Minutes

Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Executive Forum

Meeting No 17
3.00pm – 4.15pm Friday 7 August 2014

City of Melbourne
Bunjil Room, Level 4, Town Hall Administration Building

Attendance:
- IMAP Executive Forum: Warren Roberts – Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington (Chair); Geoff Lawler – Director City Planning and Infrastructure, City of Melbourne – arrived late; Vijaya Vaidyanath – Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra; Tracey Slatter – Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip; Stephen Wall – Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council
- IMAP: Elissa McElroy – IMAP Executive Officer
- Consultants: Mark Woodland, Echelon Planning consultants
- Guests: Melissa Rathje, Coordinator Economic Development, City of Stonnington; Kelly Martini, Coordinator Corporate and Community Planning, City of Stonnington; Jenny Rayner, Senior Strategic Planner, City of Melbourne; Katrina Terjung, Coordinator Strategic Planning, City of Port Phillip; Barry McGuren, Manager Business and Tourism Melbourne, City of Melbourne; Helen Hardwick, Program Manager Tourism Policy, City of Melbourne

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>1.1</td>
<td>The IMAP Executive Forum resolved to appoint Mr Warren Roberts as the Chair of the Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katy McMahon, CoMar; Ross Goeman CoY; Sherry Hopkins CoY; Adam Mills CoM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEMS

3 The IMAP Review – Presentation on content of the first draft

Mark Woodland briefly presented the draft plan and noted, since last reporting in November, the synthesis of his input and staff comments leading to the current format and content.

[Geoff Lawler arrived at 3.12pm]

Comments/questions

General comments:
- It achieves that ‘raise the bar’ challenge, reflects the right issues and challenges
- The breadth of IMAP and its focus comes through
- Needs a good edit to remove duplication
- Has become a much more evolved document, more strategic
• IMAP councils have funded RMF initiatives with state government; this has lifted the game. Some of the goals and outcomes in the IMAP plan could be achieved in a similar way. Provides a synergy with RMF. For example, the Neighbourhoods and Places section links with the Integrated Services Delivery project – together they help us build better schools, better Fishermans Bend type developments etc - joint projects allow our councils to see how things are done at other councils.
• Comfortable with the document.
• The plan is not all inclusive; it is broad based, the content not too constricted so that it limits us in what we can pursue
• Agrees the document is close to requirements, needs some editing still
• Needs details – through attachments or other plans/briefs outside the plan for the working groups to report against
• Substance is nearly there. Referring the plan on provides other opportunities for finessing it.

Comments on KPIs:
• Needs to identify some KPIs of success – three per goal? It is a good discipline to have stretch targets that are achievable – shows what we are aiming for. Can refresh the plan from time to time and add measures as time goes on – they don’t need to be on everything, and not too many.
• Agreed KPIs necessary for any strategy – we need to be clear whether they are KPIs for the region, or KPIs for the management of IMAP. Prefers KPIs for the region, making IMAP a repository of information, which would give IMAP a point of strength, purpose and advocacy. Creates a central point for information.
• All outcomes noted on section 6 are measurable. Have KPIs already in the vision statements.

Comments on name of section 6:
• Includes aspirational statements in the Outcomes – things that we all want for the region. However, there is some doubt as to whether IMAP has the ability to deliver these aspirations and be responsible for them. Therefore, suggest we be careful that IMAP is not held accountable for what we wish for, only for what IMAP will do.
• Would like to see the title of section 6 changed to reflect/clarify that these goals/outcomes are the aspirations for the region, and that IMAP will make a contribution towards this.
• Did not assume from the document that IMAP was responsible for doing it all. Reflected that there are a number of regional forums, other than IMAP, that contribute to achieving changes to the region.
• Title of section 6 – hadn’t read it that IMAP was responsible for achieving these. However, agreed it could be misleading and could be reworded to reflect that these outcomes are, for example:
  • The ‘things IMAP will contribute to’ that helps get Melbourne there in 10 years time.
  • “We aspire in 10 years time to be...?”
  • “How we would like Melbourne to be in 10 years time”
  • “We will have strategies to influence how Melbourne will be in 10 years time.”

Other sections comments:
Need to change Mission statement #2 to:
“We will pursue projects of regional scale and regional significance”.

Comments on Implementation and funding
• Noted the shift in this plan in terms of the implementation technique. All five councils have to treat it more seriously in terms of resource allocation. The working groups who develop the business case for inclusion in the budget need to be more senior and strategic. Each CEO needs to allocate responsibility for doing this work. Referred to page 24 and noted it is a deliberate funding allocation exercise.
• Agree it is necessary to give IMAP more prominence. Agreed with the inclusion of senior staff.
• We won’t get transformational projects unless we have a joint voice and joint funding; and are able to sell the IMAP story to councillors at budget time.
• Some of Council’s own actions are in the new plan – so IMAP councils will be helping to develop these projects further.
• There is the challenge of resourcing IMAP through Council especially in the context of rate capping. Currently we fund a “group” of Actions through Council – the detail on the projects may create problems. IMAP places a different lens on Council’s ability to do things – comes back to the “scale” of these projects.
• If these things matter to us, they matter to our communities. Regional cooperation becomes more
important under rate capping.
- Councils delegate to a Special Committee on the basis that the Councils can support a concept financially without having to give it their specific approval.
- There is a risk that IMAP falls over if Councils don’t fund its work
- The difference is that projects that IMAP might do go through the process of the IMAP Committee for consideration. The real doing of things by staff is/needs to be planned into budget allocations.
- The preparation of projects needs to come up to a notch. The end result proposed is a budget allocation to IMAP – not a global amount – tagged to particular projects.
- If we are able to show efficiency gains, this shows the benefit of IMAP. There is currently so much duplication of effort – it creates a real risk to what we do.

The Executive Officer noted that the next steps are:
- reporting the 1st draft plan to the IMAP Implementation Committee for sign off to circulate to the 5 IMAP councils
- preparation of staff reports and informal review by all 5 councils at Council Briefings to achieve approval in principle/endorsement (*this may require more than one round*)
- preparation of endorsed Draft Plan following council briefings, incorporating any requested changes
- public consultation on Draft Plan
- preparation of Final Plan for all 5 Council approvals – (Council Briefing round and adoption by Council x5)
- referral of the approved plan to the IMAP Implementation Committee for implementation.

### 3.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum:

- **a.** *endorses* the Draft Plan (*inclusive of any recommended amendments*); and
- **b.** *refers* the Draft Plan to the IMAP Implementation Committee for consideration; and
- **c.** *recommends* the five member councils be briefed on the Draft Plan.

**MOVED:** MR WALL/ Mr Lawler

*Action: The draft plan is to be referred to the IMAP Implementation Committee on the 28 August with the following amendments - Development of KPIs for each goal; reword title of section 6, amend Mission statement #2, undertake some editing*  

### 4.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum *note* the update prior to the IMAP Implementation Committee presentation.

**MOVED:** MR LAWLER/ Ms Vaidyanath

### 4  Briefing: Proposal by Destination Melbourne

Barry McGuren, Manager Business and Tourism Melbourne, City of Melbourne attended for this item to brief the Executive Forum on the presentation by DML at the upcoming IMAP Committee meeting.

Mr McGuren advised of:
- expected structural changes at state government level to marketing Victoria, which could affect DML.
- the support of the tourism group to the proposal (proposal is long overdue, benefits of management plan noted – identifies areas lacking tourism infrastructure, helps promote local areas) but noted that the amount of funding that DML may request from the IMAP councils could be an issue and leave little funding for the tourism group itself.
- General support for a larger number of contributing metro councils than just IMAP in order to reduce costs on IMAP councils, who are individually contributing to DML programs anyway;
- The need to attract federal matched funding.

### 4.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum *note* the update prior to the IMAP Implementation Committee presentation.

**MOVED:** MR LAWLER/ Ms Vaidyanath

### 5  Briefing: Wayfinding signage design project brief

Helen Hardwick, Program Manager Tourism Policy, City of Melbourne attended for this item. She advised that, following Paul Street’s visit from Legible London, the coordinating committee is now looking to redesign the wayfinding signs –
- lift the height to aid visibility,
- introduce a 2 map system - 5 min walking radius and 15 min planning map to plan onward journeys
- improve materials to lower maintenance
- explore embedding technology and digital aspects.

CoM needs to put in new signs where there are none and improve existing ones throughout the city. Plan to
redesign and pilot new features, building a journey of signs, commission some user testing. CoM is proposing collaboration with the IMAP councils on the designs – gain advantages of single design, procurement advantages, cost savings etc. She sought approval from the 4 partner councils to participate in this stage of the project, with some possible funding contribution. Elissa noted this could come within the existing project budget as it had increased through a $20K contribution from Wyndham.

Comments/Questions
- General support for the principle from CoY
- CoS noted last IMAP signs expensive and would need a cheaper option as an outcome
- Need to reduce clutter
- CoS comfortable to participate, to improve technology and gain information on lessons learned

Helen noted she would come back to the council reps with new costs.

5.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum:
   a. endorse the involvement of the five IMAP councils in the wayfinding signs design project; and
   b. agree to participate in testing the wayfinding sign prototypes, as required.

MOVED: MR LAWLER / Ms Slatter

6 Updates: IMAP Operational Protocol; Procurement Policy & MoU; Intellectual Property MoU; Media Policy;

The Executive Officer noted the need to regularly update the governance documents and get them signed off. Mr Lawler requested an update to the CoM media contacts.

6.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum notes the updates prior to the IMAP Implementation Committee review.

MOVED: MR LAWLER / Ms Slatter

7 Other business: Filming arrangements - Housing Forum

The Executive Officer reminded the Forum, that following approval of the brief for the upcoming Housing Forum in October, the project team at Yarra were preparing to interview IMAP Mayors and CEOs for their short introductory film, as noted in the Brief. She asked that they remind their Mayors that this was coming up; and that they would be receiving an invitation to participate and the right to review the film clip.

Ms Vaidyanath offered to follow up the process and advise further.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.15pm.

RESOLUTIONS

1.1 The IMAP Executive Forum resolved to appoint Mr Warren Roberts as the Chair of the Meeting.

3.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum:
   a. endorses the Draft Plan (inclusive of any recommended amendments); and
   b. refers the Draft Plan to the IMAP Implementation Committee for consideration; and
   c. recommends the five member councils be briefed on the Draft Plan.

4.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum note the update prior to the IMAP Implementation Committee presentation

5.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum:
   a. endorse the involvement of the five IMAP councils in the wayfinding signs design project; and
   b. agree to participate in testing the wayfinding sign prototypes, as required

6.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum notes the updates prior to the IMAP Implementation Committee review.