

# Code of Meeting Practice – Submissions

Doc ID	Submission Point	Content	Staff Response
35633.19 35875.19	1	<p>Clause 1.1</p> <p>I request that the requirement that meetings be “Informed” by decisions being based on “relevant, quality information” be enhanced to read “<b>all</b> relevant, quality information”, to ensure that councillors are provided with not just information relevant to staff’s preferred position, but <i>all</i> relevant information. As we all know, none of us ‘knows what we don’t know’.</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The clause covers relevant and quality information.</p>
	2	<p>Clause 2.14. <i>Practice 4.</i></p> <p>I request that “Reports determined by the General Manager to be confidential ...” be amended to read “Reports <b>recommended</b> by the General Manager ...”. This Practice note refers to confidentiality in the context of s 10A of the LGA, which is clear in placing the authority with the governing body, not the general manager, on whether to close a meeting (ie in order to consider confidential matters).</p>	<p>Supported.</p> <p>Agree to amend clause 2.14 Practice Note (4) as follows:</p> <p><i>‘4. Reports <b>recommended</b> by the General Manger to be confidential in nature...’</i></p> <p>It is important to note that the current wording still allows Councillors to determine if a report should be confidential.</p>
35633.19 35875.19	3	<p>Clause 2.17 Practice.</p> <p>I request that it be the mayor and not the general manger who determines what an “emergency” is. Certainly, the mayor can and should consult with the general manger in such instances but should be the person who,</p>	<p>Supported in part.</p> <p>Agree to amend clause 2.17 Practice as follows:</p> <p><i>‘The General Manager, <b>in consultation with the Mayor</b>, can give notice....’</i></p>

		<p>as the elected leader of the council, is responsible for such a declaration.</p>	<p>There may be circumstances when the Mayor is not available or contactable. If the GM is on leave, there is always an acting General Manager. In the case of an emergency situation early contact could be vital.</p> <p>It is important to note that the authority of the General Manager to give notice of an Extraordinary meeting in an emergency situation is consistent with Council’s current Code of Meeting Practice.</p> <p>Further clause 2.3 refers to an Extraordinary meeting but clause 2.17 refers to an emergency meeting.</p> <p>By way of background, the following relates to clause 2.3.</p> <p>Section 366 of Local Government Act states:</p> <p><i>‘If the mayor receives a request in writing signed by at least 2 councillors, the mayor must call an extraordinary meeting of the council to be held as soon as practicable but in any event within 14 days after receipt of the request’.</i></p>
	<p>4</p>	<p>Clause 2.23 (Now clause 2.2) I request that “... will not be accepted” be amended to read “will not be accepted <b>unless resolved otherwise by Council, ...</b>”</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>This clause is in Council’s current Code of Meeting Practice.</p> <p>It is important to note that if a Councillor believes that an operational issue is urgent, they should raise it when the matter arises and not wait for a Council meeting to bring the matter to Council.</p>

35633.19 35875.19	5	Clause 2.28 (now clause 2.27) These conditions appear to remove any chance of contentious matters being the subject of questions asked. I suggest that councillors give careful attention to this clause.	Noted. This clause is in Council's current Code of Meeting Practice. There has been no issues with this wording previously.
	6	Clause 2.40 (now clause 2.39) Typo: "Clause 2.41 reflects ..." should read "Clause 2.39 reflects ...".	Supported. Agree to correct typographical error in clause 2.39 as follows: <i>"Clause 2.39 reflects ..."</i> .
	7	Clause 2.41. <i>Practice</i> note 4. (now clause 2.40) I refer to my comments on clause 2.14: with reference to s 10A, it is only the governing body, not the general manager, which has the authority to determine when a matter should be treated as confidential and considered in a closed meeting. s10A (1) reads: " <b>A council, or a committee of the council</b> of which all the members are councillors, may close to the public so much of its meeting as comprises ...".	Not supported. It is the responsibility of the General Manager to classify the reports as confidential. The agenda is prepared by the General Manager and must comply with clauses 2.38 and 2.39. The Council make a decision during the Council meeting.
35633.19 35875.19	8	Clause 2.52 (now clause 2.51) I object to this clause and request that it be amended to read " <b>Members of the public may attend pre-meeting briefing sessions, except for that part of the briefing sessions which deals with confidential matters.</b> "	Not supported. The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.

		<p>There is no justification provided for this 'closed meetings approach' in the report to council dated 26 March 2019, except for the statement that "Staff support this optional rule". There is surely nothing to hide from the public during these pre-meeting briefings – since that would make it confidential. As the clause reads, it would appear that every pre-briefing session deals with confidential information. These sessions involve the community's representatives being briefed by staff. It is therefore not only appropriate that the public be able to be present but it is necessary, if council is to adopt best practice when it comes to communicating with the community it is answerable to.</p>	<p>Pre-meeting briefings have been current practice at this Council for a number of years.</p> <p>It is important to note that in many cases the information discussed during briefing sessions contains personal and financial information that is confidential. Therefore it is not appropriate for these sessions to be open to the public.</p>
	<p>9</p>	<p>Part 3 – Public Forums I recommend that clauses 3.1 to 3.26 be removed from the Code of Meeting Practice and that, following adoption by council, they be placed in a stand-alone code of practice document, titled Public Forum. The rationale for this recommendation is that, as the OLG has recommended, public forum should not form part of the meeting. I agree with this. It makes perfect sense. It also makes perfect sense to exclude it from the Code of Meeting Practice, since it does not form part of the meeting. A Public Forum Code of Practice can very easily include a code of conduct, just as</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The OLG have recommended that the Public Forum form part of the Model Code of Meeting Practice as it is a non-mandatory clause which are considered best practice.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to have a separate Code for Public Forum.</p>

		happens when council engages contractors: if one wants to take part, then one is obliged to comply with the set code of conduct. In fact, it might be best to have public forum presenters sign such a code prior to their first presentation, to apply for all subsequent presentations.	
35633.19 35875.19	10	I request that the wording be amended to read “The Council <b>will schedule</b> a public forum prior to each meeting of the council ... Public forum <b>will</b> also be <b>scheduled</b> prior to extraordinary meetings ...of the Council and meetings of committees of the Council.” The OLG advises that public forum is best practice and so it <i>should</i> be held prior to each meeting, including extraordinary meetings.	Supported with additions.  The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.  Agree to amend clause 3.1 as follows:  <i>‘The Council <b>will schedule</b> a public forum prior to each meeting of the council <b>unless there are no registered speakers</b>. Public forum <b>will</b> also be scheduled prior to extraordinary meetings ...of the Council and meetings of committees of the Council <b>unless there are no registered speakers</b>.’</i>  The draft Code already included a public forum session for extraordinary meetings in Clause 3.1.
35633.19 35875.19	11	Also, the removal of public forum on non-agenda items (public access) from current practice cannot be allowed to stand. There are many council matters that concern community members which fall outside those listed on meeting agendas and which should and must be allowed to be presented to councillors, within the chamber. To deny this	Not supported.  It is important to note that there is no provision for Public Access in OLG’s guidelines.  Members of the public have many avenues to raise issues with Councillors.

		<p>forum is to deny the community its right to plead its case on a wide range of important matters to those who are meant to be representing them. I therefore recommend that councillors consider allowing such a session, but on a different day to the day of the meeting. The most suitable day, or the least inconvenient for councillors, would very likely be the Tuesday on which standard staff briefings take place, presently held a week before the scheduled meetings. And, of course, these public access sessions should be webcast, for the same reasons provided in support of webcasting public forum on agenda items, as detailed in my response to clause 3.12, below.</p>	<p>Councillor’s email and phone contact details are available on Council’s website. Residents and ratepayers may contact individual councillors or a group at any time. Councillors can also meet with residents. Councillors connect with members of the community in many ways through their own networks that are more flexible and accessible.</p> <p>They have no need to rely on Public Access to represent their communities effectively.</p> <p>By way of background, Public Access was developed to enable the community to connect with Councillors. Since its implementation, the way we communicate has evolved and Councillors are now more connected and accessible with their community.</p>
	<p>12</p>	<p>Clause 3.3 It may well be that a presenter does not wish to speak either “for” or “against” an agenda item but to simply make comment and ask councillors to consider those comments, which may be in the form of expert opinion. And so, I request that this requirement of “for” or “against” be deleted.</p>	<p>Supported.</p> <p>Agree to amend clause 3.3 as follows:</p> <p><i>To speak at a public forum, a person must first make an application to the Council in the approved form. Applications to speak at the public forum must be received by Council, Executive Support (02 4474 1358 or council.meetings@esc.nsw.gov.au), no later than 12.00noon of the business day prior to the meeting, and must identify the item of business on the agenda of the Council meeting the person wishes to speak on, and <b>should state</b> whether they wish to speak ‘for’ or ‘against’ the item.</i></p>

35633.19 35875.19	13	<p>Clause 3.4</p> <p>I strongly object to this requirement for presenters to provide a copy of their presentation the day before the meeting. It is a clear departure from the current practice of it being provided on the day of the meeting, either before or after the meeting. The reason given (in the 26 March 2019 report to council) seems to be that this earlier availability of the presentation will allow councillors to read it well before the meeting. I think that this possible if not questionable advantage for either, or both, the presenter and councillors of this prior notice, is one that ought to be left up to the presenter. There should be a choice available.</p> <p>Presentations ‘without notice’ most certainly have their place. They can grab the attention of the listener in a way that ‘familiar’ material cannot. The prior availability could very likely result in those councillors who do read the presentations before the meeting, switching off during the oral presentation, after having ‘heard it all before’!</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>It is proposed that presenters send their presentations to Council by 12.00noon on the business day prior to the meeting. Currently presenters are required to provide their presentations at the Council meeting, so this brings that requirement back by less than one business day. These submissions will be forwarded to Councillors for their information and consideration prior to the Public Forum session.</p> <p>By having the community member’s presentation early, it will assist Councillors to make decisions based on relevant, quality information as it states in clause 1.1. It also provides opportunities for Councillors to do research on the issues that have been raised, improving decision making process.</p> <p>Sending the submissions the day before will assist and provide sufficient time for Councillors to understand and be presented with all views if the process outlined in clause 3.9 occurs. It also assists to identify what a presenter may or may not support about that proposal.</p> <p>There is a requirement for people to send through written response to any plan, strategy or policy that Council has placed on exhibition. It is therefore reasonable to expect presenters to communicate their views to Councillors in the same manner.</p>
	14	<p>Clause 3.8</p> <p>I request that this clause be amended to read “If there are more speakers registered than</p>	<p>Not supported.</p>



		<p>time permits, <b>Council may resolve to extend the Public Forum session.</b>” The current wording is totally inflexible and seeks to deny the autonomy that should always be available to councillors to resolve to do whatever is (lawfully) necessary to facilitate the functions of council, and that of course includes providing the community with every opportunity to be heard by their representatives.</p>	<p>The current clause states ‘could’ and there is no apparent reason to change it to ‘may’.</p> <p>The ability for Council to potentially limit the number of speakers of up to three for and three against is considered by OLG to be best practice.</p> <p>As outlined above, providing of submissions on the business day prior to the meeting as listed in clause 3.4 also provides all views for Councillor’s consideration.</p>
<p>35633.19 35875.19</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>Clause 3.9 Even given that the OLG has an equivalent suggested, non-mandatory provision, this clause really does take Public Forum to a new level of unjustifiable control. Some years ago, there were many tens of presenters on the subject of the then newly proposed LEP: the ‘like-for-like war’. While there were many presenters who did effectively repeat what had been said by those before them, their numbers alone provided hard evidence to councillors of just how important the LEP issue was to many people within the shire. In other words, by seeking to limit numbers in the ways being proposed, councillors will be effectively denying the community a full expression, by way of numbers, of those issues that are of great importance to them. A false picture will very likely result in these</p>	<p>Provision not required. This is already in the draft Code of Meeting Practice.</p> <p>This is covered under Clause 3.23. Clause 3.43 states: <i>‘In the unusual circumstance that Council is proposing a significant issue. A dedicated Public Forum session can be facilitated, should the need arise. The date and time of such a session will be at the determination of the General Manager.’</i></p> <p>The option for Council to resolve to hold dedicated public forum session is also covered in the draft Code of Meeting Practice as part of its standard practice for passing resolutions.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Council implements appropriate engagement activities providing the community opportunity to inform Council’s decision making.</p>

		circumstances. I suggest therefore that council allow itself the flexibility to decide whether extended public forum sessions are warranted in unusual circumstances – for significant, shire-wide issues.	
35633.19 35875.19	16	<p>Clause 3.10</p> <p>Again, we have a clause that seeks to remove any scope for flexibility – and that is never desirable, given that there will always be unforeseen circumstances that will need to be accommodated at the time they occur. Therefore, I request that the wording be amended to read “Each speaker will be allowed five minutes to address the Council, <b>except if resolved otherwise by Council.</b>”</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>It is considered that five minutes is adequate for members of the public to put their case forward. It should be noted as outlined in clause 3.4, that Councillors will have a copy of the presenter’s submission on the day prior to the meeting or they may choose to send more details through to Councillors or contact them directly prior to public forum.</p> <p>The five minute limitation also allows more speakers to speak and provide a range of views.</p>
	17	<p><b>Clause 3.12: The proposal to cease webcasting of Public Forum</b></p> <p>To say the least, Council’s proposal to cease webcasting of the public forum session is most contentious. Being astounded at the proposal, and at a loss to understand what justification could possibly be made, I sought the views of several councillors, including the mayor. Those views vary from complete opposition to the proposal to complete support for it.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>OLG has stated:</p> <p><i>Public forums should not be held as part of a Council or committee meeting. Council or committee meetings should be reserved for decision-making by the Council or committee of Council. Where a public forum is held as part of a Council or committee meeting, it must be conducted in accordance with the other requirements of this code relating to the conduct of Council and committee</i></p>

			<p><i>meetings</i>'. (Pg 16 of OLG's Model Code of Meeting Practice for Local Councils in NSW)</p> <p>Therefore as OLG have stated that public forum should not be held as part of the meeting, there is no requirement or recommendation for it to be live streamed unlike the Council meeting which must be live streamed.</p> <p>OLG further strongly recommend: <i>'The provisions governing public forums contained in the Model Meeting Code reflect what OLG sees to be best practice and have been informed by the following considerations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Councils should have a comprehensive community engagement strategy in place to ensure that the views of affected persons and (where relevant) the community as a whole are considered in council decision making. This will soon be a statutory requirement. Public forums at council meetings are not an appropriate substitute for effective community consultation and <b>councils need to be mindful that the views expressed at public forums will not necessarily be representative of the views of other affected parties or the broader community.</b> (OLG FAQ attached to Circular 18-45).</i></li> </ul> <p>In the context of this statement, Public Forum should not be given any more weight or importance than any other form of community engagement such as written submissions. Webcasting presentations at Public Forum gives more prominence to this input than other contributions from the community</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>In the context of the above provision, Council has an adopted Community Engagement Framework, which guide how projects, both Shire wide and local, engage the community in order to provide feedback from interested parties prior to Council making a decision.</p> <p>While there are provisions in the draft Code of Meeting Practice to manage disorderly conduct, members of the public do not have to comply with a Code of Conduct. Once a statement has been made by a presenter and it has been live streamed it is irretrievable.</p> <p>Webcasting of Public Forum not only increases Council's potential liability, but could also cause significant or offence should a speaker reveal an issue of privacy or state derogatory comments about a person which is based on incorrect, malicious or misunderstood information.</p> <p>Presenting to Council can be a daunting experience for many people. The added pressure of being webcast and a person's presentation being available for anyone to view for seven years can be a significant deterrent. Removing the tension of the webcast may encourage more speakers or may lessen the stress of a presentation for those who wish to address the Council.</p> <p>All submissions made in public forum will be placed on the web so any member of the community can view a presenter's submission to any issue.</p> <p>In addition staff:</p>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a full copy of all submissions to Councillors when a plan, policy or strategy has been on exhibition.</li> <li>• Summarise key issues and provide a staff response to concerns or suggestions in regard to changes to the recommendations or why no change has been recommended.</li> <li>• Provide a pre-meeting briefing on all issues that have been raised by the community and any policy or legal ramifications.</li> </ul> <p>Community members can also contact Councillors directly to express their views.</p> <p>Further, reasons regarding the recommendation to not live stream public forum are listed below in response to additional comments.</p>
18		<p>Addressing each reason given, in turn:</p> <p>a) The ‘no need’ argument has (at least) the obvious flaw that it adopts the position previously long held by council that there was no need for webcasting of council meetings. As we all know, for the ESC that attitude has been overtaken by a hard-fought-for resolution of council and now the state-wide mandated requirement to webcast meetings. Sure, public forum is not part of the meeting (and really should never have been included in</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Under the Model Code of Meeting Practice Council must webcasts its meetings. This has been practice since 2015 when webcasting became more affordable. Prior to that time it was investigated but was considered to be cost prohibitive.</p> <p>Council initiated webcasting of its meetings to provide the community with greater access to Council decisions and address geographical barriers preventing the public from attending meetings.</p>

		<p>the agenda) but it currently shares with the meeting a public display of ‘councillors at work’ – to be witnessed by those who put them there, to see for themselves just what their representatives do and how they respond or do not respond to public presentations.</p> <p>If one were to disregard the interests of the wider community in council’s affairs, then, yes, there is no practical need to make public forum available outside the chamber. If, however, councillors are to meet their legislative obligations and not only have a proper regard for the wider community’s interests in council’s affairs but actually facilitate and encourage such engagement, then there is a most definite need for the webcasting.</p>	<p>Under this Code, Council will continue to live stream the decision making democratic process, which is a Council meeting. As the Council meeting is webcast, members of the public can view their ‘Councillors at work’.</p> <p>Council has a comprehensive Community Engagement Framework which provides numerous opportunities for Councillors to hear community views. Within this context Councillors fulfil all of their legislative obligations.</p> <p>Public Forum is one component of that Framework and enables community members the opportunity to present their views. The draft Code enables a Public Forum session to be held.</p> <p>Councillors email and phone contact details are available on Council’s website. Residents and ratepayers may contact individual councillors or the group at any time. Councillors connect with members of the community in many ways through their own networks.</p>
<p>35633.19 35875.19</p>	<p>19</p>	<p>b) Certainly, there have been, and will no doubt continue to be, presenters who do not comply with the simple and necessary requirement to treat others with respect. But so too, there have been and are councillors who behave similarly, either actively, with words, or passively, by overt, determined inattention to a presenter</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council meeting is the democratic process and this is webcast.</p> <p>The behaviour of those present at a Council meeting is addressed in Clauses 3.18-3.2 and Part 14. Councillors and Council staff also need to adhere to Council’s Code of Conduct.</p>

		<p>(to the point of leaving the chamber and hovering outside until the presentation is completed), which goes beyond rudeness and becomes a display of contempt for the presenter in question. I find that form of behaviour particularly galling. Control of such unacceptable behaviour is in the hands of the mayor or whoever might be chairing the meeting. There are means for controlling unacceptable behaviour, whether from presenters or councillors. On the matter of the ‘dangers’ of ‘instantaneous transmission’ of possibly libellous material, well, that can just as easily happen with a shouted interjection from the gallery, during a presentation <i>or</i> a meeting. It is but a small price to pay for our open, democratic process – which must be held onto no matter what. In any event, if a truly libellous accusation or remark is made, legal action is available which can and often does include a public apology.</p>	<p>Once a statement has been made by a presenter and this has been live streamed it is irretrievable.</p> <p>Webcasting of Public Forum therefore not only increases Council’s potential liability, but could also cause significant or offence should a speaker reveal an issue of privacy or state derogatory comments about a person which is based on incorrect, malicious or misunderstood information.</p>
<p>35633.19 35875.19</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>c) Members of the community who want to make a presentation but who do not wish to be ‘live streamed’, can very easily be accommodated by the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Public Forum does not form part of the Council meeting and therefore should not be live streamed.</p>

		<p>public forum session being divided into two sections: those who do and those who don't wish to be live streamed, with a suitable announcement beforehand so that those viewing on the net are made aware that there will be presentations – with the subject matters described – that will not be transmitted or recorded.</p>	<p>As per the above, webcasting of Public Forum not only increases Council's potential liability, but could also cause significant or offence should a speaker reveal an issue of privacy or state derogatory comments about a person which is based on incorrect, malicious or misunderstood information.</p> <p>Further, if some presentations were live streamed and some were not, a distorted view of the range and content of the contributions would occur.</p> <p>Refer to page 12 of this document for further information on this issue.</p>
<p>35633.19 35875.19</p>	<p>21</p>	<p>d) I agree that if one wishes to influence councillors' presumed or declared position then the more notice that is given to them, of the arguments in support of the presenter's position, the better. At the same time, questions or points made, without notice, have their place. They are a means by which council's knowledge of a given matter can be tested in a way that questions or points made on notice cannot achieve. Such questions are a staple of the federal and state parliaments and are very much a necessary ingredient of our democratic processes. Whether such surprises are in the best interests of</p>	<p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>As per Council's current Code of Meeting Practice, questions asked during public forum will be responded to in writing.</p> <p>During debate on the matter, Councillors can ask the questions of Council staff or fellow Councillors, as is the current practice.</p> <p>As Councillors are receiving the presentations the day prior to the meeting, as listed in clause 3.4, any questions can be addressed during the debate on the item.</p>



		<p>the community or whether they are an ineffective means by which to influence councillors' thoughts, is entirely irrelevant to the question of their legitimacy. If the presenter has taken an ineffective approach, it is a matter that concerns only the presenter.</p>	<p>Members of the public can also contact staff or Councillors prior to the meeting if there are any issues that require clarification prior to the Council meeting.</p>
<p>35633.19 35875.19</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>e) It may well be that some presenters make use of public forum to bolster support for next year's council election. I don't hold that view. Certainly, those of the presenters who are intending to run for council will do themselves no harm in appearing and presenting in the chamber, but so what?! A presenter's motive in appearing in the chamber is utterly irrelevant to the question of whether public forum should or should not be live streamed. It could equally be argued that those current councillors who want to reduce any exposure of potential competitors come the council elections, want to remove that exposure and thereby the competition. Such a tactic would be reprehensible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Public Forum is available for any person to present to Council regardless of their potential political aspirations, perceived or real.</p>

35633.19 35875.19	23	Public presentations to councillors, whether through the currently available Public Access or Public Forum sessions, provide community members with their ONLY opportunity to engage directly with their representatives, collectively. While there is no legal requirement that the public be given this opportunity, best practice demands it – as the OLG itself has stated. Therefore, such forums <i>are</i> in fact <i>required</i> of council if it is to conduct itself according to best practice. And, I submit, it also best practice to have such forums webcast and archived, so that this form of engagement between community members and those who represent them, can be made available for viewing to the wider community, without the need to attend the chamber.	<p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>As per OLG guidelines, Council has included a Public Forum session prior to the Council meeting.</p> <p>Written public forum submissions will be available for viewing on the Council’s website under the appropriate meeting page and titled ‘Public Forum’ as per clause 3.26.</p> <p>Council has an adopted Community Engagement Framework, which guide how projects, both Shire wide and local, engage the community in order to provide feedback from interested parties prior to Council making a decision.</p> <p>In addition staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a full copy of all submissions to Councillors.</li> <li>• Summarise key issues and provide a staff response to concerns or suggestions in regard to changes to the recommendations or why no change has been recommended.</li> <li>• Provide a pre-meeting briefing on all issues that have been raised by the community and any policy or legal ramification.</li> </ul>
	24	The OLG goes further on the importance of public forum, advising that “ <b>Public forums</b>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The OLG has stated: <i>Public forum should operate as an input into Council decision –making at meetings. This</i></p>

		<p><b>should operate as an input into council decision-making at meetings”</b></p> <p>2. In giving reasons for mandating webcasting of meetings, the OLG has said that they <b>“should be webcast to increase the transparency of council decision making and allow access to those who may not be physically able to attend meetings”</b></p> <p>3. So, given OLG’s view that public forums should operate as an input into council decision-making and that it wants increased transparency (by way of webcasting) of council decision making, then, by simple logic, the public forum session must acquire the same status as the meeting itself, as far as the need for webcasting is concerned. It therefore could not be clearer that, in the public interest, public forum must be webcast, in order that the viewing community is able to witness the extent to which it (through the presenters) has provided such input into council’s decision-making. If the reasoning given to this point is not sufficiently persuasive, then the case is pressed further, below.</p>	<p><i>means that they should be focussed on the matters under consideration at a council meeting and not permit free ranging discussions of other matters that are not being dealt with at the meeting’.</i></p> <p>This principle is supported as reflected in the fact that public forum will be held prior to the Council meeting.</p> <p>OLG has stated that <i>Council meetings should be webcast to increase the transparency of Council decision making.</i></p> <p>Council is webcasting its meetings.</p> <p>OLG has made it clear that public forum does not hold the same status as the Council meeting:</p> <p><i>‘Council meetings should operate as a forum for debate and decision making by the community’s elected representatives. Public forums should not operate in a way that displaces this as the principal purpose of council meetings nor operate as a platform for others to participate in debate with elected officials on matters under consideration at a meeting.</i></p> <p><i>Participation in a public forum is a privilege not a right. It should be within the discretion of a council to withdraw this privilege where a person fails to respect meeting rules or engages in disorderly conduct.’</i> (OLG FAQ attached to Circular 18-45).</p> <p>There is no recommendation from OLG that public forum should be webcast. Webcasting of public forum is not included in OLG best practice guidelines or recommended as an option.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>Further, members of the community can still present to Council during the decision forming stages of the democratic process and not during the decision making process, which is the Council meeting.</p> <p>Councillors take all views and opinions from the community as part of its Community Engagement Framework. There are many inputs into a Council decision.</p>
35633.19 35875.19	25	<p>As those who sought and obtained public office will well appreciate, councillors hold their office as a matter of privilege as well as duty. In dealing with council business they each, individually and collectively, have the demanding responsibility of standing in the place of every member of the community. And for such privileged representation to be undertaken conscientiously and diligently, each councillor must necessarily apply him or herself to facilitating and fostering this special relationship in every way possible. As a reminder to councillors, section 232(1)(e) of the LGA, which prescribes the role of a councillor, in fact <b>requires each councillor, to “facilitate communication between the local community and the governing body”</b>. This directive is an unequivocal legislative requirement of each councillor; and is not a task that can be delegated to staff. Again, best practice will require more than simply</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>All Councillors have made oath of office or made an affirmation of office.</p> <p>As per OLG guidelines, the draft Code of Meeting Practice has included public forum prior to the Council meeting where any member of the public can address the Council.</p> <p>Written public forum submissions will be available for viewing on the Council’s website under the appropriate meeting page and titled ‘Public Forum’.</p> <p>OLG strongly recommends that: <i>‘The provisions governing public forums contained in the Model Meeting Code reflect what OLG sees to be best practice and have been informed by the following considerations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Councils should have a comprehensive community engagement strategy in place to ensure that the</i></li> </ul>

		<p>satisfying the bare, mandatory minimum, of facilitation. It requires councillors to facilitate their communication with those whom they represent, and thereby <i>foster</i> the <i>relationship</i> itself. The inverse follows: without (meaningful) communication, there can be no relationship; certainly not a harmonious one. The need for and importance of communication between councillors and the community they represent, is central to the importance of public forum being communicated to as many of the community as possible – through webcasting. Again, it’s a matter of simple logic.</p>	<p><i>views of affected persons and (where relevant) the community as a whole are considered in council decision making.</i> (OLG FAQ attached to Circular 18-45).</p> <p>In the context of these provisions, Council has an adopted Community Engagement Framework, which guide how projects, both Shire wide and local, engage the community in order to provide feedback from interested parties prior to Council making a decision.</p> <p>In addition staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a full copy of all submissions to Councillors.</li> <li>• Summarise key issues and provide a staff response to concerns or suggestions in regard to changes to the recommendations or why no change has been recommended.</li> <li>• Provide a pre-meeting briefing on all issues that have been raised by the community and any policy or legal ramifications.</li> </ul> <p>Community members can also contact Councillors directly to express their views.</p>
35633.19 35875.19	26	<p>And councillors might also care to recall the oath (or affirmation) they took on assuming office: that they will each act “<b>in the best interests of the people of the Eurobodalla Shire</b>” and that they “will faithfully and impartially <b>carry out the functions</b>, powers,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These issues have been responded to in the above answers.</p>

		<p>authorities and discretions vested in [them] <b>under the Local Government Act 1993</b> or any other Act to the best of [their] ability and judgment.” Clearly, it is absurd for anyone to even suggest that denying the people of the Eurobodalla shire the opportunity to view a webcast of Public Forum is in their best interests. It is in fact entirely contrary to their best interests, which are most effectively served in this matter by having full access to hearing and viewing presentations and the responses of their representatives, not only when they meet to conduct business during a meeting but also when they engage with members of the community during public forum.</p>	
<p>35633.19 35875.19</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>Finally, given the unique nature of public forum, and the importance assigned to it by the OLG, it is a forum that could hardly be more worthy of sharing with the wider community. Such engagement is at the heart of what local government is about, and to prevent its dissemination can fairly be described as a form of political censorship; which in conjunction with political propaganda, of constantly delivering a rosy picture in the face of dissent, has no place in our democratic society. There is a need to address the <i>causes</i> of the dissent rather than seek to quash it. Council needs to move</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>All submissions to public forum will be placed on Council’s website.</p> <p>Public forum is included in the draft Code of Meeting Practice and forms part of Council’s comprehensive Community Engagement Framework.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10- 20 of this document for further response on these issues.</p>

		forward, not backwards; to become much more open; and proactively so.	
	28	<p>Clause 4.10. <i>Practice 5</i></p> <p>I request that the wording be extended as follows: “The seating arrangements ... by the Chairperson of the meeting, <b>if councillors cannot agree</b>”.</p>	<p>Supported.</p> <p>Agree to amend clause 4.10 Practice (5) as follows:</p> <p><i>‘The seating arrangements for a meeting may be determined by the Chairperson of the meeting, if councillors cannot agree’.</i></p>
35633.19 35875.19	29	<p>Clause 4.24 (now clause 4.26)</p> <p>In this age of digital information storage, there is absolutely no justification for the destruction of public records – none whatsoever. And a period of 7 years is ridiculously brief, not even covering two terms of council. I strongly object to this provision, on the grounds that there is a complete absence of any justification for it and because it is in the community’s best interests and councillors’, to be able to research earlier meetings and resolutions, as far back in time as possible.</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>The webcast of each meeting is not the Council minutes.</p> <p>The official record of the Council meetings are its minutes and they are made available for viewing at any time in perpetuity.</p> <p>It is important to note that the OLG draft Code of Meeting Practice document states:</p> <p><i>‘A recording of each meeting of the council and committee of the council is to be retained on the council’s website for [council to specify the period of time the recording is to be retained on the website]. Recordings of meetings may be disposed of in accordance with the State Records Act 1998.’</i></p> <p>The period of time (seven years) surpasses the <i>State Records Act 1998</i> requirements.</p>
	30	<p>Clause 9.9. <i>Practice</i></p> <p>This Practice note is open to misuse – whether intentional or not. I request that it be amended to read: “The Chairperson has</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Recommendation is to remove practice note.</p>

		the authority to rule out of order any Motion ... involve a contravention of the law, <b>according to supporting legal advice provided to council</b> ".	This practice reflects clause 9.7 which is a mandatory provision.
	31	<p>Clause 13.11</p> <p>There have been problems in the past (for example, at the time of the general manager's contract renewal), when there has been insufficient detail provided in the agenda, of the proposed confidential subject, thus preventing an informed decision by a potential speaker on whether to speak against the proposed closure of the meeting to the public. Certainly, s 9 (2A) (a) of the LGA requires that in the case of "likely" closed meetings that "the agenda for the meeting must indicate that the relevant item of business is of such a [confidential] nature (but <b>must not give details of that item</b>)". However, section 10D requires that, at the open meeting, at the time that council decides to close part of the meeting, the grounds on which it is [intended to be] closed must be stated in the decision <b>and</b> the grounds <b>must specify</b> not only the relevant provision(s) of s 10A (2) being relied on but also "<b>the matter that is to be discussed</b> during the closed part of the meeting". That is to say, the chairperson must "specify the matter". This requirement is somewhat at</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This issue is addressed in Clause 2.39.</p> <p>Council has addressed this issue previously with OLG and has put in place processes to ensure that sufficient information is provided to enable a member of the community to ascertain what the confidential matter listed is about.</p>



		odds with the “must not give details” requirement. Perhaps councillors could obtain an expert opinion on how these two apparently conflicting requirements can be reconciled. My own opinion is that council must not provide ‘confidential details’ but must provide (specify) enough detail to enable a member of the public to know, specifically, what the subject matter is. So, in the case of the general manager’s contract renewal, it would be insufficient to describe the confidential matter as “Personnel matter”. It would need to be described as “Renewal of the General Manager’s contract”, which does not reveal a skerrick of confidential information, but will provide sufficient detail for a person to decide whether to speak against closure.	
35633.19 35875.19	32	I therefore request that clause 13.11 be extended, as follows: “Where the matter has been identified in the agenda of the meeting under clause 2.37 as a matter that is likely to be considered when the meeting is closed to the public, <b>and the matter has been specified in accordance with s 10A(2)</b> , in order to make representations under clause 13.9, members of the public ... by 12 noon ... to be considered.”	Supported.  Agree to amend clause 13.11 as follows:  <i>‘Where the matter has been identified in the agenda of the meeting under clause 2.40 as a matter that is likely to be considered when the meeting is closed to the public, <b>and the matter has been specified in accordance with s 10A(2)</b>, in order to make representations under clause 13.9, members of the public ... by 12 noon ... to be considered’.</i>
	33	Clause 13.17	Not supported.

		Two minutes in which to make a case against closing the meeting to the public is blatantly inadequate. I strongly object to this unjustifiable limitation and request that the time permitted be set at 5 minutes.	Council's current Code of Meeting Practice has a limitation of two minutes and has not presented an issue.  It is important to note that speakers are <b>only</b> to address Council on the fact that the meeting is being closed. Not on the actual item.
35633.19 35875.19	34	Clause 17.1 I suggest that this clause be amended to read: "Meetings of the Council ...no later than 2.00 pm, <b>subject to clause 17.2.</b> "	Supported.  Agree to amend clause 17.1 as follows:  <i>'Meetings of the Council and committees of the Council are to conclude no later than 2.00 pm, <b>subject to clause 17.2.</b>'</i>
	35	Clause 17.7 This clause needs to be extended, according to the wording provided in the Model Code of Meeting Practice: "Where a meeting is adjourned under clause 17.3 or 17.6, the General Manger must individually notify each Councillor of the time, date and place at which the meeting will reconvene <b>and must publish the time, date and place at which the meeting will reconvene on the council's website and in such other manner that the general manager is satisfied is likely to bring notice of the time, date and place of the reconvened meeting to the attention of as many people as possible.</b> " Without this additional requirement, the public would almost certainly never know where and when the reconvened meeting would occur.	Supported.  Agree to amend clause 17.7 as follows:  <i>'Where a meeting is adjourned under clause 17.3 or 17.6, the General Manger must individually notify each Councillor of the time, date and place at which the meeting will reconvene <b>and must publish the time, date and place at which the meeting will reconvene on the council's website and in such other manner that the general manager is satisfied is likely to bring notice of the time, date and place of the reconvened meeting to the attention of as many people as possible.</b>'</i>

		Clearly, the OLG expects council to publicise this information.	
	36	Clause 18.15 I request that this clause be extended to read: “In the interests of privacy protection ... containing personal information, unless the petitioners request otherwise”.	Not supported. This is not supported as it may breach Privacy Laws.
35633.19 35875.19	37	Non-mandatory clause 20.24 of the Model Code of Meeting Practice has been omitted (or excluded) from council’s draft code. Given that its purpose is to provide the community with highly relevant information on councillors’ voting, including at closed council committee meetings, it is very concerning that this omission has occurred. I request that this clause be included in the draft code. The wording is as follows: “All voting at meetings of committees of the council (including meetings that are closed to the public), must be recorded in the minutes of meetings with the names of councillors who voted for and against each motion or amendment,(including the use of the casting vote), being recorded.”	Not supported. Councillors can note their voting against the motion or a division can be called. The following clauses from the draft Code of Meeting Practice states: <i>‘10.5 If a Councillor who has voted against a Motion put at a Council meeting so requests, the General Manager must ensure that the Councillor’s dissenting vote is recorded in the Council’s minutes.’</i> <i>‘10.6 The decision of the Chairperson as to the result of a vote is final, unless the decision is immediately challenged and not fewer than two (2) Councillors rise and call for a division.’</i>
	38	Clause 3.7 The General Manager or their delegate may refuse an application to speak at a public forum. The General Manager or their delegate must give reasons in writing for a decision to	Not supported. The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.

		<p>refuse an application and must make those reasons public. By resolution, councillors may overturn a decision made by the General Manager or their delegate under this clause." My reasoning for this requested amendment should be clear but in case it is not, it is that as the clause currently reads, a poor or unjustified decision, based on misinformation or even a bias against a prospective speaker, is a real possibility, especially given the glaring omission of criteria against which a decision to refuse an application might be made. As well, there is no appeal process.</p>	<p>There may be circumstances where the reason for refusal to speak at public forum may contain personal or confidential information. Therefore, Council could not make this information public as it may breach privacy laws.</p> <p>It should be noted that any refusal must be in writing. The General Manager must comply with Council's Code of Conduct. The letter would be sent to the person who has been refused as well as the Councillors. This letter would be sent prior to the meeting.</p> <p>A Councillor could move a motion to defer the item to recommend that the speaker address Council at the next public forum session.</p>
<p>35633.19 35875.19</p>	<p>39</p>	<p>Clause 3.17 Speakers at public forums may ask questions of the governing body." The clause, as it currently reads, that speakers "cannot ask questions of ... Councillors", is an affront to the community that council is there to serve. It is no less than the nonsense of seeking to deny an employer the right to question an employee. Surely, councillors, individually and collectively, as the governing body, want to be asked questions by those who have put their faith in them and elected them to office. After all, councillors are accountable to the community and even if questions are not able to be answered during public forum, through</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>As per Council's current protocol, questions asked during public forum will be responded to in writing.</p> <p>During debate on the matter, Councillors can ask questions of Council staff or fellow Councillors, as is the current practice.</p> <p>As Councillors are receiving the presentations the day prior to the meeting, as stated in clause 3.4, any questions can be addressed during the debate on the item.</p> <p>Members of the public can also contact staff or Councillors prior to the meeting if there are any issues that require clarification.</p>

		the mayor, they can be taken on notice and answered later, in writing, publicly.	
	40	<p>Clause 3.22 (now clause 3.21)  Where a speaker engages in conduct of the type referred to in clause 3.19 ... for such period as the General Manager or their delegate considers appropriate. Reasons for refusal of further applications must be given in writing and made public. By resolution, councillors may overturn a decision made by the General Manager or their delegate under this clause."  My reasons for this requested amendment are those given with respect to clause 3.7.</p>	<p>Supported in part.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>There may be circumstances where the reason for refusal to speak at public forum may contain personal or confidential information. Therefore, Council could not make this information public as it may breach privacy laws.</p> <p>Agreed to amend clause 3.22 as follows:  <i>'Where a speaker engages in conduct of the type referred to in clause 3.19, the General Manager or their delegate may refuse further applications from that person to speak at public forums for such a period as the General Manager or their delegate considers appropriate. <b>This refusal must be provided in writing.</b>'</i></p> <p>It is important to note that the General Manager must comply with Council's Code of Conduct.</p>
34731.19	41	<p>Removal of Public Access  This is a supplementary provision added by council. It is not included in OLG's Model Code as mandatory or non mandatory.  The Draft Code eliminates entirely, 'public access' sessions where community members can meet with councillors to express their</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Members of the public have a number of avenues to raise issues with Councillors.</p> <p>Councillors' email and phone contact details are available on Council's website. Residents and ratepayers may contact individual councillors or the group at any time.</p>

		<p>views, concerns and to provide information on any issue.</p> <p>Council's justification for its removal is that the community can access councillors via email or phone. The problem with this being that most councillors don't respond to emails or phone calls.</p> <p>It must also be said that there is no substitute for face to face contact where facial expressions and body language reflect interest, understanding and/or empathy.</p>	<p>Councillors connect with members of the community in many ways through their own networks. They have no need to rely on Public Access to represent their communities effectively.</p> <p>By way of background, Public Access was developed to enable the community to connect with Councillors. Since its implementation, the way we communicate has evolved and Councillors are now more connected with their community.</p> <p>Refer to page 6 document for extended response to this issue.</p>
34731.19	42	<p>* Removal of Public Forum Webcasting</p> <p>This is a supplementary requirement added by council. It is not included in OLG's Model Code as mandatory or non mandatory. Council resolved to webcast council meetings, including Public Forum, at its meeting on 9 Dec 2014.</p> <p>The aim being to enhance public access to decision making and debate by overcoming geographic barriers preventing public attendance at meetings.</p> <p>This decision also fulfilled the Code's objective to, "ensure that proceedings are transparent and understandable to all persons participating in and observing meetings of council ...."</p> <p>What has changed?</p>	<p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>All submissions to public forum will be placed on Council's website.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 - 20 of this document for extended responses to these issues.</p>

		<p>After 4 years, why has council now decided that members of the public unable to attend council meetings due to work, geographic location, disability or other commitments, be denied access to information provided by their fellow ratepayers?</p> <p>Webcasting of Public Forum allows speakers to share information and concerns with the public on issues that may effect them. It also serves to enhance community awareness of issues, opinions and concerns that would otherwise be unknown to the public.</p>	
34731.19	43	<p>General Manager may refuse application to speak at Public Forum(3.7, 3.22) This a non mandatory provision in the Model Code. Empowering the General manager to refuse applications to speak at Public Forum is hardly 'democratic.' The General Manager should have no authority to pick and choose who is permitted to address our elected representatives. Currently, only a council resolution or the Chair(if delegated) can authorise a ban on a community member from Public Forum, if that person commits an act of disorder and refuses to apologise. Why has this authority been removed from councillors and given to the GM?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>Refer to pages 28, 29 and 32 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>

		Council has provided no explanation for this change.	
	44	<p>* Written copy of address to be provided to council by noon the day prior to meeting(3.4)  This is a supplementary requirement added by council. It is not included in OLG’s Model Code as mandatory or non mandatory. The Model Code 4.10 does have a non mandatory provision, “to register with council any written, visual or audio material to be presented IN SUPPORT of their address to council .....</p> <p>(insert) days before public forum.”  So the requirement to provide the actual address to council the day before, is a supplementary inclusion by council.  If councillors are to have half an hour to consider Public Forum presentations before the council meeting begins, why do they need a copy of the presentation the day before?  If Councillors have received and read presentations the day before, why would speakers want or need to present them at Public Forum?  Some councillors already exhibit attention deficit without having to ‘endure’ a presentation they have already read.  OR,</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is proposed that presenters send their presentations to Council by 12.00noon on the business day prior to the meeting. Currently presenters are required to provide their presentations at the Council meeting, so this brings that requirement back by less than one business day. These submissions will be forwarded to Councillors for their information and consideration prior to the Public Forum session.</p> <p>By having the community member’s presentation early, it will assist Councillors to make decisions based on all points of view. It also provides opportunity for Councillors to do research on the issues that have been raised.</p> <p>Sending the submissions the day before will assist and provide sufficient time for Councillors to understand and be presented with all views if the process outlined in Clause 3.9 occurs. It also assists to identify what a presenter may or may not support about that proposal.</p> <p>It is considered that 30 minutes is not always sufficient time to consider all points of view. Receiving submissions the day prior allows for further consideration.</p> <p>If the General Manager refuses an application to speak in public forum under clause 3.7 it must be in writing. Staff and Councillors must comply with Council’s Code of Conduct.</p>



		<p>Perhaps this proviso has been added to the Code for the benefit of the General Manager – so she can ‘pick and choose’ who she will allow to present at Public Forum.</p> <p>Perhaps it will enable staff to censor, redact, edit or prepare an ‘inquisition.’</p> <p>No matter what the reason, it is a control mechanism that has no place in democratic decision making, as it does nothing to inspire trust, fairness or transparency.</p> <p>It is glaringly obvious that council’s intent in drafting this Code was to conceal the views and concerns of the local community from the general public, minimise their impact on council decision making while endowing the General Manager with the power of veto.</p>	
35787.19	45	<p>Clause 2.29 (now clause 2.28)  <i>“Questions should not ask for legal opinion to be provided at the Council meeting.”</i></p> <p>I note that this particular proposed clause is not contained in either the mandatory or non-mandatory sections of the new OLG Model Code. It is not obvious to me why, if requested, a councillor should not be provided with such information and, as far as I can see, the council's case for the inclusion of this clause is not contained in the available documentation. I therefore believe that this proposed clause should be withdrawn.</p>	<p>This is a clause from Council’s current Code of Meeting Practice which was adopted in December 2014.</p> <p>Legal opinion cannot be presented at Council as it may breach legal privilege.</p>

		In this regard, although legal privilege might technically be available to the council in relation to any particular legal opinion that it has received, the accepted good practice in the public sector in this State is that, in the absence of good reasons to the contrary, it is in the public interest for such information to be released by a government agency.	
35787.19	46	<p>Clause 14.23  Add the following requirement to this proposed clause.  <i>“Councillors must not use mobile phones and similar devices during council meetings.”</i>  This proposal is aimed at (i) enhancing the likelihood of the full attention of councillors being given to the official proceedings of the council and (ii) ensuring that any communications between individual councillors during formal council proceedings are able to be heard by the other councillors and by the members of the public who are in the chamber or who are viewing the webcast.</p>	<p>This clause is mandatory.  Councillor’s use technology such as mobile phone and tablets to undertake their civic duty.  It is up to the individual Councillor to determine the use of their mobile phone during meetings as long as it is switched to silent as requested by the Mayor at the start of each meeting.</p>
		<p>Governance (page 48)  Some of the documents, etc., listed under “Related legislation, policies, codes, and guidelines” are either no longer relevant, no longer in existence and/or have incorrect links shown.</p>	<p>Noted.  Relevant changes amended in document.</p>

		<p>Appendix “F” Closure of Meetings</p> <p>Add, at the start of the second sentence in the preamble in this appendix, the following words.</p> <p><i>“Subject to the limitations and restrictions specified, ...”</i></p> <p>I believe that these words are needed to ensure that councillors are absolutely clear that, despite the identification of any relevant matters that might suggest a need to close a particular meeting to the public, the councillors <b>must not</b> decide to do so unless <b>on balance</b> they are able to conclude that it is in the public interest for that to happen.</p>	<p>Supported.</p> <p>Agree to amend Appendix F as follows:</p> <p><i>‘The table below summarises the provisions of sect. 10A and 10B of the Act. Subject to the limitations and restrictions specified, Council may go into closed session for receipt or discussion of any of the following matters, for as much of the discussion as is necessary to preserve the relevant confidentiality, privilege or security:’</i></p>
35564.19	47	<p>I am strongly against the general managers recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to remove the live streaming of Public Forum</li> <li>- to impose a 24 hour requirement for submissions before Public Forum</li> <li>- to allow the General Manager discretion as to who is allowed to speak</li> <li>- to fully remove Public Access</li> <li>- to remove all recording of Public Forum</li> <li>- to deny media the right to record Public Forums for the purpose of news and accuracy.</li> </ul> <p>I am disgusted with the very fact that this Draft has gone before the community for</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Removal of live streaming should not impact effective media coverage. Journalists attending the meeting may still report on meeting proceedings and will continue to request follow up interviews and information to complete their reporting.</p> <p>Refer to pages 6, 10-20, 28-29 and 34 of this document for extended responses to these issues.</p>

		<p>their comment. While Councillors might claim they have not 'endorsed' it the draft carries the 'signoff' of each and every Councillor who sat in the secret workshops and co-penned this document along with the general manager and her staff knowing fully well that the Code intended to remove Public Forum as we know it from the records and remove Public Access of non-agenda items completely. There is little doubt that this will not go through as the voting block of Brown, Innes, Nathan, Thomson, Tait and Pollock will stand behind the General Manager. Constable is unknown however few in the community hold faith that he is his own man when it comes to staff recommendations and will cave in.</p> <p>Most likely there will only be two councillors, McGinlay and Mayne who might recognise this as a major turning point in democracy and put up a challenge however, irrespective of what they put forward and irrespective of the submissions received the Code will go through as it, won by the Gang of Six. Should that be the case then a pox on the houses of those who vote for it and a pox on the House of Eurobodalla Council and all those who have bought it to this darkest hour.</p>	<p>The Code of Meeting Practice is in accordance with OLG's guidelines and mandatory clauses. The draft Code of Meeting Practice was placed on exhibition for public comment from 3 April to 15 May 2019.</p>
--	--	--	---

35532.19	48	<p>Due diligence is needed by all councillors in respect of the ramifications of the removal of Live Streaming of Public Forum &amp; Public Access Councillors you are elected by your constituents to be responsible representatives who listen to the concern of the community no matter what the issue or the arguments for or against ; a fair hearing or debate should always be permitted not gagged or removed as would happen if you approved the General Manager’s motions to eliminate Live Streaming &amp; Public Access</p> <p>3. Consultation with the community is a key ingredient in ensuring free speech is championed at the local government level 4. Accountability &amp; transparency are vital components of local government to ensure democratic principles are adhered to in the day to day business of council 5. Support of the status quo will be a vote for open debate , accountability transparency, honesty &amp; inclusivity all of the principles that make up the fabric of democracy . If you eliminate Live Streaming &amp; Public Access sessions you are cutting off pillars that hold up the very body of local government; pillars that progressive people have fought for &amp; won for the benefit of all. Remember other councillors will follow you. Do not encumber them with such</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Public Forum will be held prior to the Council meeting. OLG have made it clear that public forum does not hold the same status as the Council meeting. There is no recommendation from OLG that public forum should be webcast. Webcasting of public forum is not included in OLG best practice guidelines or recommended as an option.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
----------	----	--	---

		<p>dangerous draconian controlling “legislation”.</p> <p>Vote to support the retention of both Live Streaming of Public Forum &amp; Public Access on all council</p>	
35842.19	49	<p>Removal of public access</p> <p>Clearly the community respects the institution of Local Government otherwise people would not bother researching and preparing presentations to address councilors as well as the public, on a variety of issues that impact the daily lives of citizens of the Eurobodalla. This is democracy and what people do in a civil society. The removal of the public’s access presentations is nothing less than act of hostility towards the public. Unfortunately the message this sends to the public is that little respect for the people who elected you to represent.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Members of the public have a number of avenues to raise issues with Councillors.</p> <p>By way of background, Public Access was developed to enable the community to connect with Councillors. Since its implementation, the way we communicate has evolved and Councillors are now more connected with their community. Councillors can be contacted via email or mobile with all contact details published on Council’s website. Councillors can also meet with residents individually.</p> <p>Refer to page 6 in this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
35842.19	50	<p>Removal of Public Forum webcasting</p> <p>As the Office of Local Government FAQ Circular 18-45 December 2018 states that the reason for making webcasting mandatory is - “to increase the transparency of council decision making and to allow access to those who may not be physically able to attend meetings.” The Draft Code of Meeting</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Public Forum will be held prior to the Council meeting. OLG have made it clear that public forum does not hold</p>

		<p>Practice contradicts Council’s claim of meeting OLG benchmarks with the removal of public forum webcasting. The Office of Local Government “strongly recommends” that “councils make provision in their Codes of Meeting Practice for some form of public access or input into council decision making.”(OLG’s FAQ Circular 18-45)</p> <p>It is inconceivable that this decision could be considered the right decision in the public interest. And if it is not in the public’s interest in whose interest is it?</p>	<p>the same status as the Council meeting. There is no recommendation from OLG that public forum should be webcast. Webcasting of public forum is not included in OLG best practice guidelines or recommended as an option.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
35842.19	51	<p>Refusal by the General Manager of an applicant to speak at the Public Forum</p> <p>It is a concerning decision and backward step to give so much power to one person, the General Manager, to decide who can and who cannot speak at the Public Forum. Why has this authority been removed from councillors? How can this change be justified? This is not transparent! Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.</p> <p>My intention is not to be patronising but you must be aware of the public’s perceptions of Council management’s Draft Code of Meeting</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>Refer to pages 28, 29 and 32 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>

		Practice. Transparency matters. Councillors please consider your decision to support changes that will only add to the high level of distrust of politics and how this impacts democracy. The Draft Code of Meeting Practice requires improvements so it is transparent, inclusive and reflects a democratic process.	
35743.19	52	<p>Public Forum should continue to be part of Council meetings.</p> <p>a) Live streaming, and later access to the video, should be retained for all aspects of the Council meetings including Public Forum.</p> <p>b) Public Access should also be included as part of Council meetings and live streamed/videoed as a public record and later reference.</p> <p>c) All applicants to speak at either Public Access or Public Forum should be permitted to make their presentations without any exclusions.</p> <p>d) Applicants to make submission should not be required to submit details of their submissions on the day prior to the meeting but may do so if they wish Councillors to read their submissions before the meeting.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice is following OLG’s non-mandatory guidelines which is considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Public Forum will be held prior to the Council meeting. OLG have made it clear that public forum does not hold the same status as the Council meeting. There is no recommendation from OLG that public forum should be webcast. Webcasting of public forum is not included in OLG best practice guidelines or recommended as an option.</p> <p>Refer to page 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p> <p>b) Not supported.</p> <p>There is no provision for Public Access in OLG’s guidelines. Refer to page 6 of this document for an extended response to this issue.</p>



		<p>e) All speakers should be allowed to have their full 5 minutes for presentation and an opportunity for a 3 minute extension as has been the case.</p> <p>f) Media representatives should be given the right to record Public Access and Public Forum and to free access to meetings' videos as a basis for accurate reporting.</p>	<p>c) Not supported. If a speaker has been refused to speak, the reasons will be put in writing.</p> <p>d) Not supported. Refer to page 8 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p> <p>e) Not supported. Refer to page 10 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p> <p>f) Noted. Removal of live streaming should not impact effective media coverage, journalists attending the meeting may still report on meeting proceedings and will continue to request follow up interviews and information to complete their reporting.</p>
35718.19	53	<p><b>THERE IS AN OBVIOUS EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC ACCESS AT 9.30am WHY?</b> When this has been 'custom and practice' and it is the only opportunity that the community has to raise item that are not on the Agenda. This view that the community can email the Councilors or phone the Councilors is unrealistic as I and others have found that VERY few emails get responded to and the phone calls to Councilors is not always achievable.</p>	<p>Noted. Members of the public have a number of avenues to raise issues with Councilors. By way of background, Public Access was developed to enable the community to connect with Councilors. Since its implementation, the way we communicate has evolved and Councilors are now more connected with their community. Councilors can be contacted via email or mobile with all contact details published on Council's</p>

			<p>website. Councillors can also meeting with residents individually.</p> <p>Refer to page 6 of this document for extended response to these issue.</p>
35718.19	54	The 2014 Code of Meeting Practice document - <b>DIRECTORATE stated</b> – Finance and Governance – the 2019 DRAFT has been changed to the “ <b>Office of the General Manager</b> ” <b>WHY?</b>	The responsibility of the Code of Meeting Practice falls within the Directorate of the General Manager.
	55	<b>2.2 POINT 3</b> – OPTIONAL and is highlighted in YELLOW - Meeting will commence at 11am and conclude by 2pm etc. <b>DISAGREE</b> the meeting should commence at 10am with Public Forum being part of the meeting.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Refer to page 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
	56	<b>2.5</b> – How will Council give notice of an Extraordinary Meeting – this needs to be defined as many do not have access to the internet and for example the local papers may have already gone to print.	<p>Refer to Clause 2.17 which has now been amended to read:</p> <p><i>‘The notice will be published is the Customer services Centre foyer, 89 Vulcan Street, Moruya and <b>Council’s website</b>’.</i></p>
	57	<b>2.19</b> – Practice – There is no provision for the Agenda and Business Papers including ALL attachments to be available in the 3 local libraries. <b>THIS IS A MUST.</b>	2.19 does not relate to business papers and attachments.
35718.19	58	<b>2.20</b> – HIGHLIGHTED IN RED OPTIONAL – Notice of motion submitted by a Councilor - This provision gives to much power to the General Manager – “Legal” –this could come	This clause enables the General Manager to prepare a report in relation to the notice of motion for inclusion with the business papers for the meeting at which the notice of motion is to be considered by Council.

		down to the 'OPINION OF THE GENERAL MANAGER'".	This information is to assist Council in its decision making. It does not limit the Councillor from putting forward a notice of motion.
	59	<b>2.29</b> (now clause 2.28) Question should not ask for legal opinion to be provided at the Council Meeting – THIS HAS BEEN HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW OPTIONAL – A Councilor should have the right to ask for Legal Advice rather than relying on the 'OPINION OF THE GENERAL MANAGER'".	A Councillor has the right to ask to receive copies of legal advice. However, legal opinion cannot be presented at Council as it may breach legal privilege.
	60	<b>2.42</b> (now clause 2.41) Copies of the Agenda and ALL the associated pages including the ATTACHMENTS should be available in the 3 Libraries.	It is practice that only the agendas are printed. Attachments can be viewed at the libraries on the Council's supplied computer.  Requests for printing of attachments can be made to Council's Executive Services on 4474 1358.
	61	<b>3.1</b> – Public Forum should be included in each Ordinary Meeting of Council and Extraordinary Council Meetings. This SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED.	Noted.  The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.  Public Forum will be held prior to the Council meeting. OLG have made it clear that public forum does not hold the same status as the Council meeting. There is no recommendation from OLG that public forum should be webcast. Webcasting of public forum is not included in OLG best practice guidelines or recommended as an option.

			<p>Public Forum will be held prior to the Council meeting, with a possible extension for 15 minutes. This will enable members of the public to present to Council during the decision forming stages of the democratic process and not during the decision making process, which is the Council meeting.</p> <p>OLG strongly recommend: <i>'The provisions governing public forums contained in the Model Meeting Code reflect what OLG sees to be best practice and have been informed by the following considerations:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Public forums should operate as an input into council decision-making at meetings. This means that they should be focussed on the matters under consideration at a council meeting and not permit free ranging discussion of other matters that are not being dealt with at the meeting.'</i></p> <p>Refer to page 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
35718.19	62	<p><b>3.3</b> – This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL – This is not necessary as those who speak in Council register to speak on a SUBJECT ON THE AGENDA BY 12 NOON THE Monday before the meeting, therefore the subject has been identified. In my case I register to speak on the subject then the night before the meeting</p>	<p>Noted. This is already included in the draft Code of Meeting Practice.</p> <p>3.3 states:</p> <p><i>'To speak at a public forum, a person must first make an application to the Council in the approved form. Applications to speak at the public forum must be received by Council, Executive Support (02 4474 1358 or council.meetings@esc.nsw.gov.au), no later than</i></p>

		I then decide the contents of speech. Council have not identified the day to register if the Monday prior to the meeting is a PUBLIC HOLIDAY.	<p><i>12.00noon of the <b>business day prior to the meeting</b>, and must identify the item of business on the agenda of the Council meeting the person wishes to speak on, and should state whether they wish to speak 'for' or 'against' the item'.</i></p> <p>Therefore, presenters must register to the business day prior to the meeting. If Monday is a public holiday, presenters must register by 12.00noon on the Friday prior to the meeting.</p>
35718.19	63	<b>3.4</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL – This should NOT apply.	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>It is proposed that presenters send their presentations to Council by 12.00noon on the business day prior to the meeting. Currently presenters are required to provide their presentations at the Council meeting, so this brings that requirement back by one business day. These submissions will be forwarded to Councillors for their information and consideration prior to the Public Forum session. Councillors can also meet with residents individually.</p> <p>Refer to page 8 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
	64	<b>3.5</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL – Public Access should be retained at 9.30am AND Public Forum should commence at 10am at the commencement and included in the Council Meeting.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Members of the public have a number of avenues to raise issues with Councillors.</p> <p>By way of background, Public Access was developed to enable the community to connect with Councillors. Since</p>

			<p>its implementation, the way we communicate has evolved and Councillors are now more connected with their community. Councillors can be contacted via email or mobile with all contact details published on Council's website. Councillors can also meeting with residents individually.</p> <p>Refer to page 6 in this document for extended response to this issue.</p>
35718.19	65	<b>3.6</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL – The should not be a time factor placed on Public Forum.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Clauses 3.8, 3.9 and 3.23 address the issues of speakers for Public Forum.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 and 11 in this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
	66	<b>3.7</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice - This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL -This gives too much power to the General manager OR their delegate and is not necessary.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>Refer to pages 28, 29 and 32 in this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
	67	<b>3.8</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code f Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL – There should not be a time limited placed on Public Forum and there SHOULD NOT be a limit placed on the number of speakers on any one subject.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>Refer to pages 9 and 10 in this document for extended response to this issue.</p>

	68	<b>3.9</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL – The number of speakers SHOULD NOT be limited, as who can say that one persons statement is not as important as the next person (discrimination). The suggestion that names be drawn from a ballot is a disgrace.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>Clause 3.23 of the draft Code accommodates the situation that a significant number of speakers wish to present.</p> <p>Clause 3.23 states:</p> <p><i>‘In the unusual circumstance that Council is proposing a significant issue. A dedicated Public Forum session can be facilitated, should the need arise. The date and time of such a session will be at the determination of the General Manager.’</i></p>
	69	<b>3.10</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL – It has been Custom and Practice that if a speaker goes over the 5 minutes that the Mayor calls for a ‘mover and seconder for an extension of time’ This should be RETAINED.	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>It is considered that five minutes is adequate for members of the public to put their case forward. Also noting that in clause 3.4 Councillors will have a copy of the presenter’s submission on the day prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Refer to page 10 in this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
35718.19	70	<b>3.12</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is Optional – PUBLIC FORUM SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE COUNCIL	<p>Noted.</p>

		<p>MEETING AND SHOULD BE WEBCAST – the facts are those who Live Stream should be given the opportunity to hear what those who have register to speak have to say, they should be entitled to hear any questions from the Councilors – As a Rate Payer of this shire my Rates contribute to the expense of the Live Streaming – the Councilor I believe are also Rate Payers of this shire – One Rate Payer of this shire cannot derive a benefit over any other Rate Payer of this shire – therefore I believe that the Rate Payers that speak in Public Forum will be discriminated against if they are not Live Streamed and the Councilor will be deriving a benefit given that the viewing Public will only view the Councilors – it could be said that given that it is only 15 months to this Council goes into Caretaker mode the current Councilor will derive the benefit of having their names and faces viewed via Live Streaming thus they will gain a benefit prior to the 2020 Council Election.</p> <p>The other factor is that once the Council meetings were changed from night meetings to day time meeting the Live Streaming of the “FULL COUNCIL MEETINGS” enabled those who worked during the day to view the meeting when it came on line.</p>	<p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
--	--	---	--



35718.19	71	<b>3.22</b> (now clause 3.21) This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in RED and is OPTIONAL. This is giving the General Manager and delegate TOO MUCH POWER in being able to refuse further application to speak and TO MUCH POWER in relation to a “period of time”.	Council has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice. This clause has been amended. Refer to pages 28, 29 and 32 of this document for extended responses to these issues.
	72	<b>3.25</b> (now clause 3.24) This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in YELLOW and is OPTIONAL – If the Council Live Streams the full meeting this provision SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED.	Not supported. Unauthorised recording of Public Forum is a breach of copyright.
35718.19	73	<b>3.26</b> (now clause 3.25) This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in YELLOW and is OPTIONAL – Again if the Council Live Stream the full meeting this provision SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED.	Not supported. Unauthorised recording of Public Forum is a breach of copyright.
	74	<b>7.1</b> - This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – Public Access should be included at 9.30am as it has been Custom and Practice and it is the only opportunity that the residents of this shire have to raise issues that are not on the Agenda of a meeting	Not supported. Members of the public have a number of avenues to raise issues with Councillors. By way of background, Public Access was developed to enable the community to connect with Councillors. Since its implementation, the way we communicate has evolved and Councillors are now more connected with their community. Councillors can be contacted via email or

			<p>mobile with all contact details published on Council's website. Councillors can meet with residents individually.</p> <p>Refer to page 6 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
	75	<p><b>BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES SHOULD BE INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA</b> – other Councils have this provision WHY does the Eurobodalla Shire Council not?</p>	<p>Not supported.</p> <p>Clause 2.36 specifies what must be included in the agenda. Clause 2.36 states:</p> <p><i>'The General Manager must ensure that the agenda for an Ordinary meeting of Council states:</i></p> <p><i>(a) all matters to be dealt with arising out of the proceedings of previous meetings of the Council, and</i></p> <p><i>(b) if the mayor is the Chairperson – any matter or topic that the Chairperson proposes, at the time when the agenda is prepared, to put to the meeting, and</i></p> <p><i>(c) all matters, including matters that are the subject of staff reports, to be considered at the meeting, and any business of which due notice has been given under clause 2.18.'</i></p> <p>Placing Business Arising from the Minutes is in contradiction to Section 367 of the Local Government Act and inconsistent with Clause 8.1 of the Code of Meeting Practice.</p> <p>It is important to note that OLG has not included this item in its Model Code of Meeting Practice.</p>
35718.19	76	<p><b>POINT 12</b> – SHOULD BE GENERAL BUSINESS AND NOT URGENT BUSINESS.</p>	<p>Not supported.</p>

			<p>Section 241(3) (b) of the Local Government Regulations states that:</p> <p><i>'the business proposed to be brought forward is ruled by the chairperson to be of great urgency'.</i></p> <p>Therefore it is considered that it should not be General Business.</p> <p>Refer to previous page in this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
77	<p><b>7.4</b> This has been changed from the 2014 Code of Meeting Practice – This is highlighted in YELLOW and is OPTIONAL – Meeting should commence at 10am with Public Access at 9.30am as this has been “custom and practice”.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>
78	<p><b>12.1</b> – The Council or a Committee of Council SHOULD NOT resolve to adopt multiple items of Business on the Agenda together with a single resolution if an item has been raised that could be disputed.</p>		<p>Not supported.</p> <p>Clauses 12.2 – 12.7 restrict items being moved by block, if there is a concern.</p> <p>This is in Council’s current Code of Meeting Practice.</p>
79	<p><b>13.11</b> This has been changed from the Code of Meeting Practice 2014 – This has been highlighted in YELLOW and is OPTIONAL – There should not be a requirement for the public to make application 12 noon the business day prior to the meeting.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG’s non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>Registering to speak about an item that has been identified as a matter that is likely to be considered when the meeting is closed to the public is in line with clause 3.3 which requires speakers to register by this time.</p>

35718.19	80	<b>13.12</b> The General Manager (or their delegate) should not be given the power to refuse an application.	Noted. This is a mandatory provision that cannot be altered.
	81	<b>13.13</b> This has been highlighted in YELLOW and is OPTIONAL - There should not be a limit placed on the number of speakers.	Not supported. It is considered that 10 speakers is a reasonable number to present an objective to move into confidential.
	82	<b>13.14</b> This has been highlighted in YELLOW and is OPTIONAL – there should not be a limit placed on this and there should not be a ballot.	Not supported. It is considered that 10 speakers is a reasonable number to present an objective to move into confidential.
	83	<b>13.16</b> This has been highlighted in YELLOW and is OPTIONAL – there should not be a limit placed on this .	Not supported. It is considered that 10 speakers is a reasonable number to present an objective to move into confidential.
35637.19	84	Our organisation write in favour of the draft Code of Meeting Practice in relation to Public Forum. Our organisation agrees that Public Forum should not be weighted with any more importance than a written submission. By live streaming the Public Forum session, you are weighting this part of the submission process as more important than the written submissions, surveys and meetings that have occurred prior to the Council meeting.	Noted. Supportive submission.
35616.19	85	I'd like to express my support for the possibility of the removal of public forum from live streaming of council meetings. I	Noted. Supportive submission.

		<p>have not presented to council largely due to my fear of being webcast. I don't trust web based media as I understand that the webcast can be accessed for up to seven years. For example, I would have loved to address the council on issues such as dogs on beaches but the live streaming has largely prevented me. Trust you consider my submission in faith.</p>	
30142.19	86	<p>Council is inviting Public Comment or Input into something they have yet to make a final decision on, their 'Code of Meeting Practise'. That's a council policy reviewed from time to time as required by State Government and the requirements enshrined in the Local Government Act. Clearly Councillors have discussed the matter in a 'Workshop' arrangement, developing what the community has been provided with for comment. What's been developed so far is clearly what the Council – Councillors want as the new 'Code of Meeting Practise' policy until the next time it's reviewed.</p> <p>It's extremely difficult to comprehend why Councillors would not support more public input and recording of council meetings including the public participation segment, over and above to what's required by the State Government Legislative Requirements and identified in the Local Government Act .</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>

		<p>Councillors are elected to represent the areas residents. There's a general community expectation councillors are elected to promote and support community opinion as the community elected delegates to the Council. Many in the community expect to be able to confidently rely on the elected councillors to represent community opinion whether that be by groups or individuals. Council is a publicly funded organisation. It's not owned just by those who are elected or those working in the Council system. Community opinion and expectations need to more than, just invited comment. Community opinion and expectations in the council, community business, the shires residents and ratepayers fund should be taken seriously and acted on in a positive productive way as opportunities occur. I believe there is no practical reason why councillors wouldn't include in the council Code of meeting Practise, proper recording ( live streaming ) of all the public forum sections of all Council meetings. Council 'briefings' and 'workshops' in my view should also be open to the general public.</p>	
27687.19	87	<p>I would like to give notice of my objection to the changes to the code which preclude public from attending or seeing via webcasting all relevant components of the</p>	Noted.

		<p>councils decision making and briefing processes. The council as an elected body representing the community should be duly held to public accountability for their decisions.</p>	<p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>
27481.19	88	<p>I would like to voice my strong objection to removing the public live stream forum from the Council Meeting. It is essential for the ESC public to see what decisions are being made on our behalf at the time of their making. Disempowering us is not good democracy nor good government.</p> <p>Please do not change the current public live stream system.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Code of Meeting Practice has followed OLG's non-mandatory provisions which are considered best practice.</p> <p>The Council meeting, where decisions are debated and made, will continue to be live streamed.</p> <p>Refer to pages 10 - 20 of this document for extended response to these issues.</p>