*

- 1. Only the Elected Member of each Participating Local Government shall be entitled to vote.*
- 2. Voting is to be by show of hands.*

*The Chairperson is to declare the election and announce the Deputy Chairperson elect."*

Further, the SEARTG Board at its inaugural meeting held on 2 September 2010, resolved as follows in relation to Board Meetings and Decision Making Procedures:

#### **"1.0 Objectives**

*Objectives of the SEARTG are:*

- 1.1 To achieve structural reform in local government throughout the region.*
- 1.2 To develop a Draft Regional Business Plan.*
- 1.3 To plan the development and delivery of common systems, as detailed in Clause 6 of the SEARTG Agreement.*

#### **2.0 Membership**

- 2.1 Each Participant Local Government is to nominate one Elected Member and one Deputy Member to the SEARTG Board.*
- 2.2 Term of Office of the Elected Members and Deputy Members shall be for a term of one year, and shall be eligible for re election.*
- 2.3 Vacancies on the SEARTG Board to be addressed by each Participant Council, and within 30 days, nominate a new representative should a vacancy occur.*

### 3.0 *Meetings*

#### 3.1 *Meetings of the Board shall be either:*

- (a) *General Meeting – The Board shall meet at least four times per year in accordance with Clause 3.3 of the SEARTG Agreement.*
- (b) *Special Meeting – This shall be called and held for a specific purpose.*

#### 3.2 *Agenda for General Meeting:*

- (i) *Declaration of Opening/Announcement of Visitors.*
- (ii) *Record of Attendance/Apologies/Leave of Absence.*
- (iii) *Deputations/Presentations.*
- (iv) *Confirmation of Minutes.*
- (v) *Announcements by Presiding Member without discussion.*
- (vi) *Reports.*
- (vii) *Delegates Motions of which previous notice has been given.*
- (viii) *New business of an urgent nature.*
- (ix) *Closure of Meeting.*

#### 3.3 *Quorum*

- (a) *No item of business may be conducted at a General or Special Meeting unless a quorum of Members entitled to vote is present at the time when the Meeting is considering that item.*
- (b) *Three (3) Elected Members personally present constitutes a quorum for the conduct of the business of a General or Special Meeting.*
- (c) *If a quorum is not present within an hour after the appointed time for the commencement of either a General or Special Meeting, the Meeting shall stand adjourned to a date, time and place to be determined by the Chairperson.*

#### 3.4 *Calling of Meetings*

- (a) *The Chairperson, or in his/her absence, the Deputy Chairperson, and/or three (3) Board Members.*

### 3.5 *Conduct of Meetings*

*General and Special Meetings shall be conducted in the following manner:*

- (a) *The Chairperson or in his/her absence, the Deputy Chairperson, and in the absence of both, a Chairperson elected by resolution of a majority of the Members present at the Meeting.*
- (b) *The Chairperson shall conduct all Meetings in an orderly manner.*
- (c) *Every question, resolution or decision shall be decided by consensus, but should a deadlock occur, a vote of all Elected Members of the Board present will be taken and a majority decision shall apply.*
- (d) *Should a vote be required, every Elected Member present shall be entitled to one vote. When a vote is tied, the motion lapses so that the status quo is maintained.*
- (e) *Voting shall be by a show of hands.*
- (f) *Full and accurate Minutes of all questions, matters, resolutions and other proceedings of every General and Special Meeting, to be entered in a book to be provided for that purpose.*

### 4.0 *Funds*

- 4.1 *The Board to elect a Participant Council to control and manage the finances of the RTG.*
- 4.2 *Expenditure of funds to be in accordance with the SEARTG Agreement.*
- 4.3 *Monthly Financial Statements to be prepared and presented to the Board.*
- 4.4 *An Annual Budget to be prepared and presented to the Board.*

### 5.0 *Secretariat*

- 5.1 *The Board to appoint a Secretariat to the RTG.*

## 6.0 Duties

*The Board Members have a duty:*

- 6.1 *To act honestly in the exercise of their powers and discharge of functions.*
- 6.2 *To disclose direct or indirect interests in a matter being considered, or about to be considered, by the Board.*
- 6.3 *To exercise a degree of duty of care and diligence.*
- 6.4 *Not to make improper use of information or position to gain, directly or indirectly, an advantage for himself or herself, or to the detriment of SEARTG."*

The Chairman then called for nominations for Deputy Chair, with Cr D Richards nominating Cr S Uppill, Tammin Shire President.

Following the Chairman's query, Cr D Richards advised that Cr S Uppill had confirmed his acceptance of nomination as Deputy Chair.

There being no further nominations, the Chairman declared Cr S Uppill as Deputy Chair to the SEARTG Board.

By a round of applause, Attendees offered their congratulations to Cr D Richards as retiring Chair, and to Cr R Carter and Cr S Uppill on their appointment as Chair and Deputy Chair respectively.

The Chairman then confirmed Present and Apologies as follows:

## 2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE

### 2.1 Present

Shire of Cunderdin	- Cr R Carter	- Shire President
Shire of Cunderdin	- Cr C Gibsone	- Deputy Shire President
Shire of Cunderdin	- Mr P Naylor	- Chief Executive Officer



Shire of Quairading	- Cr D Richards	- Shire President
Shire of Quairading	- Cr B Caporn	- Deputy Shire President
Shire of Quairading	- Mr G Fardon	- Chief Executive Officer
Shire of Tammin	- Mr I Bodill	- Chief Executive Officer <i>(From 9:56am)</i>
Shire of York	- Cr M Reid	- Shire President
Shire of York	- Cr M Duprouzel	- Deputy Shire President
Shire of York	- Mr R Hooper	- Chief Executive Officer
Shire of York	- Ms T Cochrane	- Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Department of Local Government	- Ms C Tuthill	- Project Manager
Western Australian Local Government Association	- Ms J Burges	- Regional Cooperation Manager
Dominic Carbone and Associates (DCA)	- Mr D Carbone	- Executive Officer
Anything Telephones and Data (AT&D)	- Mr D Reese	- Business Development Manager
Focus Networks	- Mr D Staeck	- Managing Director
Focus Networks	- Mr D Cusens	- Operations Director

## 2.2 Apologies

Shire of Tammin	- Cr S Uppill	- President
Shire of York	- Cr P Hooper	- Councillor

## 2.3 Leave of Absence

Nil.

### **3. DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

#### **3.1 Deputations**

Nil.

#### **3.2 Presentations**

The Executive Officer advised that AT&D and Focus Networks representatives will provide a presentation as part of Reports RTG-019-13 and RTG-022-13.

### **4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

- 4.1 South East Avon Regional Transition Group Board Meeting held at the Shire of Quairading Council Chambers on Wednesday, 16 October 2013.

Cr D Richards advised that page 26 should be amended to read ". . . *his contribution has been outstanding*", and not "astounding" as shown.

With that correction, it was:

***MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr M Reece, that the Minutes of the South East Avon Regional Transition Group Board Meeting, held at the Shire of Quairading Council Chambers on Wednesday, 16 October 2013, be received.***

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **Business Arising from Minutes**

Nil.

### **5. ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

Nil.

**6. REPORTS**

**RTG-018-13 STATUS REPORT – OUTSTANDING BUSINESS FROM THE SOUTH EAST AVON REGIONAL TRANSITION GROUP (SEARTG) BOARD MEETINGS**  
(File: rtg018-13)

The Executive Officer provided comment in relation to this item of business, detailed as follows:

<i><b>Item</b></i>	<i><b>Comment</b></i>
Information Technology and Communication Systems (ITC)	Subject of a Report on this Agenda, with presentation to be made by Consultants in attendance.
Amalgamation and Implementation Plan	Discussions held with Ms C Tuthill.  Presentation of Plan anticipated for the next SEARTG Board Meeting.
Transitional Funding	Approval received to amend the Pre Release Funding Budget to permit \$245,000 to be allocated to Information Technology and Communications (ITC).  Department have implemented a change in relation to the allocated overall funding of \$2.95M, with this to be allocated across a five year timeframe instead of the original four.

Mr R Hooper queried the Minister's announcement that metropolitan amalgamations will be fully funded, if this is the reason behind the extended timeframe of five years, and whether it puts the Group at risk.

Ms C Tuthill advised that metropolitan funding will be consolidated, whereas funding for this Group was predominantly Country Local Government Fund, with the two being managed in total separation. Further, this reflects the Department of Local Government's negotiations with the Department of Regional Development, the subsequent cash flow to the Department of Local Government, and in turn the Department of Local Government's cash out flow to projects.

It was then:

***MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr R Carter, that Report RTG-018-13 – Status Report – Outstanding Business from South East Avon Regional Transition Group (SEARTG) Board Meetings, be received.***

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

<b>RTG-019-13</b> <b>CLOUD BASED INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS</b> (File: rtg019-13)
--

The Executive Officer invited representatives from Focus Networks to make a presentation to the Group, with Mr D Staeck's presentation detailing the following:

- Focus Networks were appointed by the Shire of York in May 2011 to prepare a report on the current IT status of each Participating Local Government of the SEARTG.
- This report was presented to the SEARTG Board on 13 July 2011.
- The report highlighted many aspects of the current IT setup that required attention.
- The Future State IT Report was presented to the Board on 27 July 2012.
- This report detailed the minimum requirements for hardware, software and services.
- Wherever possible, tier one hardware and software products were referenced to meet minimum requirements.
- Assumptions were made, and then broken up into overall assumptions and key feature assumptions.
- The Future State IT Report delivered a conceptual design and cost estimates for future IT solutions for the amalgamated entity.
- Questions have been raised on the concept, but in particular the associated cost estimates.
- This report lists the advantages and disadvantages of various options, with the intention of suggesting a Cloud based IT solution is not the preferred choice at this point in time for the amalgamated entity.

- On Premise IT solution is the preferred choice.
- Defined common terms.
- Three options for hardware and software solutions, namely:

*Option 1 – On Premise*

Defined as traditional server hardware located on the client's premises, that runs the client's software. Usually owned by the client, and maintained by an IT service provider. Each Participating Local Government currently utilises this model.

*Option 2 – Hosted*

Defined as a server that is not located on the client's premises. This server is hosted by a provider and runs the client's software. This service is usually offered through a direct network connection that runs across a private or public network, ie internet. The provider takes over most of the management including security, memory, storage and IT support.

*Option 3 – Cloud Base*

Defined as hardware/software that is not located on the client's premises, but is delivered to the client as a service over a network.

1. *Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)* – Provides the client with virtual infrastructure which is usually hosted in a data centre.
  2. *Platform as a Service (PaaS)* – Provides the client development environment services where the user can develop and run in-house built applications. Services might include an operating system, databases or web servers.
  3. *Software as a Service (SaaS)* – Provides the client access to already developed applications that are running in the Cloud. Access is achieved by Cloud clients, and the clients do not manage the infrastructure where the application resides.
  4. *Network as a Service (NaaS)* – The least common option where the client is provided with network connectivity services such as Virtual Private Network (VPN) and bandwidth on demand.
- It is not uncommon for complex IT solutions to include two or more of these options.

- Hosted/Cloud:

- Advantages*
- Lower up front costs.
  - Lower IT operating costs.
  - Access to advanced technology.
  - Improved system availability and disaster recovery.

- Disadvantages*
- Subscription expenses.
  - Security risks.
  - Performance risks.
  - Integration limitations.
  - Strategic risks.
  - Service Level Agreement (SLA) risks.
  - Vendor lock-in. This is a dependency on the Cloud provider which makes it difficult and sometimes impossible to migrate away from a Cloud provider. It can be expensive and cumbersome to transfer huge amounts of data from an old Cloud provider to a new one.

- On Premise:

- Advantages*
- Communication links.
  - Sandbox environment (test environment).
  - Application compatibility.
  - Security risks.
  - Disaster recovery.

- Disadvantages*
- SLA issues.
  - Expansion limitations.
  - System availability.
  - Physical security risks.
  - Higher up time costs.

- Recommendation:

The conceptual design and cost estimates for a future IT solution were based around an On Premise design. A number of key factors were taken into consideration, with comment provided on each, ie:

- Site locations.
- Network design.
- Core application.
- NBN.

Mr D Staeck then invited questions from the floor, summarised as:

- Mr R Hooper
- Advised that there is a willingness amongst the Group to work together, confirming that the preferred option would provide for a shared service model whether amalgamation occurred or not.
- Mr D Staeck
- Confirmed that the proposed IT solution would permit shared services across the Group irrespective of amalgamation.
- Mr R Hooper
- Communication process has been an issue from the beginning, with Participants operating on different platforms.
  - This would bring everything back to a common level for all.
- Mr D Cusens
- Confirmed that the suggested process is to have a main file server based at York, to be mirrored at each other site.
  - This would be updated regularly during the day.
  - If there were to be a communication break down the documents would remain visible at each site, but could not be edited as they would be locked down.
- Mr D Staeck
- The data will be centrally located in York, via Microsoft DFS technology, where it will replicate data out from York to each site.
  - This is handled by a physical server at each site that talks in real time and replicates.
  - If a link is cut, people in each site still have access to those documents.
  - When the link is restored, the remote server will communicate and restore that availability.
  - Depending on which application the Group selects, this could also reside on a terminal server situated at York, and could be utilised via remote desktop services.

- Mr D Cusens
- Other systems such as GIS may also be based at York, with other Participating Local Governments having secure access to the system.
  - If the service was down, remote sites retain their local copy and accessibility.
  - The system has the ability to integrate copies once the service is again operational.
  - The Microsoft reference site is an international property management company which has 1,500 servers worldwide.
  - This proposal incorporates five servers and is considered entry level by comparison.
  - This arrangement has been undertaken across Australia and overseas.
  - Microsoft replication technology is built into the operating system.
- Mr G Fardon
- Queried if the central location is down, are the other Participants able to continue with live receipting, rates enquiries, etc.
- Mr D Staeck
- Advised that Mr G Fardon is referring to a published application such as Synergy Soft software.
  - This is slightly different, as this is an application that is published out of York.
  - The Future State Report refers to redundant internet connections and redundant links.
  - If York for example lost an internet connection, or if the satellite site lost an internet connection, these would fail over to a secondary connection, retaining access to the published application such as Synergy Soft, GIS, etc.
- Mr G Cusens
- If you have an extended power outage that is a different story, no-one would be able to retain access.
  - It is important to have filtered power in play and UPS (battery backup) to keep the system operational for as long as possible.



- UPS systems and backup generators can be expensive.
- It is proposed to have a full hosting service, inclusive of emails.
- The Group currently has four small business servers which host the required business needs.
- The proposal is to have all of this centralised on one server based in York, with Participating Local Governments accessing this larger set up.
- Essentially the system would become a "private Cloud" which delivers the services to each Participant.

Chairman

- Suggested that the proposal makes sense for the Group.
- Thanked Mr D Staeck and Mr G Cusens for their report and presentation.
- Drew attention to the recommendation detailed on page 8 of the Notice Paper, namely the preference for the On Premise option.

It was then:

***MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr R Carter, that:***

- 1. The "Cloud Viability Report" prepared by Focus Networks, be received.***
- 2. That the preferred choice in delivering information technology solutions to the South East Avon Regional Transition Group Participating Local Governments in the current and amalgamated state, be based on the "On Premise" option.***

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr I Bodill entered the Council Chambers at 9:56am, and was welcomed by the Chairman on behalf of the Group.

Following Mr G Fardon's suggestion, the Chairman advised Mr I Bodill that Cr S Uppill had been elected as Deputy Chair of the SEARTG Board, asking that this be relayed to Cr S Uppill.

Mr I Bodill then advised that Cr S Uppill's Deputy Delegate to the SEARTG Board will be Cr Carol Crane.

**RTG-020-13 INTERIM NAME FOR PROPOSED NEW LOCAL GOVERNMENT**  
(File: rtg020-13)

The Executive Officer drew attention to this item of business, providing comment on the following points:

- Written request received from the Department of Local Government for an interim name for the proposed new Local Government.
- The interim name is required prior to the Advisory Board submitting its report to the Minister for Local Government, anticipated in December 2013.
- Advice that an interim name will suffice until suitable resources are available to undertake a Corporate Branding Study.
- Report RTG-020-13 details earlier discussions in this regard, and requirements of the Local Government Act.
- Suggestion that the "Shire of South East Avon" be the interim name.

Following Cr D Richards' query on the entity being called "the Shire of South East Avon", with the Executive Officer advising that Section 2.4 of the Local Government Act determined that a district is to be a city, town or shire, and in this instance it would need to be "Shire of . . .".

Cr D Richards advised that given previous discussions in this regard, he was happy to move that the interim name be "the Shire of South East Avon".

Mr G Fardon sought clarification in relation to the phrase utilised within Report RTG-020-13, namely "the Shire of South East Avon" or "the Shire of *the* South East Avon, suggesting the former be utilised.

Following comment by the Chairman, the Executive Officer advised that the recommendation detailed previous SEARTG Board discussions and decisions in respect of wards, ward names, etc. Further, the recommendation offered the Group the option of advising the Local Government Advisory Board direct, or alternatively resolving to refer the matter to each Participating Local Government for endorsement.

General discussion followed, summarised as:

- Chairman
- Believed the decision to be straight forward,
- Mr P Naylor
- Suggested that previous Minutes detailing the suggested interim name will have been presented to each Participating Local Government Council.
  - There being no comment from each Council to the contrary, suggested that the Group provide direct advice to the Advisory Board.
- Chairman
- Suggested that Mr P Naylor's comment was pertinent.
- Cr M Reid
- Queried the retention of existing town names.
- Executive Officer
- Understanding that the current Shire would become the Ward, eg Cunderdin Ward.
- Cr M Reid
- Raised concern with changing town names to include the word "Ward".
- Mr G Fardon
- Advised that the intent is that the existing Shire boundary would become the Ward boundary, with no change to existing town names.
- Executive Officer
- The district would then become "the Shire of South East Avon", and the Wards will be Cunderdin, Quairading, Tammin and York.
  - Confirms that town names will remain unchanged.
  - There is a need for the Group to make a decision on whether the matter is referred to each Participating Local Government Council, or that the SEARTG Board advises the Advisory Board direct.
- Chairman
- Concurred with Mr P Naylor's earlier comment that there is no need to refer the matter back to each Participating Local Government Council.

- Cr D Richards
- Also concurred with discussions that the SEARTG Board advise the Local Government Advisory Board direct.
  - Confirmed that should a poll be requested, that the preference is for an in person election.

It was then:

***MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr R Carter, that the Local Government Advisory Board be advised as follows:***

- 1. The interim name for the proposed new Local Government is to be the "Shire of South East Avon".***
- 2. The South East Avon Regional Transition Group Board reaffirms the following:***
  - (a) The election of President to be by the Council.***
  - (b) The names for each Ward to be:***
    - Cunderdin Ward;***
    - Quairading Ward;***
    - Tammin Ward; and***
    - York Ward.***

***The Ward boundaries are to remain as per the current Participating Local Government Boundaries.***

- (c) Should a poll be requested, the preference is for an in person election.***

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr R Hooper raised the following matter, seeking input from the Group:

- York Shire has identified an anomaly within its boundary, where an area of the Great Southern Highway has only three rateable properties, with the remainder being forest.
- South of the Great Southern Highway is in Northam Shire.
- Correspondence requesting a boundary adjustment has been drafted.

- Does not believe this to interfere with the SEARTG reform process, however York will not initiate anything that may do so.
- York is happy to wait until February or March when the SEARTG process is defined before progressing with the suggested boundary adjustment.
- Input sought from the Group on this matter.

Ms C Tuthill responded with comment covering:

- Will discuss the matter with Mr R Earnshaw from the Advisory Board as to whether this can be undertaken concurrently.
- If it is not going to be a major impact, there may be scope to do so.
- Confirmed with Mr R Hooper that his intent was to submit this request to the Advisory Board.

Mr R Hooper advised:

- A draft letter has been prepared for Council consideration on Monday, 18 November 2013.
- Should Council agree with the content of the correspondence, this will be distributed seeking initial reaction from the Shire of Northam.
- There are two connected roads through the area that create traffic issues for the Shire of York.
- York's section of this road is on "Regional Roads" however Northam's section is not.
- Reiterates that York do not wish for this to interfere with the SEARTG process.

Ms C Tuthill advised:

- If the matter proves to be minor, it may be dealt with quickly.
- On that premise, it should be able to be addressed concurrently.
- Given the timing of Governor's Orders in approximately May or June 2014, there is sufficient time to deal with the matter.

The Executive Officer requested that the Order of Business be altered to permit Report RTG-022-13 – Proposed Expenditure – Information Technology Equipment, to be dealt with at this juncture. The purpose being that any decision on this Report will impact on funds available for the purchase and installation of software at the Shires of Cunderdin and Tammin. Further, suggesting that the Meeting may wish to stand adjourned to permit Mr D Reese to prepare his presentation.

<b>RTG-022-13      PROPOSED EXPENDITURE – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT</b> (File: rtg022-13)
---

Following the Chairman's invitation, Mr D Cusens provided a presentation summarised as follows:

- Focus Networks wrote the information technology (IT) components for both the Current State Report and the Future State Report.
- Original audits for each locality were completed some two years ago.
- Recent site visits undertaken at the request of the Executive Officer to look at possible expenditure from the available Transitional Funding.
- Review undertaken of areas detailed in the Current and Future State reports.
- Analysis on how funds can be best utilised for the greater entity if amalgamation goes ahead, whilst also benefiting the Group should amalgamation not occur.
- Provided comment on the different categories of the respective attachments to this report, and why some categories were selected over others.
- Primary selections will have a major impact on what can be undertaken following the initial stage.
- Concentrated on Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) communications.
- This is a stand alone investment which can be integrated in the future to create a common overall VoIP network platform.
- A VoIP platform would provide features such as direct in-dial, voice mail, more line capacity, simpler Telstra account, and room for rationalisation after the process is complete.
- Other technologies selected to support the VoIP infrastructure.
- Current cabling cannot support a VoIP solution.
- Quotes obtained from cabling companies to re-cable to a centralised cabinet, whilst upgrading to a Category 6 cable.

- Preference to retain phone use on loss of power, with UPS systems required for this.
- Network switching is to be a stand alone box providing the appropriate network infrastructure to power the VoIP facility.
- Other areas were investigated, however budgetary constraints and associated impacts negated consideration of these, which included:
  - Internet gateways and their associated recurrent costs.
  - ISP links can amount to several thousand dollars per month.
  - Backup was highlighted as high risk; without a centralised server, backup arrangements would need to be made for four separate systems.
  - Desktop and laptop upgrade would provide faster and more reliable work stations, however each machine requires 2-3 hours labour to set up, with investment in this labour lost on amalgamation.
  - There is one small business server at each site, designed to remain as one domain.
  - One of the largest and most complicated tasks for the Group will be to remove each small business server, replace these with standard servers, and create one common domain to share network data, centralise information, and replicate to each site.
  - This would provide for one Microsoft server for emails, with the creation of a new domain name and aliases for the old domain names.
  - As suggested by Cr M Reid, for a small fee the Group could register and secure a new domain name now.
  - Local Government domain names require the ".wa.gov.au" extension, with these being controlled by the Department of Treasury and Finance, and secure from public utilisation.
  - Domain addresses with a ".com.au" extension are also utilised by Local Government, however these are secondary domain names and not normally related to email addresses or websites.
  - Most Participating Local Governments have upgraded their servers over the last two or so years.
  - Replacing server hardware without undertaking any other strategic Windows work will bring little benefit to individual Councils until major works are completed.

- Participating Local Governments have varying anti virus platforms which are not monitored particularly well, with some not being up to date.
  - Creation of a single domain with a single, centrally managed anti virus platform will be more cost effective.
  - Fibre optic runs were highlighted in the Future State Report as an option to interconnect the smaller buildings, such as depots etc. This has been effectively ruled out from a pricing perspective.
  - Internet connectivity solutions such as Virtual Private Network (VPN) and wireless solutions will be considered.
  - Windows updates also come down to a common domain, rather than implement the Windows infrastructure on each individual domain which is not efficient or cost effective.
  - The decision on implementing corporate applications such as a rates database should be undertaken as part of the overall Strategic IT Plan with a common goal and defined solution.
  - Most Participating Local Governments have an ad-hoc arrangement for IT support.
  - Recommendation that the Group procure an IT support arrangement for a new domain, which would be considerably more complex than the current individual server arrangements.
  - Documenting individual strategies is not cost efficient with a recommendation that the Group adopt a corporate direction, and similarly with the Disaster Relief (DR) Plan.
- Process to be followed:
    - Seek quotations from cabling contractors.
    - Network switches – key feature being power over internet.
    - UPS systems – one adequate for both phones and server and inclusive of a surge filter.
    - Computer room – re-cabling with allocation of standard cabinet, with small "Tardis" for each site.
    - York has an adequate dedicated computer room.
    - Server cabinets in each site will house UPS system, network switch, phone system, and server hardware.



- Installation will be inconvenient and noisy for a period.
- Tight timeline to implement this solution.
- Cannot change phone system until cabling is brought up to specification.
- Starting point is for cabling contractors to install dedicated power/UPS.
- All web communications, VoIP, and phone systems will utilise the new network cabling.
- Key aspect being the conversion from analogue to digital lines, which will permit direct in-dial, voice mail, voice mail to email, log on/log off of phone handsets at any location without change of phone numbers.
- This technology will permit the reception phone to be diverted to any location in times of absence, maintaining functionality of business.
- Functionality, technology and licensing is recommended for purchase now in order that these facilities will be available in the future.
- Telstra lines need to come in on a digital platform to permit the upgrade.
- York Recreation Centre currently has this technology.
- Existing main phone numbers would remain in place for a period of time with diversions to newly allocated numbers.
- Each Participating Local Government would be provided with one hundred consecutive phone numbers each.
- Eventual advertising of new numbers will be required, with suggested timing of this on amalgamation with new branding and stationery.
- Following Mr G Fardon's query, Mr D Reese advised that each location has PSDN lines, and would upgrade to digital ISDN2 over existing Telstra copper lines, and therefore no delay is anticipated as a result.
- PSDN is an analogue line as per most residential installations.

- Digital service discussed has been available for many years and will permit required upgrades in the short timeframe available.
- Following a query by Mr R Hooper, Mr D Reese advised that old numbers will divert to the Receptionist.
- Staff will log on to a handset which will permit them to receive their phone calls no matter their location on that day.
- Numbers allocated will be dependent on what is available at the exchange.
- Following a query by Cr M Reid, Mr D Reese and Mr D Cusens confirmed that existing telephone numbers will be permanently redirected to the newly allocated numbers; ie should someone dial the old number they will still be put through. This will be undertaken at an IT level without awareness to the caller.
- This process has been implemented at York Hospital.
- Mr D Reese advised that this system provided the ability to redirect calls to reception, to voice mail, or mobile, in times of absence, with the ability for voice mail to be on delivered as an email.
- This system allows for seamless business operation, including the ability to transfer a call received by mobile to another phone in the system.
- Whilst not all options will be utilised immediately, utilisation will be increased over time.
- Licensing and handsets have been allowed for at each depot site, to enable the system to be rolled out as the upgrade unfolds.

Drawing attention to the tight time frame for implementation, Mr D Cusens provided the following summary:

- Will be dealing with Telstra on a very tight timeline.
- Mr D Reese has undertaken some preliminary work in relation to liaising with Telstra.
- Project to commence today, Thursday, 14 November 2013.

- Critical point will be the York Shire Council Meeting on Monday, 18 November 2013, where expenditure would need to be formally accepted.
- Purchase orders would need to be issued on Tuesday, 19 November 2013, including Telstra, cabling contractors, suppliers, etc.
- Telstra paperwork would need to be signed off on Tuesday, 19 November 2013.
- Hardware requires a two week lead time.
- Project contract also to be signed on Tuesday, 19 November 2013.

Following the Executive Officer's advice, on behalf of Focus Networks, Mr D Cusens declared an interest in relation to this matter, providing additional comment as follows:

- Focus Networks put a proposal to the Executive Officer to project manage and provide network configuration for this project.
- There will be different entities involved in the project.
- Focus Networks are on the Western Australian State Government Common Use Agreement (CUA) Panel.
- Focus Networks have considerable experience in Local Government operations.
- Large component of the project will be the telephony aspect and required cabling.

Mr D Cusens then continued with his summary, detailed as:

- Equipment and data cabling would need to commence on Monday, 25 November 2013.
- Data cabling has the longest project scope to be completed in two halves, and extending to the end of January 2014.
- Old cabling and phone sockets will be removed on installation of the new phone system, with patching and installation of blank face plates.
- VoIP will require equipment to be ordered for UPS and network switching installation, with this required prior to installation of the phone system. This will roll out before Christmas and conclude at the end of January 2014.
- Very tight timeframe to ensure funds are expended in the month of December with some works carried over into January 2014.

Mr G Fardon raised concern with maintaining communications during the fire season, with Mr D Reese confirming that the new system will run in tandem with the old in order to eliminate such issues.

The Chairman queried worse case scenario of not making the required expenditure deadlines.

Mr D Cusens responded with comment on the following:

- Critical aspect relates to Telstra's timing.
- Most suppliers are flexible in receiving expenditure in the month of December.
- Timing of Telstra contract signing is crucial to the timing of works.
- Telstra has a monthly billing cycle, with considerable effort required to liaise with Telstra on works to be included in the December account rather than January 2014.
- Telstra has an embargo every year from mid December to mid January which impacts on this process.

Following the Chairman's further query on where the Group stood if works were not billed in time, Ms C Tuthill advised that:

- Evidence provided on work being undertaken and completed.
- Whether invoicing/payments fall within a particular billing period is not the issue.
- Timing of entering into contracts and forward works to be done.
- Does not consider there to be an issue, with the proposed works schedule.

Mr D Cusens continued with his summation:

- Main issue surrounds Telstra works, and the need for billing on a monthly basis.
- If invoicing/payment slipped to January 2014, work will still continue in the background.
- Scope will break down to detail cabling roll out per Participating Local Government.

Mr R Hooper suggested that if York Shire Council accepts the expenditure on Monday, 18 November 2013, and contracts are signed on Tuesday, 19 November 2013, then this would lock in the IT component of the Transition Funding. Further, the delivery period may extend by a week or so, but the contracts would be secured.

Ms C Tuthill advised that the allocation has already been approved, and it is up to the Group on how those funds are expended.

Mr R Hooper advised that the Executive Officer had queried if York Council would accept a late item on this matter at its Ordinary Meeting of Monday, 18 November 2013, otherwise the matter would not be considered until the December Meeting, or at a Special Council Meeting, which would extend the timeline.

Mr D Reese drew attention to the Group's concern on Telstra's timing, advising that AT&D are a Telstra Help Desk and Telstra Enterprise and Government Partner, and as such, any Telstra requests or queries can be made direct to AT&D for resolution.

Mr R Hooper then queried York's VoIP rate via the WALGA/Telstra billing system, with Mr D Reese advising that this will not change, with existing WALGA rates remaining in place.

Ms J Burges drew attention to the Group undertaking an infrastructure change, not a contractual arrangement.

Mr D Cusens advised that York's VoIP system was installed in the office only, however once the network connectivity was upgraded, there would be free call between office extensions, and the ability to look at additional Telstra services such as Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) which could provide additional savings.

Mr D Reese further advised that Telstra accounts would be consolidated in an amalgamated state.

Mr D Cusens stated that there were some Participating Local Governments who were not on the Telstra/WALGA billing system, and that this status quo would remain until such times as a formal review was undertaken.

Following the Chairman's query, Ms C Tuthill advised as follows:

- Departmental staff are located at a number of sites, and the VoIP technology provides seamless connectivity.
- Given distances between each Participating Local Government site, such infrastructure is important.
- This would allow for continued shared services if amalgamation does not occur.
- Queried the ability of bringing another Local Government on board with the Group, for example shared services with Beverley.

Mr D Reese advised that the system allowed for IP networking of up to 250,000 handsets, with Mr D Cusens referencing other sites utilising this infrastructure, namely Roy Hill mine site in the Pilbara, Kmart and Bunnings Australia wide.

Following the Executive Officer's request, and with agreement of Participants, the Meeting stood adjourned at 10:49am to permit Mr D Reese to set up equipment for his demonstration.

The Meeting reconvened at 10:59am, with the same attendees present.

Mr D Reese proceeded with his phone system demonstration, covering the following points:

- Working system with handset connected via 3G to the Telstra tower and back to AT&D Wangara office.
- This replicates Stage 2, namely implementation at each depot site.
- Call made to AT&D office.
- System provides the ability to see which staff members are available.
- Standard phone unit quoted across all sites.
- Demonstrates ability to "hot desk in" utilising a log in on any handset.
- This ability is suitable for any Officer needing to transfer between locations.
- Following Mr R Hooper's query, Mr D Reese confirmed that a conference call could be conducted with each participant remaining at their own desk.

- System allows for up to 8 handsets to be engaged in a conference call.
- Software can be purchased which permits more.
- Following Cr M Reid's query, Mr D Reese advised that the proposed system has the ability to connect to a plasma screen or PC to permit viewing of documents.
- Upgrading the proposed system to the next level would permit video conferencing for up to four units.
- Cr M Reid drew attention to this feature being able to reduce travelling for Elected Members and residents.
- The overall cost of upgrading the proposed system to permit video conferencing is not considered significant.
- Following Cr M Duperouzel's query, Mr D Reese advised that the system did not allow for the wearing of headsets, however the system was designed to be used in a reasonable sized room
- The system permits the ability for options such as blue tooth or wireless headset connectivity.
- Following a further query from Cr M Duperouzel, Mr D Reese advised that an upgraded video conferencing model would permit the screen to be dissected to show each site involved.
- Life size video conferencing solutions are also available, with the ability for additional third parties to dial in to the conference via mobile devices.
- Cr M Reid suggested that these features were not immediately required, however it is pertinent to form the base system that could accommodate these enhancements in the future.
- The software stream moves the technology, and with MiTel's twice yearly major release to coincide with technology that Telstra and others release, the technology will continue to be enhanced.
- Mr D Cusens advised that the phone system was also able to be moved to Cloud.
- The technology will move with the Group's strategic direction.
- Virgin airlines have the same system, and recently removed their server and migrated to Cloud.

Mr R Hooper provided comment on the video conferencing being a positive in allowing enhanced access to Council Meetings, and permitting greater communication with staff, work crews and the community. Further, suggesting that estimates should be obtained for these "add-ons" in Stage 2 of the process.

Mr D Reese advised it was a matter of determining which applications would best suit the Group, and cost accordingly.

Mr R Hooper suggested that this technology would enhance toolbox meetings, occupational health and safety meetings, and simplify matters for the Group's Regional Risk Coordinators.

Mr D Reese advised that the system also allowed for messaging via the phone screen which can be administered by a nominated staff member. Following queries from the floor, Mr D Reese further advised that messaging is available via a blogging site, with control on the content.

Following queries from the floor, Mr D Reese and Mr D Cusens advised:

- Standard handsets had been included in the proposal, along with one conferencing phone per Participating Local Government.
- Standard handsets do not have a touch screen.
- No headsets have been included, however modules were available to connect to hands free handsets.
- A cordless handset has been allowed for Receptionists.
- This effectively replaces "like for like", with audio conferencing available.
- Options such as video conferencing would need to be scoped and added to the system in the future. This however needs additional input on room sizes, configuration, the number of screens etc.
- By including Category 6 cabling in the initial stages, this would permit such enhancements in the future.

The Chairman suggested that this was a platform that the Group could build on, with Mr D Reese suggesting that investment in the proposed base system was money well spent and provided a good base which could be enhanced over time.



Mr R Hooper queried the cost of upgrading to video conferencing and the enhanced handsets, with Cr M Reid requesting that this be detailed as two separate costs, then providing comment that ratepayers had voiced concerns on connectivity and the ability to view meetings.

Lengthy general discussion followed, with input by Mr D Cusens, Mr D Staeck, Mr R Hooper, Cr M Reid, Mr G Reese, the Chairman, the Executive Officer, Ms C Tuthill and Ms J Burges, on:

- Government pricing for handsets.
- Suggestion that Government pricing be utilised to upgrade the proposed handsets and to include a video conferencing feature, with relevant savings in this regard.
- Government costing will not be available to the group for the suggested upgrades at a later date.
- Moveability of conferencing handsets provides for the handset to be plugged into any live port, to be recognised on the network and provide the relevant connectivity.
- Quality of the video is dependent on the bandwidth available.
- The bandwidth will be available to all in Stage 2 and will provide for enhanced video conferencing.
- Difference in price:
  - Proposed handsets are costed at \$250.00 each (Government Pricing).
  - Next handsets, minus cordless component, are costed at \$380.00 each (Government Pricing – normally over \$600.00).
  - Headsets are costed at \$400.00 each. This requires a cordless module, and not everyone would need this. This enables the ability to answer and hang up calls whilst mobile within the office.
  - Government pricing is based on the initial purchase, with a possible approach to MiTel on securing future pricing.
  - There is \$124.00 difference between the proposed standard handset and upgraded version.
  - Concept of communication across four sites is phenomenal.
  - Executive Officer to obtain estimates on handset upgrades.

- Additional cost may be something that individual Councils may consider.
- The handset upgrade will be highly valuable, and if amalgamation does not occur, the facility will be helpful with the Group continuing to share resources.
- There is a big difference between audio and video conferencing.
- Video conferencing should be handled as a separate project.
- Room assessment required, glass, glare, etc to be accounted for.
- Commencing with base level audio conferencing would allow people to sit in a room and hear a Council Meeting at another location. This would be a starting point and enhance on what is currently available, offering the community some integration.
- A total of 77 handsets have been allowed for.
- The Department will not release more funds than the allocated \$295,000 Transitional Funding.
- \$214,000 has been quoted from the \$245,000 allocated funds for IT infrastructure.
- Audio connectivity would offer exceptional enhancements on the current scenario.
- Earlier advice that the "system allows for up to 8 handsets to be engaged in a conference call", clarified that up to eight parties can dial into the conference.
- Enhancements that enable public involvement are positive.
- Ability to upgrade bandwidth essential.
- Expenditure required on lighting, sound, and screens to support video conferencing.
- Other video conferencing solutions available at less cost.

Mr R Hooper drew attention to the Executive Officer needing to prepare a report for the York Ordinary Council Meeting on Monday, 18 November 2013. Further, seeking agreement that if funds were available, that handsets be upgraded as discussed, then querying if this would jeopardise the Group in any way in relation to funding.

Ms C Tuthill advised that if the upgrade sits within the budget allocation and with agreement on what funds are to be expended on, this would not be an issue.

Mr R Hooper sought agreement that:

- The audio component is a part of this process.
- That upgraded handsets be included in the allocated funding if possible.
- Scope for contingencies to be maintained.
- What York is to sign off on can be delivered within budget, and within the process.

Ms C Tuthill sought clarification on the difference between the proposed handset and the enhanced version, with Mr D Reese advising as follows:

- Functionality is almost identical.
- The enhanced version has a touch screen and 48 pre determined buttons as opposed to 24.
- The enhanced version has the ability to view blog data, has a bigger screen, and is in colour.
- Cordless handset is at an additional cost.
- Hands free functionality is up to 100m dependent on wall configurations.

General discussion followed, with input by Mr G Reese, Mr G Fardon, Cr D Richards, Ms C Tuthill, Mr R Hooper, Mr P Naylor, Cr M Reid, Mr D Cusens, and the Executive Officer, detailing:

- Costs are \$400.00 for a cordless model plus \$380.00 for the handset, versus \$240.00 for the standard proposed handset.
- This amounts to approximately \$1,000 per upgraded handset.
- What is sufficient, versus use of enhanced capabilities, versus the ability to add-on in the future.
- The enhanced version with a touch screen would better position the Group for the future.
- Best value for money for the Group.

- The proposed handset is not an entry level phone.
- Personal Assistants and Receptionists will require a more advanced phone.
- The Chairman suggested that the group had spent considerable time on seeking a solution.
- Suggestion that the Executive Officer prepare a report on this matter.
- Further suggestion that the Executive Officer, Mr G Reese and Ms C Tuthill determine what is affordable within budget parameters, and put a recommendation forward.
- Important to allow a contingency factor of 10% equalling approximately \$8,500.
- Suggestion that 50 standard and 20 enhanced handsets be purchased.
- Each Participating Local Government to determine the mix of handsets required.
- Preference that additional funds be directed to a UPS system.
- Proposal details a 3 kVA UPS system.
- Audio conferencing microphone accommodates varying voice tones, and will dampen other sounds dependent on the room environment.
- Additional costing estimates will not affect timeframes.
- Some orders have already been placed in anticipation of maintaining the timeline. These will need to be cancelled or amended.
- Suggestion that York Council accept the prices put forward for the phone system and make provisional allowance for twelve upgraded phones, subject to individual Council needs, which is a \$1,300 variation to the price and well within the project scope.
- The contract, when written, will detail the specific requirements.
- Mr R Hooper to advise Mr G Reese following York's Council Meeting in order that a revised quote can be provided on required phone configurations.
- Suggestion that the Group move a motion that the Shire of York adopts the prices recommended, detailing 65 standard handsets and 12 upgraded handsets, to be allocated on an as needs basis, which is to form a variation to the contract.
- Variation to the quotation will form part of the resolution.

- Clarification that:
  - York is the holder of the allocated Transitional Funding.
  - Expenditure of funds by the SEARTG Group has traditionally been endorsed by York as the host Council.
  - Need to comply with the purchasing and tendering policies.
  - Two of the quotes are below \$100,000.
  - Concern if there is a contingency with the cabling that it may approach tendering requirements.
  - Telstra quote for communication, whilst being over \$100,000 is exempt under the Regulations as the works are via a Government agency.
  - Billing will be allocated to York for dissemination to each Participating Local Government.
  - Suggestion that any remaining funds from the \$245,000 allocated will be utilised to cover maintenance costs across the Participating Local Governments.
  - Ms C Tuthill advised that this was not possible, as maintenance falls under operational costs.
  - Confirmation that billing separation will be based on the system not the number of handsets, as these are considered a disposable item compared to server allocation, etc.
  - Motion required on the cost allocation.

It was then:

***MOVED Cr M Reid, Seconded Cr D Richards, that costs will be allocated per server, ie two in York, one in Cunderdin, one in Quairading, and one in Tammin.***

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Mr R Hooper suggested that a resolution was required in relation to cabling and a 10% contingency factor, and an allowance for upgraded handsets as part of the tender, so that this was locked in.

The Executive Officer suggested a recommendation that the SEARTG Board requests the Shire of York to authorise expenditure, as detailed in Report RTG-022-13 – Proposed Expenditure – Information Technology Equipment, in relation to the three contracts being for works to be undertaken for cabling, ICT communication, and project management. Further that this is currently quoted at \$214,667.

Mr R Hooper suggested that Council has the right to make a recommendation on the number of upgraded phones to be included.

The Executive Officer suggested that the motion include that the information technology and communication system be amended to allow for up to 12 upgraded handsets.

Cr M Reid then suggested that if there were a cabling cost blowout, there were sufficient funds available to cover this, with the Executive Officer raising concern that this may exceed the \$100,000 tendering requirement.

The Chairman suggested that with inclusion of the contingencies discussed, this would remain within the allocation \$245,000 allocated funds.

It was then:

***MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr R Carter, that:***

- 1. The South East Avon Regional Transition Group Board, requests the Shire of York to authorise expenditure, as detailed in Report RTG-022-13 – Proposed Expenditure – Information Technology Equipment, in relation to the three contracts being for works to be undertaken for cabling, information technology communication, and project management.***
- 2. In relation to (1) above, the information technology and communication system be amended to allow for up to 12 upgraded handsets.***

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

The Chairman took the opportunity of thanking Mr D Cusens, Mr D Staeck and Mr D Reese for their presentations and attendance at the Meeting, whilst inviting them to join the Group for lunch.

With agreement of Attendees, the Meeting then stood adjourned at 11:54am for lunch. With the exception of Mr D Cusens, Mr D Staeck and Mr D Reese, the Meeting resumed at 12:40pm with the same Attendees present.

<b>RTG-021-13</b> <b>SOFTWARE CONSIDERATIONS – SYNERGY SOFTWARE AND LG SYSTEM</b> (File: rtg021-13)
--

The Chairman drew attention to this item of business, querying available expenditure.

The Executive Officer advised that there was approximately \$10,000 available, whilst providing comment on the following

- Following discussions at the SEARTG Board Meeting of 16 October 2013, IT Vision were requested to provide a quotation for the installation of Synergy Soft at Cunderdin and Tammin.
- Page 11 of the Notice Paper details the information received from IT Vision in this regard.
- Core modules of this software would cost in the vicinity of \$82,000 per installation, with annual licence fees of \$21,000.
- With additional modules, this could cost up to \$98,000 for the entire suite.
- Additional modules would increase annual licence fees by \$15,000.
- Given resolutions relating to Report RTG-022-13, there are insufficient funds for this purchase.
- With IT Vision's advice of a six month lead time, funds could not be spent in the required Transitional Funding timeframe.
- LG System Inc (LGS) were contacted in relation to their LG Enterprise (LGE) product, requesting a proposal.
- Cunderdin are currently utilising this software.
- LGS were made aware of the perception that this software was not meeting Western Australian requirements.
- LGS have advised that they are willing to commit resources to come to Western Australia and address any issues and train Cunderdin staff.
- The Shire of Beverley will indirectly benefit from this, albeit they are not a SEARTG Participant, they are a SEAVROC Member, and partner in contract with the four Member Councils.
- Consideration could be given to allocation of funds to meet the cost of bringing LGS representatives to Western Australia to address the issues experienced by the Shire of Cunderdin.

- There are insufficient funds to undertake any major software implementation projects at this point in time.

Mr P Naylor provided comment in relation to the following:

- Given what the end result may be, believes that IT Vision have not done the work to attract more business.
- Discussion held with Mr P Moore of LGS this morning on issues that require resolving.
- Issues have been in place for some time and not satisfactorily resolved.
- Following a suggestion that LGS need to consider placing a person in Western Australia to become familiar with Western Australia legislation and compliance requirements, Mr P Moore advised that this would be done.
- Considers this to be a step forward in getting the system working to Western Australian requirements.
- Issues experienced in relation to rates and asset registers are being addressed, albeit not as expediently as would be preferred.
- Drew attention to availability of people with Synergy Soft experience compared to those with LGS experience.
- Training is required to be put in place.

The Chairman then provided comment in relation to:

- Suggested that due to lack of funding this matter becomes a deferred issue.
- The matter will either get dealt with as amalgamation proceeds, or may revert to a SEAVROC project.
- No doubt the Group will aim to pursue structural reform no matter what happens.
- The key component of reform is to have a compatible and common IT platform.
- There are good points with IT Vision with staffing and experience, and likewise with the LGS commitment to assist with training support.
- The Group must make a decision on direction of this project.



Following Mr I Bodill's query, Mr P Naylor advised that he considered that there could be cost savings with the Synergy Soft proposal, such as joint training programs etc for the two Shires, particularly given the business prospect existing across the Group.

Following Mr I Bodill stating that he was not particularly familiar with either software, Ms T Cochrane advised that York were experiencing problems with their recent Synergy Soft upgrade, and Mr G Fardon suggesting this was the case with each upgrade. Mr P Naylor then offered comment that Broome had two full time IT staff members, and still experienced issues with the Synergy Soft system.

The Executive Officer provided comment on the following:

- In view of the funding and restricted timeframe, this may be an opportunity to see if LGS can improve the LGE software installation in Western Australia.
- Should this be successful, if amalgamation does take place, then a more informed decision can be made as to which software becomes the preferred option to implement in the new entity.
- In line with what is to be achieved with the Pre Release Funding, there could be some financial assistance to the Shire of Cunderdin to bring the system to the level that it should be.

Cr D Richards then offered comment detailing:

- Suggested that there was time on the Group's side to approach IT Vision in relation to their quote, and to provide LGS the opportunity to improve their marketability.
- Has concerns in relation to LGS staff retention and support.

Following Mr I Bodill's query, Mr R Hooper advised that York had considered going with LGE software, however with the resulting issues chose to upgrade existing Synergy Soft software. The chance of York changing over to LGE would be minimal at this point in time.

Mr I Bodill then queried if LGE software could communicate with Synergy Soft, with Mr G Fardon advising that the systems did not communicate. Mr I Bodill suggested that this was a problem, with Mr G Fardon providing comment in relation to the client base for each product.

The Executive Officer provided comment on:

- The differences between IT Vision and LGE software.
- LGE is based on up to date Microsoft technology where IT Vision is not.
- IT Vision provides a very good front end, with an "old engine" behind it.
- Eventually IT Vision will have to do what LGE has done and ensure the "engine" is updated.
- LGS has invested heavily in updating their old system.
- LGE and IT Vision Synergy Soft are built on the old "data flex" system.
- These factors need to be taken into account.
- Suggests that a decision on software implementation should be considered on amalgamation.
- Understands that the four Participating Local Governments wish to integrate their systems with resource sharing, with options available to do so.
- Tammin may wish to consider partnering with another Local Government and outsourcing their information technology requirements.
- There are a number of solutions available.
- Believes that other software suppliers may be more expensive than IT Vision and LGS which will affect affordability.
- Both software options discussed have disadvantages and advantages.
- LGE has no licence restrictions given existing partnership arrangements.
- IT Vision proposal provides for six licences.

Mr R Hooper commented on:

- Available funds to obtain connectivity.
- Normally Local Governments would fund their own upgrades as required.
- Believes there will be cost overruns in relation to information technology expenditure.
- Suggests that the available \$10,000 funding is spent on something that gives the Group some form of communication, possibly GPS equipment.

- Concurs with the Executive Officer in that a decision is made on software implementation following poll provisions.
- This would permit an extended tender period to ensure everything is in place.
- Because of the uncertainty and lack of commonality across the four Participating Local Governments, believes the money should be kept for communication and connectivity or technology that all can use.

Mr I Bodill provided comment on Tammin's desire to have a fully operational software package, with Mr G Fardon suggesting that the Chief Executive Officers and accounting staff need to meet to discuss options in this regard.

The Chairman suggested that IT Vision and LGS be informed that the Group are working towards compatible software, and that no decision will be made until March 2014. Further, that the Group were dissatisfied with the quote from IT Vision and support from LGS.

Mr R Hooper queried if Quairading were to provide a service to Tammin under Synergy Soft, Tammin would only be required to purchase licenses for the rating and accounting functions with hardware already in place.

Mr I Bodill understood this to be correct, stating that there was no need for the dog module, with Mr G Fardon confirming that Quairading does not have this module.

Mr R Hooper suggested by pursuing this aspect, it would negate the overall purchase of \$82,000. Until completion of the information technology cabling dial up may be slow, but does not see any impediment to pursuing this as an option. Further, that this may be discussed at the next Chief Executive Officers' meeting.

The Chairman sought agreement on the suggested advice to IT Vision and LGS, with Mr G Fardon indicating that this was fair and reasonable. Further, that confirmation will be sought from LGS in relation to greater support for the Cunderdin trial site.

The Chairman then queried the need to allocate the \$10,000 funding, with the Executive Officer advising that there is no requirement to do so at this point. Further, recommending a motion to read "That IT Vision be advised that the decision to implement Synergy Soft is deferred, and LGS be advised to contact the Shire of Cunderdin in relation to their offer for training and upgrading of the LGE System".

It was then:

*MOVED Cr D Richards, Seconded Cr R Carter, that IT Vision be advised that the decision to implement Synergy Soft is deferred, and that LG System Inc be advised to contact the Shire of Cunderdin in relation to the offer for training and upgrading of the LG Enterprise product.*

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. BOARD MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil.

**8. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE**

Nil.

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

**1. SEARTG Publicity**

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Chairman     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Drew attention to publication of the monthly circular, and in particular detailing support for amalgamation.</li></ul>   |
| Mr R Hooper  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Advised that he has made some amendments to the distributed draft circular.</li><li>• Suggests that each Chief Executive Officer peruses the document and provides any amendments to the Executive Officer in order that this may be published.</li><li>• Believes the document "hits the target", and details the benefits of amalgamation.</li></ul> |
| Ms C Tuthill | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Queried if this document had been forwarded to the Department.</li></ul>   |

- Executive Officer
- Advised that the document had not been emailed, as it has not been finalised.
  - A draft will be provided following amendments from the Chief Executive Officers.

## 2. Compliance Requirements

- Mr R Hooper
- Raised concerns with the difficulty in achieving compliance requirements.
  - A lot of money was spent in 2010 undertaking full valuations.
  - Now there is a need for a desktop valuation every two years, requiring an additional \$1,600 to complete.
  - Auditor's advice is that the desktop valuation is not a sworn valuation, and therefore holds little importance.
  - Suggests the need for a compliance template similar to the election timetable, which should include all matters such as boundary review, financial management review, etc.
  - This would be invaluable for Elected Members and staff.
  - Discussion at the Chief Executive Officers' meeting had raised the issue of compliance burden.
- Ms C Tuthill
- Will take suggestion back to the Department.
  - Perhaps something broad with no fixed dates.
  - A checklist of compliance requirements.
- Executive officer
- Suggests that the compliance return will determine the checklist.
- Ms C Tuthill
- Advised that she will raise the matter with the Department.

### **3. Chief Executive Officers' Meeting and Elected Member Training**

- Mr G Fardon
- Chief Executive Officers' meeting was held on Friday, 8 November 2013 in Quairading.
  - This meeting had an extensive agenda, and included cooperative matters being worked on.
  - Next Chief Executive Officers' meeting will be held on Thursday, 5 December 2013 in Cunderdin.
  - Notes from each meeting will be circulated to Board Members for information.
  - Not only SEARTG matters being discussed, but also on how the Group can work together more cooperatively.
  - Elected Member training will be arranged for February 2014.

The Chairman then requested that Chief Executive Officers remain behind to finalise the monthly circular as discussed.

### **9. NEXT SOUTH EAST AVON REGIONAL TRANSITION BOARD MEETING**

As agreed at the SEARTG Board Meeting of 5 April 2013, meetings will be held on the first Thursday of each month, unless there is insufficient business to address.

The Chairman suggested the possibility of a December SEARTG Board Meeting, with discussion following summarised as:

- Mr R Hooper
- Suggested a meeting to provide an update on the signing of contracts for information technology works.
- Ms C Tuthill
- This could be provided by way of a communiqué.
- Cr D Richards
- Suggested that the next meeting be held at Green Hills, with confirmation that this was the venue two years ago.
- Chairman
- With a change in availability of the Green Hills venue, suggested a late afternoon meeting at another location.

- Mr R Hooper
- Ministerial advice at the LGMA meeting, was that an announcement will be made in the first or second week of December 2013.
  - Should this occur, this will trigger the poll provision.
  - Queried the need to schedule a meeting within a week of the announcement.
- Chairman
- Concurred that a meeting be held after the Minister's announcement, and that this include an update on work being undertaken with telecommunications.
- Mr R Hooper
- If the Minister does not make an announcement before Christmas, this meeting could be deferred, with information on telecommunications work distributed to Participants.
- Cr D Richards
- Queried advice from the Local Government Advisory Board as to when a decision will be made.
- Mr R Hooper
- Indications are that the decision is ready, it is just a matter of discussions to be held with the Minister.
  - Advice that the Minister has apologised for not being able to assist with legislative changes in relation to poll provisions.
- Ms C Tuthill
- Stated that the Advisory Board is coming to the final stages of its report, hence the request for an interim name and ward details.
  - Asked that the Group note the work pressures of the Board with the various metropolitan proposals being dealt with.
  - Stated that the Minister wished to make an announcement as early as possible.
  - This Group's submission will be dealt with prior to the metropolitan submissions, however there may be a minor delay given the volume being handled.

**10. CLOSURE OF MEETING**

The Chairman took the opportunity of thanking all for their attendance, and input, stating that he understood these were busy times for all.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the Meeting closed at 1:10pm.

\*\*\*\*\*