Minutes
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Executive Forum
Meeting No 15
9.00 – 10.00am Wednesday 10 September 2014
Karstens Conference Centre, 123 Queen Street, Melbourne
Board Room, Room 1204, 12th level

Attendance: Warren Roberts – Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonington
Geoff Lawler – Director City Planning and Infrastructure, City of Melbourne
Vijaya Vaidyanath – Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
Tracey Slatter – Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
Nigel Higgins – Acting Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council
Elissa McElroy – IMAP Executive Officer
IMAP Consultants
Mark Woodland, Echelon Planning consultants
Cameron Martyn, Martyn Group consultants
IMAP Review Working Party
Melissa Rathje, Coordinator Corporate & Community Planning, CoS
Leanne Hodyl, Team Leader Urban Planning, CoM
Adam Mills, Senior Strategic Planner, CoM
Katrina Terjung, Coordinator Strategic Planning, CoPP
Morris Bellamy, Manager Strategic Marketing, Communications and Advocacy, CoMar

PRELIMINARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appointment of Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolves to appoint Mr Nigel Higgins as the Chair of the Meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>The IMAP Review – Format for the Draft Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MW reviewed his paper on outcomes of the Councillor /Executive and staff Forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section 3: Priority Challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong> had not been identified as a key outcome. It has important regional consequences. It was agreed that it was important to include Sustainability on its own as a priority Outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section 4: IMAP Functions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MW noted there had been real discussion at the workshop around <strong>Advocacy</strong> and further clarification was required from the Executive Forum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the past IMAP had steered clear of advocacy, but it has come out strongly as part of this review as a future change. It was not about political lobbying. It is about having one voice in the central subregion, not fragmented, working together when talking with state government. This has been demonstrated on our agreement over Liveability, Urban Manufacturing etc. common platforms where the IMAP councils can come together in agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There has to be consensus on projects like trams, urban forest etc.

It helps if the plan identifies what's important and then advocates for what's important to IMAP. IMAP shouldn't be a mouthpiece for "issues of the day". If it was a strong single voice for the IMAP plan, no problem.

Councils are the elected body; IMAP doesn't overcome the legitimate role of elected councillors.

The plan could become limiting if of long duration. It would need to be broader. This wording gives the opportunity to take forward anything we all agree on.

NH halted the discussion on advocacy for later.

MW noted the workshop had:

- discussion around innovation and IMAP's leadership role.
- a lot of discussion around shared services – although it identified the need for a cautionary approach, to firstly investigate/identify opportunities for sharing resources.
- Identified the need to spend some time on the governance framework. Need an Advocacy framework which requires further discussion and scope.

**Section 5 IMAP Vision**

The existing one is all encompassing and long. Noted the need to review the Vision and emphasise liveability, sustainability etc.

**Section 6 Priority Outcomes**

MW acknowledged these Outcomes need a bit of rewording, still a bit generic. Technical groups will work on the wording.

Comment:

- The outcomes need to help clarify the significant priorities, before we can develop the actions further.

**Section 7 Project Criteria**

MW noted there had been a lot of feedback but general agreement on criteria for projects. One issue for clarification is whether the 5 councils need consensus or not to select projects?

Comments:

- Consensus is a strength of IMAP; cooperation between the Councils is important. Collective understanding has been the failsafe in the past, but that it was then up to individual councils whether they implement the recommendations from a project.
- When one council has a different view, but still agrees to the project, that is OK.
- There have been issues when council has not agreed with a project, but they will continue with it anyway. A council could walk away if not they were not happy with the majority view.
- Majority not a good way to go. It doesn't need to be of equal benefit to all councils, but it's important not to be against it. It might be harder to get consensus further down the track if majority is the start point.

**Section 8 Integrating IMAP with other planning forums**

MW noted a typo on the IMAP council's circle in the diagram. Note to bring the 2 MPA circles together, as one organisation.

**Section 9 Proposed structure of the IMAP document**

MW described the matrix proposal. If trying to achieve a particular outcome, there are multiples of advocacy, research and projects etc. that would go into it.

- The strategies would go into the white space
- It's possible with this approach to select projects for the year annually, which gives flexibility.

Comments:

IMAP is **a plan of things to do**. The outcome side could articulate short, medium and long term strategies.

Further comments on Advocacy:

What advocacy is about in relation to IMAP:

- Advocacy is about “representation” – and likely to be short term, unless the plan talks about advocacy as a separate form of work that IMAP undertakes.
- Advocacy is about ways of persuading, one voice.
- We can only be persuasive once we create a basis on which people will listen to you. If we create IMAP
as a source of knowledge and information on the region, doing the work creates a power that then becomes a point of reference in its own right.

- We need to unpack our reputation/brand etc. and understand how IMAP councils are perceived and act; the way we are seen. It is reasonable that the IMAP councils should have one voice, as depicted in the diagram. We are one area. When we go to speak with these groups (MPS, RMF etc.) the IMAP councils should have a view. Without that view, that's what makes us anxious. We then have to work it all out, all over again, each time.
- IMAP is a work plan. Having one voice for the plan and what it stands for, is almost another thing outside of the Actions we do. There are some functions that help to create a brand, and developing collateral for certain things which will attract others to come to find out and learn from our example, is powerful advocacy, developed through doing.
- Fully support the concept of advocacy, the outcomes of the region are supported in principle; it's an important shift.

What we would advocate on

- How would you use this framework to give a position on advocacy? – maybe not put it as a “to do” necessarily
- Keep the Advocacy column there and collect examples of what could be considered.
- Advocacy is not necessarily an activity in its own right – is at the end point of a project. Advocacy is a tool. MAV and others advocate on behalf of local government. If IMAP have credibility and focus as a unified group delivering a series of actions in the plan, advocacy from work done on the plan is an end point.
- IMAP is a subcommittee of 5 councils to deliver the plan. It's about one voice, commonalities, what we value as a region. IMAP's advocacy should not be any wider than this. IMAP Councils want to achieve common projects/outcomes through IMAP, and will advocate for those to deliver the outcome.

How IMAP can create a stronger group

- IMAP at the moment is a number of parts – and this review is seen as a great opportunity to have a stronger group form.
- The IMAP councils should be more articulate about their priorities given their long association
- We need to think more about this. Get the CEOs for one more bite at this before it goes anywhere else. CEOs are the ones championing at the RMF and MPA and we need to be clear on this.
- If the IMAP councils haven't one voice, it indicates the current IMAP doesn't work in their minds. There is a cohesive view in the current plan – but it is clearly out of date if it's not generally known. To ensure longevity in this thing; we need to note this need to review earlier.
- It's now a changed environment – with Plan Melbourne and MPA's delivery. Outcomes are to some extent predetermined. CEOs are to “challenge the paradigm” in the inner city. Other metro areas have more contemporary projects as they are more recently established. Ours needs the update.

Reviewing the vision and outcomes to reflect discussion

- To progress this, MW noted he will try to reframe the Vision with the PCG and come back to the next meeting to review.
- The existing Vision gives a strong sense of diversity in the region – this is not coming through strongly enough in the priorities. Villages/places/heritage are important in describing the city.
- Agreed outcome statements need work. Outcomes which could differentiate us e.g. global significance of our economy is strongly relevant, diverse vibrant inclusive communities – how do we show our point of difference.
- Victoria is more highly dependent on Inner Melbourne for its economy now. We have a collective responsibility in the inner city for the rest of the state. This comes through strongly in the recent Grattan Institute work.

It was agreed that further work is required as discussed which will be reviewed by the Executive Forum at a later date. The IMAP Executive Officer noted the next item discusses the process for further review.

Actions:
1. Include Sustainability on its own as a priority Outcome.
2. Need an Advocacy framework which requires further discussion and scope.
3. Need to review the Vision and emphasise liveability, sustainability etc.
4. Need to reword the Outcomes, still a bit generic. Outcomes which could differentiate us e.g. global significance of our economy is strongly relevant, diverse vibrant inclusive communities
5. Need to amend the organisation diagram - bring the 2 MPA circles together, as one organisation.
6. Reframe the Vision with the PCG and come back to the next meeting to review.
The IMAP Review – Consultation and Approval process
The Executive Officer noted the need to book dates for the next Councillor workshop and determine the process for getting the draft plan before the IMAP Councils. After some discussion it was agreed:

- The draft IMAP would go to the November meeting of the IMAP Implementation Committee to consider the budget implications and approve the draft plan for council consultation.
- The draft plan would then go to the IMAP council briefings and council meetings for adoption during December/January – thus avoiding the October/November period around election of Mayors.
- The plan would then be referred to the next IMAP Implementation Committee meeting at the end of February for approval. (A further round of council briefings may be required if considerable changes have been made during this process.)

The Executive Officer was asked to resubmit dates and process for delivery and send an amended recommendation around the members for final approval.

There was some discussion on Public Consultation. It was noted that this was undertaken last time, with limited public engagement. It was suggested the plan be on exhibition while the councils view it via an online based process.

Actions:
1. Report back to the IMAP Executive Forum on reviewed process and dates for the IMAP Review
2. Include on-line public consultation in the IMAP Review timeline during the Council consultation phase

RMF Projects
The Executive Officer advised funding for the RMF projects had been requested by state government so a Project Manager position could be approved by the state government by November. She noted that she had been advised that there was some flexibility in the timeline for this. However, if payment was to occur prior to the November IMAP meeting, the process for this was unclear as there was no provision in the current year’s budget and an amendment would be required.

The members noted implementation of the RMF projects required their further discussion with the RMF and chairman Dean Yates.

Action:
1. IMAP Council CEOs to have further discussions with the RMF on the implementation and funding of the 2 projects.

OTHER BUSINESS
There was no other business. The meeting closed at 10.00am

ACTIONS

2. IMAP Review
   - Include Sustainability on its own as a priority Outcome.
   - Need an Advocacy framework which requires further discussion and scope.
   - Need to review the Vision and emphasise liveability, sustainability etc.
   - Need to reword the Outcomes, still a bit generic. Outcomes which could differentiate us e.g. global significance of our economy is strongly relevant, diverse vibrant inclusive communities
   - Need to amend the organisation diagram - bring the 2 MPA circles together, as one organisation.
   - Reframe the Vision with the PCG and come back to the next meeting to review.

3. IMAP Review – Consultation and Approval process
   - Exec officer to report back to the IMAP Exec Forum on reviewed process and dates for the IMAP Review
   - Include on-line public consultation in the IMAP Review timeline during the Council consultation phase.

4. RMF Projects
   - IMAP Council CEOs to have further discussions with the RMF on the implementation and funding of the 2 projects