



Appendix F Long List Assessment

Description of Option:	Scope Options (What)								Service Solution Options (How)									SD-1			SD-2	SD-3
	SC-1	SC-2	SC-3	SC-4	SC-5	SC-6	SC-7	SC-8	SS-1a	SS-1b	SS-1c	SS-1d	SS-1e	SS-1f	SS-1g	SS-1h	SS-1i	Status quo: councils individually	Centre of Excellence	Joint procurement		
Investment Objectives																						
To provide 3 water services in a way that is affordable and effective	Yes - Councils as service providers can and do deliver services affordably and effectively	Partial - separation of one service would be challenging	Partial - separation of 1 service would be challenging	Partial - separation of one service would be challenging and stormwater only service likely to be not viable	Partial - wastewater and stormwater systems are connected as drainage system so would be challenging to separate these services	Partial - similarities of water and wastewater as drainage services means no sense in separating the two	Partial - similarities of water and wastewater as essential water services and water utilities means no sense in separating the two	No - combining regulator and service delivery increases risk	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	No - unlikely to be cost effective to employ all skills required. There may be skill gaps for some roles requiring technical expertise.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk. To be considered in detail as part of implementation.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk. To be considered in detail as part of implementation.	No - outsourcing of everything unlike to be cost effective. Core water strategic capability embedded in an external provider / organisation.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk. To be considered in detail as part of implementation.	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - affordability challenges for some Councils	Partial - could make some difference to future affordability but limited	Partial - could make some difference to future affordability but limited		
To provide services that are safe, reliable and resilient	Yes - three waters services are provided adequately, keeps the separation of service delivery from the regulator	Partial - separation of one service would be challenging and increased risks with multiple providers of water services	Partial - separation of one service would be challenging and increased risks with multiple providers of water services	Partial - separation of one service would be challenging and increased risks with multiple providers of water services	Partial - wastewater and stormwater systems as drainage system so would be challenging to separate stormwater	Partial - similarities of water and wastewater as drainage services, but increased network risk with keeping essential water service separate	Partial - would improve water and wastewater network safety and resilience but would increase network risks with separating stormwater	No - combining regulator and service delivery increases network risk and accountabilities	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	No - unlikely to be best way to manage risk. There may be skill gaps for some roles requiring technical expertise.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk. To be considered in detail as part of implementation.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk. To be considered in detail as part of implementation.	No - outsourcing of everything unlike to be best approach to managing risk. Core water strategic capability embedded in an external provider / organisation.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk. To be considered in detail as part of implementation.	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	Partial - affordability challenges will in time may affect safety and resilience	Partial - affordability challenges will in time may affect safety and resilience	Partial - affordability challenges will in time may affect safety and resilience		
To provide services through a model that enables a meaningful role for Maori	Partial - status quo does separate water into three waters	No - separation of three waters into parts for service delivery inconsistent with Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - separation of three waters into parts for service delivery inconsistent with Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - separation of three waters into parts for service delivery inconsistent with Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - separation of three waters into parts for service delivery inconsistent with Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - separation of three waters into parts for service delivery inconsistent with Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - separation of three waters into parts for service delivery inconsistent with Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	Yes - brings water further together holistically including freshwater	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility	Yes - Councils in control	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility	No - council could lose control over what's important locally	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility	Partial - current approach has Maori Advisory committees and LGA obligations	Partial - current approach has Maori Advisory committees and LGA obligations	Partial - current approach has Maori Advisory committees and LGA obligations		
To provide 3 waters services through a model that has the value of water at the centre	Partial - examples demonstrate can be done	No - three waters are too connected. Separation into parts does not support holistic water cycle.	No - three waters are too connected. Separation into parts does not support holistic water cycle.	No - three waters are too connected. Separation into parts does not support holistic water cycle.	No - wastewater and stormwater systems highly connected as drainage systems. Separation does not support holistic water cycle.	No - three waters are too connected. Separation into parts does not support holistic water cycle.	No - wastewater and stormwater systems highly connected as drainage systems. Separation does not support holistic water cycle.	Yes - brings water further together	Partial - mixed model provides best way to determine local value and implement	Yes - Councils in control	Partial - mixed model provides best way to determine local value and implement	Partial - mixed model provides best way to determine local value and implement	No - council could lose control over what's important locally	Partial - mixed model provides best way to determine local value and implement	Partial - mixed model provides best way to determine local value and implement	Partial - mixed model provides best way to determine local value and implement	Partial - mixed model provides best way to determine local value and implement	Partial - across the region has many points of accountability	Partial - across the region has many points of accountability	Partial - across the region has many points of accountability		
To provide 3 waters services in a way that supports our urban and rural communities	Yes - status quo provides support rural communities with employment opportunities which supports economic viability of small townships	Partial - separation of service would create further bureaucracy for communities and business to deal with	Partial - separation of service would create further bureaucracy for communities and business to deal with	Partial - separation of service would create further bureaucracy for communities and business to deal with	Partial - separation of service would create further bureaucracy for communities and business to deal with	Partial - separation of service would create further bureaucracy for communities and business to deal with	Partial - separation of service would create further bureaucracy for communities and business to deal with	Yes - brings services together. No impact on roles in communities and therefore supports the economic viability of small townships.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to identify and respond to local needs	No - could lead to impacts on small councils and communities expected to be able to resource every aspect	Partial - mixed model provides best way to identify and respond to local needs	Partial - mixed model provides best way to identify and respond to local needs	No - likely to lead to impacts on small communities.	Partial - mixed model provides best way to identify and respond to local needs	Partial - mixed model provides best way to identify and respond to local needs	Partial - mixed model provides best way to identify and respond to local needs	Partial - mixed model provides best way to identify and respond to local needs	Yes - maintains existing roles in rural communities and therefore supports the economic viability of small townships	Yes - maintains existing roles in rural communities and therefore supports the economic viability of small townships	Yes - maintains existing roles in rural communities and therefore supports the economic viability of small townships		
To provide 3 waters services that builds enduring capability and capacity	Yes - keeps similar skills/expertise combined	No - divides and separates scarce resources and likely erode strategic capability and capacity	No - divides and separates scarce resources and likely erode strategic capability and capacity	No - divides and separates scarce resources and likely erode strategic capability and capacity	No - divides and separates scarce resources and likely erode strategic capability and capacity	No - divides and separates scarce resources and likely erode strategic capability and capacity	No - divides and separates scarce resources and likely erode strategic capability and capacity	Partial - would aggregate resources/skills but combining the regulator and delivery may not be an enduring model and unclear functional accountability	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	Partial - unable to gain national and global reach with all in house functions	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	No - councils lose capacity and strategic knowledge	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	Management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - capacity and capability challenges across the region	Partial - supports each council with specific technical support	No - regional outsourcing may further exacerbate the capability and capacity challenges		
Critical Success Factors (as these CSFs are crucial (not just desirable)	any options that score a 'no' are automatically discounted from further analysis																					
Strategic fit and business needs	Yes - maintains three waters as a service	No - no good reasons for division of service into parts. Too connected and essential services.	No - no good reasons for division of service into parts. Too connected and essential services.	No - no good reasons for division of service into parts. Too connected and essential services.	No - no good reasons for division of service into parts. Too connected and essential services.	No - no good reasons for division of service into parts. Too connected and essential services.	No - no good reasons for division of service into parts. Too connected and essential services.	No - combining regulator and service delivery increases multiple risks	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	No - bringing in house all functions does not meet all councils' business needs	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	Partial - mixed model provides best way to manage risk	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	Partial - current approach has limitations that show through in current state assessment	Partial - only addresses a limited amount of issues identified in current state assessment	Partial - only addresses a limited amount of issues identified in current state assessment		
Potential value for money (right solution, right time at the right place)	Yes - status quo	Partial - division of 1 service makes little sense and not viable for Hawke's Bay	Partial - division of 1 service makes little sense and not viable for Hawke's Bay	Partial - division of 1 service makes little sense and not viable for Hawke's Bay	Partial - wastewater and stormwater systems connected as drainage system so would be challenging to separate	Partial - similarities of water and wastewater as essential services so means no sense or viable in separating the two	Partial - wastewater and stormwater systems connected as drainage system so would be challenging to separate	Partial - concern over long term value for money including unclear functional accountabilities	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	No - likely to place to meet restrictions on achieving best outcomes	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	Management a core service that councils should retain control of	No - asset management a core service that councils should retain control of	Partial - status quo has challenges across the region	Partial - limited benefits expected	Partial - limited benefits expected		
Supplier capacity and capability (is this a sustainable arrangement - external)	Yes - connection of three waters as a service is traditional approach	Partial - separation of service would spread resources (internal and external)	Partial - separation of service would spread resources (internal and external)	Partial - separation of service would spread resources (internal and external)	Partial - separation of service would spread resources (internal and external)	Partial - separation of service would spread resources (internal and external)	Partial - separation of service would spread resources (internal and external)	Yes - unitary councils currently have this approach	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	No - this solution excludes external service providers in market regionally	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	No - Councils lose capacity, in particular core water strategic capability	Partial - mixed model likely provides greatest opportunities and flexibility for market response and internal capacity building	No - Councils need to retain asset management for long term sustainability	No - Councils need to retain asset management for long term sustainability	No - Councils need to retain asset management for long term sustainability	Partial - challenges for status quo	Partial - lack of longevity and certainty likely to hamper true investment by all parties	Partial - lack of longevity and certainty likely to hamper true investment by all parties		
Potential affordability (are there no funding constraints)	Yes - no change to whether there are funding constraints	Yes - no change to whether there are funding constraints	Yes - no change to whether there are funding constraints	Yes - no change to whether there are funding constraints	Yes - no change to whether there are funding constraints	Yes - no change to whether there are funding constraints	Yes - no change to whether there are funding constraints	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Yes - service solution not related to affordability	Partial - no impact	Partial - limited impact compared to status quo	Partial - limited impact compared to status quo		
Potential achievability (ability and skills to deliver, likelihood of successful implementation)	Yes - no change	Partial - service could be separated out	Partial - service could be separated out	Partial - service could be separated out	Yes - services could be separated out	Yes - services could be separated out	Yes - services could be separated out	No - essentially requires a unitary council to be created	Yes - currently in operation	No - unlikely that could employ all skills and expertise required. Or would want to, in particular high risk specialists such as structural and geotechnical engineering advice.	Yes - some aspects currently in operation	Yes - some aspects currently in operation	No - Councils lose capacity, in particular core water strategic capability	Yes - some aspects currently in operation	No - Councils need to retain asset management for long term sustainability	No - Councils need to retain asset management for long term sustainability	No - Councils need to retain asset management for long term sustainability	Yes - no change	Yes - simple implementation and other examples to learn from	Yes - relatively simple implementation		
Summary of Advantages and Disadvantages:																						
Overall Assessment:	Yes - status quo, but in addition retention of three waters is the preferred scope	No - has many challenges. Particularly around practicability of separating services and Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - has many challenges. Particularly around practicability of separating services and Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - has many challenges. Particularly around practicability of separating services and Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - has many challenges. Particularly around practicability of separating services and Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - has many challenges. Particularly around practicability of separating services and Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - has many challenges. Particularly around practicability of separating services and Maori view of water (i.e. holistic)	No - issues with combining regulator and service delivery and the ability to implement	Yes - status quo meets objectives	No - significant issues and major risks with doing everything in-house	Yes - achieves objectives	Yes - achieves objectives	No - a number of issues with outsourcing all aspects of the service, in particular core water strategic capability	Yes - achieves objectives	No - issues with outsourcing key strategic function of asset management	No - issues with outsourcing key strategic function of asset management	No - issues with outsourcing key strategic function of asset management	Partial - status quo but while it meets the critical success factors does not achieve against all objectives	No - achieves objectives but most are only partially. Simple change but limited expected benefits when compared to other options	No - only partially meets the objectives and falls against strategic fit and business needs		
Short-listed options:																						
Status Quo:	Three waters								Mixed model													
Option 1:	All options except those that outsource Asset Management are acceptable																					
Option 2:																						
Option 3:																						

Note, Option 1 usually "do minimum", Option 2 "preferred" and Option 3 "more ambitious"

Description of Option:	Service Delivery Options (Who)						Implementation Options (When)					Funding Options		
	SD-4	SD-5	SD-6	SD-7			IM-1	IM-2	IM-3	IM-4	IM-3	FU-1	FU-2	FU-3
	Share service (simple)	Shared service business unit	Regional CCO (management)	Regional CCO (asset owning)	Sub-national CCO (management)	Sub-national CCO (asset owning)	Transition together	When existing contracts roll off	Phased - councils	Phased - model transition	Phased - Models & councils transition	Status quo: rates, fees & charges set by each council	Regional funding solution	National funding solution
Investment Objectives														
To provide 3 water services in a way that is affordable and effective	Partial - could make some difference to future affordability but limited	Yes - has potential to make difference to future affordability	Yes - has potential to make difference to future affordability long term due to larger scale capability and capacity (particularly for the small district councils)	Yes - has potential to make difference to future affordability long term due to larger scale capability and capacity (particularly for the small district councils)	Yes - has potential to make difference to future affordability long term due to larger scale capability and capacity (particularly for the small district councils)	Yes - has potential to make difference to future affordability long term due to larger scale capability and capacity (particularly for the small district councils)	Yes - maximises opportunity to realise benefits	Partial - limits effectiveness and ability to realise benefits	Partial - limits effectiveness and ability to realise benefits	Partial - limits effectiveness and ability to realise benefits	No - combination of smaller group and sub-optimal option reduces effectiveness	No - there are significant challenges in some parts of the region, particularly for small councils	Yes - improves affordability particularly for small councils	Yes - any national support of funding would help improve affordability. Only marginal if funding otherwise is based on status quo.
To provide services that are safe, reliable and resilient	Partial - affordability challenges will in time may affect safety and resilience	Yes - expect moderate benefits of scale to make an impact	Yes - expect benefits of scale to make a significant impact	Yes - expect benefits of scale to make a significant impact	Yes - expect benefits of scale to make a significant impact and increasing as size does	Yes - expect benefits of scale to make a significant impact and increasing as size does	Yes - maximises opportunity to realise benefits	Partial - delay creates multiple risks	Partial - creates risk depending on which council(s) are not involved	Partial - limits effectiveness and ability to realise benefits	No - combination of smaller group and sub-optimal option reduces effectiveness	No - affordability challenges may lead to significant issues, in particular safety and resilience	Yes - regional funding would help address the areas of greatest risk and need first, on a prioritised basis	Yes, any national support of funding would help improve services. Only marginal if funding otherwise is based on status quo.
To provide services through a model that enables a meaningful role for Maori	Partial - current approach has Maori Advisory committees and LGA obligations	Partial - current approach has Maori Advisory committees and LGA obligations	Yes - has potential to build role into the model	Yes - has potential to build role into the model	No - has potential to build role into model but outside the region may mean loss of voice	No - has potential to build role into model but outside the region may mean loss of voice	Yes - maximises opportunity to realise benefits	Partial - delay makes no change to current situation	Partial - creates risk depending on which council(s) are not involved	Partial - creates a more complex transition for all involved	No - makes for a more complicated model for Maori to have to engage/be involved with	Yes - no impact	Yes - pooling of resources would enable concentration of resources and capability to involve/engage with Maori across the region	Yes - any national support of funding would help develop resources and capability to involve/engage with Maori across the region. Only marginal if funding otherwise is based on status quo.
To provide 3 waters services through a model that has the value of water at the centre	Partial - across the region has many points of accountability	Partial - across the region has many points of accountability	Yes - brings together responsibility/accountability. Need to keep local community connections.	Yes - brings together responsibility/accountability. Need to keep local community connections.	Partial - beyond the region could lose sight of local/community value	Partial - beyond the region could lose sight of local/community value	Yes - maximises opportunity to realise benefits	Partial - delay makes no change to current situation	Partial - creates risk depending on which council(s) are not involved. Need two largest councils as the core group to be effective.	Partial - should be aspirational in the goals if we are making change	Partial - complex transition of councils and models runs counter of having 'value' of water at the centre	Partial - recognises community connections and local values but costs fall in a narrower band	Yes - would recognise regionally significant issues on a prioritised basis. May lose some local connection though.	Yes - national funding would help but would need to ensure that in any process/system that the community/local connection is not lost
To provide 3 waters services in a way that supports our urban and rural communities	Yes - maintains existing roles in rural communities and therefore supports the economic viability of small townships	Partial - may impact roles in small communities but balanced against expected benefits from increased services and benefits of scale	Partial - may impact roles in small communities but balanced against expected benefits from increased services and benefits of scale	Partial - may impact roles in small communities but balanced against expected benefits from increased services and benefits of scale	No - loses connection to local communities. Concern that jobs would be lost in rural communities. Balanced against potential benefits of increased services and benefits of scale.	No - loses connection to local communities. Concern that jobs would be lost in rural communities. Balanced against potential benefits of increased services and benefits of scale.	Yes - maximises opportunity to realise benefits	Partial - delay makes no change to current situation	Partial - creates risk depending on which council(s) are not involved	Partial - delay makes no change to current situation	Partial - mix of councils and models may separate urban and rural communities. Viability of small townships may be at risk.	Partial - impacts fall on small communities. Not sustainable long term.	Yes - allows funding to address areas of greatest regional concern/benefit on a prioritised basis	Yes - all communities would benefit from some national support. Only marginal if the funding is otherwise based on status quo.
To provide 3 waters services that builds enduring capability and capacity	Partial - supports each council with capacity issues but can be easily eroded with loss of key staff	Partial - builds some capacity and capability but can be easily eroded with loss of key staff	Yes - builds capacity and capability for the region that is enduring	Yes - builds capacity and capability for the region that is enduring	Partial - builds capacity and capability but may do so outside their region	Partial - builds capacity and capability but may do so outside their region	Yes - maximises opportunity to realise benefits	Partial - delay makes no change to current situation	Partial - creates risk depending on which council(s) are not involved. Need two largest councils as the core group for capacity.	Partial - uncertainty will make it more difficult to attract and retain staff	Partial - uncertainty will make it more difficult to attract and retain staff	No - small councils limited in financial capacity leading to limits on technical, management and operational capacity	Yes - pooling of resources would enable concentration of resources and capability	Yes - some national support would help with attracting and retaining staff. Only marginal if the funding is otherwise based on status quo.
Critical Success Factors (as these CSFs are crucial (not just desirable))														
Strategic fit and business needs	Partial - only addresses a limited amount of issues identified in current state assessment	Partial - builds some capacity and capability but doesn't address all issues and has challenges with model	Yes - addresses some of issues identified in current state assessment. Set up as a dedicated water services business with strong strategic direction (set out in SOI).	Yes - addresses some of issues identified in current state assessment. Set up as a dedicated water services business with strong strategic direction (set out in SOI).	Partial - addresses some of the issues identified in the current state but introduces other important disadvantages by being greater size than Hawke's Bay	Partial - addresses some of the issues identified in the current state but introduces other important disadvantages by being greater size than Hawke's Bay	Yes - all councils are aligned strategically with shared business objectives	Partial - associated risks with councils starting at different times and not shared strategic direction	Partial - associated risks with councils starting at different times and not shared strategic direction	Partial - less effective with phased implementation	Partial - less effective with phased implementation and associated risks	Partial - current approach has limitations that show through in current state assessment	Yes - provides a rationale response to key issues identified	Yes - meets important strategic goals and addresses challenges
Potential value for money (right solution, right time at the right place)	Partial - limited benefits expected	Partial - expect to realise some benefits but has challenges with model	Yes - expect to realise many benefits compared to status quo due to larger scale capability and capacity	Yes - expect to realise many benefits compared to status quo due to larger scale capability and capacity	Yes - capable of realising greater scale benefits	Yes - capable of realising greatest scale benefits	Yes - demonstrated through industry benchmarking and LTP process	Partial - benefits realised over time with staged procurement approach	Partial - benefits realised over time with staged procurement approach	Partial - benefits realised over time with progressive approach	Partial - benefits realised over time with progressive approach and councils combining	Partial - current approach has limitations that show through in current state assessment	Yes - provides a rationale response to key issues identified	Partial - significant uncertainty about what is involved creates uncertainty
Supplier capacity and capability (is this a sustainable arrangement - external)	Partial - lack of longevity and certainty likely to hamper true investment by all parties	Partial - highly dependent on enduring relationships within SSBU and across Councils	Yes - CCO provides longevity, certainty and clarity. Management CCO option requires high relationship model.	Yes - CCO provides longevity, certainty, clarity and strategic direction	Yes - CCO provides longevity, certainty, clarity, and strategic direction. Greater supplier opportunities at sub national level.	Yes - CCO provides longevity, certainty, clarity, and strategic direction. Greater supplier opportunities at sub national level.	Yes - market understands the current arrangement	Yes - market can respond progressively	Yes - market can respond progressively	Yes - market can respond progressively	Yes - market can respond progressively	Partial - sustainability here is linked to affordability	Yes - an improvement on status quo	Yes - theoretically provides best solution
Potential affordability (are there no funding constraints)	Partial - limited impact compared to status quo	Partial - some impact compared to status quo	Partial - has ability to influence but on its own doesn't address affordability issues	Yes - provides vehicle to meet affordability challenge	Yes - provides vehicle to meet affordability challenge	Yes - provides vehicle to meet affordability challenge	Yes - ensures regional investment decisions made together and small councils are not isolated	Partial - regional investment decisions made for combined councils only	Partial - regional investment decisions made for combined councils only	Yes - ensures regional investment decisions made together and small councils are not isolated	Partial - regional investment decisions made for combined councils only	Partial - theoretically there is no funding constraint. Practically there will be a limit.	Yes - increases the potential funders of the services but depends on extent of how far the mode spreads	Yes - provides access to greatest amount of funding
Potential achievability (ability and skills to deliver, likelihood of successful implementation)	Partial - requires some implementation and does not have the same longevity of other options	Yes - some challenges with implementation but achievable	Yes - would be complex implementation but achievable. This option may take longer to implement.	Partial - complexity of the implementation is increased by including the assets	Partial - complexity of going beyond the region makes implementation difficult	No - including ownership of assets to a group larger than the region not considered achievable	Yes - has challenges but handled properly can be achieved	No - leaving change until a future date like this creates risk that is not outweighed by benefits	Partial - a smaller group of councils reduces the likely benefits that could be expected to be realised	Partial - may help with implementation but reduces likelihood of benefits realised	No - adds too much complication for little benefit	Yes - no change	Partial - mechanisms available/would need to be developed but can be	Partial - mechanism is unclear but has potential
Summary of Advantages and Disadvantages:														
Overall Assessment:	No - only partially meets the objectives and falls against strategic fit and business needs	Partial - achieves many objectives, albeit partially. Some difficulty likely with implementation.	Yes - achieves well against the objectives	Yes - issues likely to arise around implementation but achieves well against objectives	Partial - achieves many objectives, albeit partially. Some difficulty likely with implementation and loss of voice for small communities a major issue	No - achieves well against many objectives but asset ownership at sub-national level unlikely to be palatable	Yes - generally achieves against the objectives	No - can transfer and let contracts roll off	Partial - achieves objectives and in some cases simplifies but extends when benefits can be achieved. Needs critical mass (i.e. two largest councils as the core group) to be effective.	Partial - achieves some objectives and may can simplify process but risks being able to achieve benefits	No - phasing councils and models over time makes for a complicated set up and a long time until benefits realised	Partial - status quo. Achieves few objectives but meets critical success factors.	Yes - achieves objectives as it addresses a major issue	Yes - does not currently have an existing structure in place but otherwise meets all objectives
Short-listed options:														
Status Quo:	Councils individually						N/A					Each council		
Option 1:	Shared Services Business Unit (potential to achieve greater benefits than other shared services)						Phase - Councils					Regional funding		
Option 2:	Regional management CCO*						Transition together					National funding		
Option 3:	Regional asset owning CCO						Phased - model transition					National funding		

Note. Option 1 usually "do minimum", Option 2 "preferred" and Option 3 "mo". Also evaluate the marginal costs and benefits of a sub-national management CCO