



AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

8 MARCH 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING..... 2

2 ATTENDANCE..... 2

3 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES 2

4 AC019 APPOINTMENT OF AUDITORS 3-6

5 AC020 COMPLIANCE AUDIT RETURN 2012..... 7-10

6 MEETING CLOSURE.....10

CITY OF GREATER GERALDTON
AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING
ON FRIDAY 8 MARCH 2013 AT 3.00PM
IN THE COMMITTEE MEETING ROOM – CIVIC CENTRE

A G E N D A

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING

2 ATTENDANCE

Present:

Mayor I Carpenter

Cr T Thomas

Cr D Brick

Cr B Ramage (by proxy)

Officers:

Tony Brun, Chief Executive Officer

Cheryl Wood, Director of Organisational Performance

Bob Davis, Director of Treasury and Finance

By Invitation:

Chris Spiker, Acting Manager Governance & Risk

Apologies:

Cr S Van Styn (Chairman)

Leave of Absence:

Nil

3 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the City of Greater Geraldton Audit Committee meeting held on 18 December 2012, as attached be accepted as a true and correct record of proceedings.

4 AC019 APPOINTMENT OF AUDITORS

5 AC020 COMPLIANCE AUDIT RETURN 2012

6 MEETING CLOSURE

AC019	APPOINTMENT OF AUDITORS
-------	-------------------------

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-13-15064
AUTHOR:	C Wood, Director of Organisational Performance
EXECUTIVE:	C Wood, Director of Organisational Performance
DATE OF REPORT:	3 March 2013
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/11/0004
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	No

SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek the Audit Committee's endorsement of the appointment of Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd as the City's auditors to 30 June 2015.

PROponent:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

In April 2011 the City of Geraldton-Greenough awarded a three year contract to Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd for the audit of the City's financial statements and other audit services. This contract, although awarded prior to the amalgamation, carried over into the City of Greater Geraldton by virtue of Regulation 6(4)(i) of the Local Government (Constitution) Regulations 1998 where a reference in a contract made before 1 July 2011 to the City of Geraldton-Greenough shall be construed as a reference to the "City of Greater Geraldton".

The Department of Local Government has queried the appointment of the auditors as the names of the auditors were not included in the resolution of Council.

Section 7.3 of the Local Government Act requires a local government to "appoint a person, on the recommendation of the audit committee, to be its auditor"

Generally, in legislation, a "person" is construed to mean a natural person or a company (under Section 5 of the Interpretation Act 1984). However, under Section 7.3(3) a local government's auditor must be a person who is

- (a) A registered company auditor; or
- (b) An approved auditor (i.e. a person who is approved by the Minister under Section 7.5).

However, a registered company auditor is a person who is registered as an auditor or taken to be registered as an auditor under Part 9.2 of the Corporations Act. Part 9.2 of the Corporations Act 2001 deals with the registration as an auditor being a "natural person". Therefore, for the purposes

of Section 7.3 of the Local Government Act, a person appointed by the City to be its auditor must be a natural person.

However, this does not mean that the contract entered into with Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd is not valid. It could be argued that the City, in its intention with entering into the contract with Grant Thornton, consistent with the provisions of Section 7.3, was to appoint each of the audit partners with the company to be its auditor. All of the Grant Thornton partners are registered company auditors and therefore each qualifies as a “registered company auditor” for the purposes of Section 7.1 of the Local Government Act.

However, to avoid confusion it would be prudent for the City to clarify its position by resolving that the reference in the Council’s resolution on 5 April 2011 to Grant Thornton is to be taken to be a reference to each of the audit partners of Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd.

The Department of Local Government has been advised of the proposed action and, although they would prefer all of the partners’ names and auditor numbers to be listed, the City has been advised that this is not legally required.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION:

There has been no community consultation undertaken for this item however the City’s auditors have been consulted.

COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

There has been no councillor consultation undertaken for this item.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS:

Section 7.1 and 7.3 of the Local Government Act state the requirements for appointing the City’s auditor.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

There are no policy implications associated with this item.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications associated with this item.

STRATEGIC & REGIONAL OUTCOMES:

Strategic Community Plan Outcomes:

Goal 5:	Leading the opportunities
Outcome 5.1:	Leadership and good governance
Strategy 5.1.3:	Implement business, governance, legislative and compliance frameworks

Regional Outcomes:

There are no regional outcomes from this item.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**Economic:**

There are no economic issues associated with this item.

Social:

There are no social issues associated with this item.

Environmental:

There are no environmental issues associated with this item.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural and heritage issues associated with this item.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

There are no relevant precedents.

DELEGATED AUTHORITY:

There is no delegated authority.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS:

Simple Majority

OPTIONS:**Option 1:**

As per the Executive Recommendation in this report.

Option 2:

That the Audit Committee by Simple Majority in accordance with Section 7.1C of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. NOT RECOMMEND that the Council appoints each of the audit partners of Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd to be an auditor for the City of Greater Geraldton for the term of the contract entered into on 11 April 2011 between Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd and the City of Greater Geraldton.
2. MAKES the determination based on the following reason:
 - a. To be determined by Council

CONCLUSION:

This item is to provide clarification on the appointment of the partners of Grant Thornton Pty Ltd as the City's auditors for the duration of the contract entered into in April 2011.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That the Audit Committee by Simple Majority in accordance with Sections 7.1C and 7.3(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 RESOLVES to:

1. RECOMMEND that the Council appoints each of the audit partners of Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd to be an auditor for the City of Greater Geraldton for the term of the contract entered into on 11 April 2011 between Grant Thornton Audit Pty Ltd and the City of Greater Geraldton.

AC020	COMPLIANCE AUDIT RETURN 2012
-------	------------------------------

AGENDA REFERENCE:	D-13-15288
AUTHOR:	C Spiker, Manager Governance & Risk
EXECUTIVE:	C Wood, Director of Organisational Performance
DATE OF REPORT:	5 March 2013
FILE REFERENCE:	GO/11/0004
APPLICANT / PROPONENT:	City of Greater Geraldton
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes

SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to adopt the Compliance Audit Return 2012 (CAR) as required under the Local Government Act 1995 (LGA).

PROPONENT:

The proponent is the City of Greater Geraldton.

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with section 7.13(1)(i) of the LGA and regulation 13 of the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996 (Regulations), the Council is required to carry out, in a prescribed manner and in a form approved by the Minister, an audit of compliance with such statutory requirements as are prescribed whether those requirements are of a financial nature or not or under the LGA or another written law. The CAR applies to the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012.

The 2012 CAR is now complete (as attached) and is submitted to the Audit Committee for endorsement. The CAR must be submitted to the Department no later than 31 March 2013.

The outcome of the 2012 audit has revealed a number of issues that require explanation to the Department:

1. Item 12: Delegation of Power/Duty

Q. Were all delegations made under Division 4 of Part 5 of the Act reviewed by the delegator at least once during the 2011/2012 financial year?

Response:

No.

The City operates with two tiers for conferring delegations: First the annual delegations which are regularly approved for the purpose of ongoing orderly administration of the City; and secondly a more randomised approach applying to one off issues.

In respect of the second tier of delegations, the City has taken the approach over recent years of conferring delegated authority to the CEO within Council resolutions. These occurrences were at the time intended for short term application or single event decisions. These have not been reviewed.

The first tier of delegations are structured in an orderly manner and were reviewed (annually) in accordance with the LGA provisions.

A review of the City's approach to conferring delegated authority will be reviewed prior to June 2013 to ensure delegation is effected only through instruments of delegation included in the City's delegation register.

2. Item 8: Finance-

Q. Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report (prepared under s.7.9(1) of the Act) required action to be taken by the local government, was that action undertaken?

Response:

Actions will be undertaken on all matters raised by the Auditor.

The recommendations of the auditor arrived late in 2012 and did not provide sufficient time within 2012 to carry-out their recommendations. A commitment is in place to fully address those particular matters raised by the Auditors.

3. Item 2: Tenders for Providing Goods and Services

Q. Did the local government comply with F&G Reg. 12 when deciding to enter into multiple contracts rather than inviting tenders for a single contract?

Response:

No.

Eastward Road depot site clearing was undertaken through a number of arrangements. These were based on a misunderstanding of the preferred tender application and the separating of different phases of a project when a single tender would suffice. The actions taken were not intentional and were as a result of a lack of knowledge of the City processes.

The City has received specific advice from its solicitors in respect of regulation 12 regarding dealing with multiple contracts in place of one contract. This advice has provided the basis for developing new guidelines that when followed will ensure that the City will not enter into multiple contracts to avoid advertising for tenders for a single contractor.

Additionally, a range of training initiatives and written guidelines have been provided to improve the standard of tendering procedures.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION:

There is no requirement for community consultation on this matter.

COUNCILLOR CONSULTATION:

No consultation was required.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS:

Section 7.13(1)(i) of the LGA and regulation 13 of the Regulations applies.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

There are no policy implications.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial or budget implications

STRATEGIC & REGIONAL OUTCOMES:**Strategic & Plan for the Future Outcomes:**

Goal 5:	Leading the Opportunities.
Outcome 5.1:	Leadership and good governance.
Strategy 5.1.3:	Implement business, governance, legislative and compliance frameworks.

Regional Outcomes:

There are no regional outcomes from the consideration of this matter.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL & CULTURAL ISSUES:**Economic:**

There are no economic impacts associated with this matter.

Social:

There are no social impacts associated with this matter.

Environmental:

There are no environmental impacts associated with this matter.

Cultural & Heritage:

There are no cultural or heritage impacts associated with this matter.

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS:

There are no relevant precedents associated with this matter.

DELEGATED AUTHORITY:

There is no delegated authority.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS:

Simple Majority is required.

OPTIONS:**Option 1:**

As per Executive Recommendation in this report.

CONCLUSION:

The Compliance Audit Return 2012 (CAR) is a statutory compliance requirement for local governments and is subject to a review first by the Audit Committee and then as a report to Council for adoption before being submitted to the Department of Local Government. The City is required to provide this to the Department no later than 31 March 2013. The City does not have the option to not adopt the return as it would therefore be non-compliant with the provisions of the LGA.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION:

That the Audit Committee by Simple Majority in accordance with Section 7.1C of the Local Government Act RESOLVES to:

1. ENDORSE the Local Government Compliance Audit Return for the period 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012.

6. Meeting Closure.



Greater Geraldton - Compliance Audit Return 2012

Commercial Enterprises by Local Governments					
No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	s3.59(2)(a)(b)(c) F&G Reg 7,9	Has the local government prepared a business plan for each major trading undertaking in 2012.	N/A		chris spiker
2	s3.59(2)(a)(b)(c) F&G Reg 7,10	Has the local government prepared a business plan for each major land transaction that was not exempt in 2012.	N/A		chris spiker
3	s3.59(2)(a)(b)(c) F&G Reg 7,10	Has the local government prepared a business plan before entering into each land transaction that was preparatory to entry into a major land transaction in 2012.	N/A		chris spiker
4	s3.59(4)	Has the local government given Statewide public notice of each proposal to commence a major trading undertaking or enter into a major land transaction for 2012.	N/A		chris spiker
5	s3.59(5)	Did the Council, during 2012, resolve to proceed with each major land transaction or trading undertaking by absolute majority.	N/A		chris spiker

Delegation of Power / Duty

No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	s5.16, 5.17, 5.18	Were all delegations to committees resolved by absolute majority.	N/A		chris spiker
2	s5.16, 5.17, 5.18	Were all delegations to committees in writing.	N/A		Sheri Moulds
3	s5.16, 5.17, 5.18	Were all delegations to committees within the limits specified in section 5.17.	N/A		Sheri Moulds
4	s5.16, 5.17, 5.18	Were all delegations to committees recorded in a register of delegations.	N/A		Sheri Moulds
5	s5.18	Has Council reviewed delegations to its committees in the 2011/2012 financial year.	N/A		Sheri Moulds
6	s5.42(1),5.43 Admin Reg 18G	Did the powers and duties of the Council delegated to the CEO exclude those as listed in section 5.43 of the Act.	Yes		Chris Spiker
7	s5.42(1)(2) Admin Reg 18G	Were all delegations to the CEO resolved by an absolute majority.	Yes		Chris Spiker
8	s5.42(1)(2) Admin Reg 18G	Were all delegations to the CEO in writing.	Yes		Chris Spiker
9	s5.44(2)	Were all delegations by the CEO to any employee in writing.	Yes		Chris Spiker
10	s5.45(1)(b)	Were all decisions by the Council to amend or revoke a delegation made by	Yes		Chris Spiker



No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
11	s5.46(1)	Has the CEO kept a register of all delegations made under the Act to him and to other employees.	Yes		Annette Walsh
12	s5.46(2)	Were all delegations made under Division 4 of Part 5 of the Act reviewed by the delegator at least once during the 2011/2012 financial year.	No	<p>The city operates with two tiers for conferring delegations: First the annual delegations which are regularly conferred for the purpose of ongoing orderly administration of the City; and secondly a more randomised approach applying to one off issues.</p> <p>In respect of the second tier of delegations, the City has taken the approach over recent years of including resolutions that confer delegated authority to the CEO and/or officers in numerous policies and by way of recommendations within Council resolutions. These occurrences were at the time intended for short term application or single event decisions. These have not been reviewed.</p> <p>The first group of delegations are structured in an orderly manner and were reviewed (annually) in accordance with the LGA provisions.</p> <p>A review of the City's approach to conferring delegated authority will be reviewed prior to June 2013 to ensure delegation is effected only through instruments of delegation included in the City's delegation register.</p>	chris spiker
13	s5.46(3) Admin Reg 19	Did all persons exercising a delegated power or duty under the Act keep, on all occasions, a written record as required.	Yes		Sheri Moulds

Disclosure of Interest



No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	s5.67	If a member disclosed an interest, did he/she ensure that they did not remain present to participate in any discussion or decision-making procedure relating to the matter in which the interest was disclosed (not including participation approvals granted under s5.68).	Yes		chris spiker
2	s5.68(2)	Were all decisions made under section 5.68(1), and the extent of participation allowed, recorded in the minutes of Council and Committee meetings.	Yes		chris spiker
3	s5.73	Were disclosures under section 5.65 or 5.70 recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which the disclosure was made.	Yes		chris spiker
4	s5.75(1) Admin Reg 22 Form 2	Was a primary return lodged by all newly elected members within three months of their start day.	Yes		Chris Spiker
5	s5.75(1) Admin Reg 22 Form 2	Was a primary return lodged by all newly designated employees within three months of their start day.	Yes		Chris Spiker
6	s5.76(1) Admin Reg 23 Form 3	Was an annual return lodged by all continuing elected members by 31 August 2012.	Yes		Chris Spiker
7	s5.76(1) Admin Reg 23 Form 3	Was an annual return lodged by all designated employees by 31 August 2012.	Yes		Chris Spiker
8	s5.77	On receipt of a primary or annual return, did the CEO, (or the Mayor/ President in the case of the CEO's return) on all occasions, give written acknowledgment of having received the return.	Yes		Chris Spiker
9	s5.88(1)(2) Admin Reg 28	Did the CEO keep a register of financial interests which contained the returns lodged under section 5.75 and 5.76	Yes		Chris Spiker
10	s5.88(1)(2) Admin Reg 28	Did the CEO keep a register of financial interests which contained a record of disclosures made under sections 5.65, 5.70 and 5.71, in the form prescribed in Administration Regulation 28.	Yes		Chris Spiker
11	s5.88 (3)	Has the CEO removed all returns from the register when a person ceased to be a person required to lodge a return under section 5.75 or 5.76.	Yes		chris spiker
12	s5.88(4)	Have all returns lodged under section 5.75 or 5.76 and removed from the register, been kept for a period of at least five years, after the person who lodged the return ceased to be a council member or designated employee.	Yes		chris spiker



No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
13	s5.103 Admin Reg 34C & Rules of Conduct Reg 11	Where an elected member or an employee disclosed an interest in a matter discussed at a Council or committee meeting where there was a reasonable belief that the impartiality of the person having the interest would be adversely affected, was it recorded in the minutes.	Yes		Sheri Moulds
14	s5.70(2)	Where an employee had an interest in any matter in respect of which the employee provided advice or a report directly to the Council or a Committee, did that person disclose the nature of that interest when giving the advice or report.	Yes		Sheri Moulds
15	s5.70(3)	Where an employee disclosed an interest under s5.70(2), did that person also disclose the extent of that interest when required to do so by the Council or a Committee.	Yes		chris spiker
16	s5.103(3) Admin Reg 34B	Has the CEO kept a register of all notifiable gifts received by Council members and employees.	Yes		Chris Spiker

Disposal of Property

No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	s3.58(3)	Was local public notice given prior to disposal for any property not disposed of by public auction or tender (except where excluded by Section 3.58(5)).	Yes		Brian Robartson
2	s3.58(4)	Where the local government disposed of property under section 3.58(3), did it provide details, as prescribed by section 3.58(4), in the required local public notice for each disposal of property.	Yes		Brian Robartson

Elections

No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	Elect Reg 30G (1)	Did the CEO establish and maintain an electoral gift register and ensure that all 'disclosure of gifts' forms completed by candidates and received by the CEO were placed on the electoral gift register at the time of receipt by the CEO and in a manner that clearly identifies and distinguishes the candidates.	Yes		Chris Spiker

Finance

No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	s7.1A	Has the local government established an audit committee and appointed members by absolute majority in accordance with section 7.1A of the Act.	Yes		Kim Chua



No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
2	s7.1B	Where a local government determined to delegate to its audit committee any powers or duties under Part 7 of the Act, did it do so by absolute majority.	Yes		Kim Chua
3	s7.3	Was the person(s) appointed by the local government to be its auditor, a registered company auditor.	Yes		chris spiker
4	s7.3	Was the person(s) appointed by the local government to be its auditor, an approved auditor.	Yes		Kim Chua
5	s7.3, 7.6(3)	Was the person or persons appointed by the local government to be its auditor, appointed by an absolute majority decision of Council.	Yes		Kim Chua
6	Audit Reg 10	Was the Auditor's report for the financial year ended 30 June 2012 received by the local government within 30 days of completion of the audit.	Yes		chris spiker
7	s7.9(1)	Was the Auditor's report for 2011/2012 received by the local government by 31 December 2012.	Yes		chris spiker
8	S7.12A(3), (4)	Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report prepared under s7.9 (1) of the Act required action to be taken by the local government, was that action undertaken.	N/A	Actions will be undertaken on all matters raised by the auditor	Kim Chua
9	S7.12A(3), (4)	Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report (prepared under s7.9 (1) of the Act) required action to be taken by the local government, was a report prepared on any actions undertaken.	Yes		Kim Chua
10	S7.12A(3), (4)	Where the local government determined that matters raised in the auditor's report (prepared under s7.9 (1) of the Act) required action to be taken by the local government, was a copy of the report forwarded to the Minister by the end of the financial year or 6 months after the last report prepared under s7.9 was received by the local government whichever was the latest in time.	Yes		chris spiker
11	Audit Reg 7	Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include the objectives of the audit.	Yes		chris spiker
12	Audit Reg 7	Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include the scope of the audit.	Yes		Kim Chua
13	Audit Reg 7	Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include a plan for the audit.	Yes		Kim Chua
14	Audit Reg 7	Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include details of the remuneration and expenses to be paid to the auditor.	Yes		chris spiker



No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
15	Audit Reg 7	Did the agreement between the local government and its auditor include the method to be used by the local government to communicate with, and supply information to, the auditor.	Yes		Kim Chua

Local Government Employees

No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	Admin Reg 18C	Did the local government approve the process to be used for the selection and appointment of the CEO before the position of CEO was advertised.	Yes		Chris Spiker
2	s5.36(4) s5.37(3), Admin Reg 18A	Were all vacancies for the position of CEO and other designated senior employees advertised and did the advertising comply with s.5.36(4), 5.37(3) and Admin Reg 18A.	Yes		Chris Spiker
3	s5.37(2)	Did the CEO inform council of each proposal to employ or dismiss a designated senior employee.	N/A		Chris Spiker
4	Admin Reg 18F	Was the remuneration and other benefits paid to a CEO on appointment the same remuneration and benefits advertised for the position of CEO under section 5.36(4).	No	New CEO negotiated remuneration with council	Delwen Granville
5	Admin Regs 18E	Did the local government ensure checks were carried out to confirm that the information in an application for employment was true (applicable to CEO only).	N/A		Chris Spiker



Official Conduct					
No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	s5.120	Where the CEO is not the complaints officer, has the local government designated a senior employee, as defined under s5.37, to be its complaints officer.	N/A		chris spiker
2	s5.121(1)	Has the complaints officer for the local government maintained a register of complaints which records all complaints that result in action under s5.110(6)(b) or (c).	Yes		Cheryl Woods
3	s5.121(2)(a)	Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include provision for recording of the name of the council member about whom the complaint is made.	Yes		Cheryl Woods
4	s5.121(2)(b)	Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include provision for recording the name of the person who makes the complaint.	Yes		Cheryl Woods
5	s5.121(2)(c)	Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include provision for recording a description of the minor breach that the standards panel finds has occurred.	Yes		Cheryl Woods
6	s5.121(2)(d)	Does the complaints register maintained by the complaints officer include the provision to record details of the action taken under s5.110(6)(b) (c).	Yes		Cheryl Woods

Tenders for Providing Goods and Services					
No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
1	s3.57 F&G Reg 11	Did the local government invite tenders on all occasions (before entering into contracts for the supply of goods or services) where the consideration under the contract was, or was expected to be, worth more than the consideration stated in Regulation 11(1) of the Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations (Subject to Functions and General Regulation 11(2)).	Yes		chris spiker



No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
2	F&G Reg 12	Did the local government comply with F&G Reg 12 when deciding to enter into multiple contracts rather than inviting tenders for a single contract.	No	Eastward Rd depot clearing was undertaken through a number of arrangements. These were based on a misunderstanding of the preferred tender application and the separating of different phases of a project when a single tender would suffice. the actions taken were not intentional and were as a result of a lack of knowledge of the City's processes.	chris spiker
3	F&G Reg 14(1)	Did the local government invite tenders via Statewide public notice.	Yes		chris spiker
4	F&G Reg 14, 15 & 16	Did the local government's advertising and tender documentation comply with F&G Regs 14, 15 & 16.	Yes		chris spiker
5	F&G Reg 14(5)	If the local government sought to vary the information supplied to tenderers, was every reasonable step taken to give each person who sought copies of the tender documents or each acceptable tenderer, notice of the variation.	Yes		chris spiker
6	F&G Reg 18(1)	Did the local government reject the tenders that were not submitted at the place, and within the time specified in the invitation to tender.	Yes		chris spiker
7	F&G Reg 18 (4)	In relation to the tenders that were not rejected, did the local government assess which tender to accept and which tender was most advantageous to the local government to accept, by means of written evaluation criteria.	Yes		chris spiker
8	F&G Reg 17	Did the information recorded in the local government's tender register comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 17.	No		chris spiker
9	F&G Reg 19	Was each tenderer sent written notice advising particulars of the successful tender or advising that no tender was accepted.	Yes		chris spiker
10	F&G Reg 21 & 22	Did the local governments' advertising and expression of interest documentation comply with the requirements of F&G Regs 21 and 22.	Yes		chris spiker
11	F&G Reg 23(1)	Did the local government reject the expressions of interest that were not submitted at the place and within the time specified in the notice.	Yes		chris spiker
12	F&G Reg 23(4)	After the local government considered expressions of interest, did the CEO list each person considered capable of satisfactorily supplying goods or services.	N/A		chris spiker



No	Reference	Question	Response	Comments	Respondent
13	F&G Reg 24	Was each person who submitted an expression of interest, given a notice in writing in accordance with Functions & General Regulation 24.	Yes		chris spiker
14	F&G Reg 24E	Where the local government gave a regional price preference in relation to a tender process, did the local government comply with the requirements of F&G Reg 24E in relation to the preparation of a regional price preference policy (only if a policy had not been previously adopted by Council).	Yes		chris spiker
15	F&G Reg 11A	Does the local government have a current purchasing policy in relation to contracts for other persons to supply goods or services where the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, \$100,000 or less.	Yes		chris spiker