

The Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories - Inquiry into local governance on Norfolk Island.

Alistair Innes- Walker - Responses to Terms of Reference

For disclosure purposes I was previously employed by the Norfolk Island Regional Council from February 2018 before retiring in July 2022. I held three (3) positions in Council – Commercial Services Manager, Finance Manager, and Special Projects Coordinator. I first came to Norfolk in the late 1970’s, returning many times before relocating permanently in 2018. Please note the following responses and opinions are my own and I do not speak on behalf of any other individual or community group on Norfolk Island. The responses are based on the my existing, albeit historically limited, knowledge of the challenges on Norfolk and some of the issues I have raised may have already, or are being currently, addressed by NIRC and the Commonwealth.

Alternative approaches to property-based taxation revenue collection ('land rates') that are appropriate and equitable for the Norfolk Island community

1. Land Rates are not a significant contributor to the overall operating costs of the Norfolk Island Regional Council (NIRC), and any future attempts to increase Land rates would not be viable given the small rates base.

According to the NIRC 2022-23 DRAFT Operational Plan the budget for Rates & Annual Charges is \$4.061M, representing 14% of the NIRC budgeted operational income (\$28.181M – see attachment A Operational Plan - Annual Budget by Service/Function Areas). This is further broken up as follows.

Rates and Annual Charges	Budgeted Revenue	%age of Operational Income*
Land Rates	\$1.82M	6.5%
Waste service	\$1.8M	6.5%
Sewage services	\$0.44M	0%

*Total Operating income (\$35.6M) net of SDA Income (\$7.4M). The approved 2022-23 Operational Plan Budget for Rates and Annual Charges was \$3.065M vs \$4.061M in the draft Op Plan. The difference was due to the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, and the Arts ('the Department') agreeing to provide an additional ~\$1M to offset the proposed increase in waste and rates for 2022-23. I have assumed that this is a one-off subsidy, and the draft budget reflects the true NIRC position.

Based on these percentages the level of rates & annual charges paid by the community only represent a 13% contribution to the operating costs of NIRC, unlike other Councils on mainland Australia. This is arguably a reflection of the small base of rate payers/private dwellings, and an inability to pay based on the level of the NI median weekly incomes relative to the Australian mainland (refer Table 1). Any moves to increase rates and annual charges further to meaningfully cover operational costs would at best be a theoretical exercise and create a larger debt management issue.

Table 1 ABS Census data from 2021 Norfolk Island

All private dwellings	1,220
People	2,188
Male	48.4%
Female	51.6%
Median age	50

Median weekly incomes (a) People aged 15 years and over	Norfolk Island	%Norfolk Island	Other Territories	%Other Territories	Australia	%Australia
Personal (b)	\$736	N/A	\$829	N/A	\$805	N/A
Family (c)	\$1,630	N/A	\$1,890	N/A	\$2,120	N/A
Household (d)	\$1,184	N/A	\$1,497	N/A	\$1,746	N/A

2. Other existing sources of NIRC non-grant income are unlikely to grow and in some cases are under threat.

NIRC's other principal budgeted sources of income, excluding Grants from the Commonwealth (\$6.192M - refer attachment A) are as follows;

Service/function area	Operating income	Operating Expenditure	Surplus/(deficit)
Airport	\$3.422M	\$4.075M	(\$0.653M)
Telecom	\$3.142M	\$2.971M	\$0.171M
Liquor Mart (Bond)	\$5.2M	\$3.818M	\$1.382M

While the operating income in these areas is reasonably high, in the case of the Airport and Telecom the net operating result is a low surplus or in deficit. The Airport deficit is largely attributable to the high depreciation charge relating to the recent resealing of the airport runway.

The Bond is the only business unit showing a surplus but even this is under potential threat in the future as there is an ongoing debate on Island as to whether the existing legislated monopoly the Bond operates under, should be removed and the market opened up to competitors. This view is openly canvassed by a number of community members and the current Commonwealth Administrator, with the latter allowing an existing hotel operator to import alcohol onto the Island for commercial sale utilising a loop hole in the existing legislation, to the detriment of NIRC revenue streams..

As an aside it is a bizarre logic to think opening up the alcohol market to competition will lower costs to the community as all Bond surpluses go to subsidise services provided by the community's council whereas private business profits go to the owners. Further the relatively high alcohol costs charged by the Bond are a function of inconsistent freight transport services and subsequently higher freight costs rather than price gouging by the NIRC ie if the existing inconsistent freight challenges could be overcome Bond prices would undoubtedly fall.

The future of Telecom as an ongoing income source is also in question, based on the same competition arguments being applied to the Bond and the increasing cost of providing internet/comms services to the Island, and the associated technical skill sets required by technicians. I understand NIRC have previously engaged consultants to investigate options on how to outsource or sell Norfolk Telecom.

The reduction in revenue from any or all of these NIRC commercial entities will have a significant impact on the financial viability of NIRC, unless replacement streams can be identified.

3. Possible alternate income sources could require significant initial capital investment.

The location and natural resources of Norfolk Island do in some cases create potential opportunities for income sources for the NIRC and community members, for example.

- (a) data centres
- (b) new & improved holiday offerings focused on health and fitness eg more world class bike & walking tracks
- (c) medicinal marijuana crops
- (d) defence facilities (ports/airport)
- (e) temporary refugee processing facility

In all cases these would require significant start-up capital investment to crystallise these opportunities. Data centres would need a more reliable connection services than the existing satellite services ie a an undersea cable. Building costs for a temporary refugee processing and defence facilities would be much higher on Norfolk than on the mainland eg the recent airport reseal cost \$50M – anecdotal advice from the main contractor was a similar reseal at a mainland regional airport would cost ~\$15M.

Some preliminary planning work has been done on what it would take to build a connected bike track network on Island but again moving from planning to implementation is costly and NIRC does not appear to have the funding for this. Bike/walking tracks would also potentially encourage a younger and more cashed up visitor to come to the Island and allow Norfolk to take advantage of this fast growing and dynamic tourism sector.

4. Potentially better outcomes achieved by reducing NIRC costs

Assuming the capacity to generate alternative income streams for NIRC is limited (without major capital investment) the other approach would be to consider reducing NIRC operating costs by;

- (a) Transferring responsibility for operating the airport and associated fire services to the Commonwealth, leaving only the domestic fire service to be managed by the NIRC
- (b) Reducing the cost of freighting goods and services to Norfolk by speeding up the bureaucracy surrounding plans to improve port facilities and encouraging commercial operators to provide consistent freight services to the Island. This would benefit the Council, community and Island based businesses as better and more cost effective services could be provided to residents and visitors to the Island ie eliminate the perception & actuality that visitors need to bring their own food to Island because of ongoing shortages. This could also encourage new businesses, say in the health & well-being industry to relocate to Norfolk knowing there is certainty of supply of goods and services.
- (c) Improved coordination of service provision between NIRC and Commonwealth government departments located on the Island. There are numerous examples where costs have been duplicated because various departments have decided to fund services independently of the NIRC and other Commonwealth Departments, whereas a joint approach would have arrived at a much more cost effective outcomes. The provision of satellite services on the Island is an obvious example of this. NIRC was required to pay ~\$1.2M a year to provide internet services for the community whereas this cost could have been reduced if Commonwealth Departments had chosen to work with the NIRC to build suitable infrastructure to service all users on the Island. I understand that a more coordinated approach is now being implemented but this is after many years where this issue had been raised with the Commonwealth.
- (d) Reduce the cost of electricity by continuing to implement renewable resource infrastructure. Unlike other external territories, such as Cocos and Christmas Island(s), Norfolk does not have its electricity supply fees capped and currently pays one of the highest electricity rates in the world. The NIRC has an admirable objective to achieve 100% renewable energy generation and is implementing plans to increase existing solar generation capacity which will significantly reduce the Islands fuel costs/dependency. However like other major infrastructure initiatives on Island there are complexities that arise from the Island's remoteness so that it takes time to implement and more expensive to fund.

Whether the categorisation of the Norfolk Island Regional Council as a 'Rural Council', for the purposes of the Local Government Act 1993 (NSW)(NI) results in an appropriate quantum of funding given the geographic remoteness and population density of Norfolk Island

The methodology to determine the appropriate quantum of funding for Norfolk Island is not transparent. Regardless of the methodology used the funding model should take into account all the characteristics that make Norfolk unique. Introducing initiatives around things like opening up Council "commercial" activities to competition need to take into account the impact on NIRC's ability to provide the services the community reasonably expects. If this creates a funding shortfall who pays? Also, can a small remote community like Norfolk continue to fund depreciation for an airport of ~\$3M a year.

Past practice has also been encouragement for NIRC and the community to seek Govt funding through competitive grant schemes, in several cases for key infrastructure projects which are not "nice to have" but basic necessities eg a mobile network to replace a 20 year+ old 2G network on its last legs. NIRC chances of success are limited when there are multiple applications from around Australia for the finite pool of funds. Any Commonwealth funding model should include provision for a base level of capital & recurrent and operational funding.

The impact of limiting access to state-partner grants on the financial sustainability of the Norfolk Island Regional Council

Without knowing all the various state grant funding opportunities that exist it is difficult to comment apart from the reference to point 4(d) above noting a state based cap on the cost of electricity for other external territories. Access to State based grants could also mitigate some of the difficulties associated with the NIRC having to access the more competitive Commonwealth Grant schemes such as Building Better Regions.

It is also apparent from the Departments involvement in state focused activities such as the initial management and ultimately the transfer of functions such as schooling and hospital operations from NSW to Queensland, that this is not their normal area of expertise, and would be better managed by people experienced in state operated facilities.

The relationship between property-based taxation and the delivery of commensurate local government services

As noted above revenue from property-based taxation is only 13% of the NIRC's draft 2022-23 Budget. I think the ongoing focus on this particular revenue stream, whilst a very emotional issue for some Islanders based on a traditional land holding perspective, should not be the principal concern. It is rather looking at more appropriate ways to attract additional income and/or reduce costs that would ultimately raise the standard of living for all and increase the capacity for people to pay property based taxes.

I would suggest many Islanders understand that everyone needs to make some contribution to the operating costs of the NIRC, and some sort of property-based taxation is the most equitable way to do this (with standard provisions for hardship included).

While in theory revenue should be allocated to specific service areas eg waste services, it would appear that revenue has in the past has been generally consolidated to meet NIRC costs with a focus on the bottom line. This has been an obvious strategy given the financial challenges the NIRC has had to face in the last few years, and the objective to create adequate working capital reserves. Better controls have been/need to be put in place to ensure that where funding buckets are created to provide for future capital replacement eg the airport, that unlike in pre 2016, these funds are not utilised for purposes other than for the reason they were quarantined.

The resilience and sustainability of current and alternative revenue approaches, noting the impact of COVID-19 on Norfolk Island's economy

The principal contributor to the Norfolk Island economy is Tourism. Apart from a few "left field" suggestions like data centres or refugee processing facilities I believe efforts should be focused on increasing the return from Tourism by;

- (a) Shifting the demographic profile of visitors to the Island by building infrastructure to attract the sports, health & wellbeing market, eco-tourism etc eg by developing world class bike and walking tracks, health retreats
- (b) Focus on shorter stay visits (4 days) rather than the traditional 7-10 days resulting in more visitors spending the same \$'s but over a shorter period.
- (c) Remove the Norfolk Island designation as an international flight destination. This would reduce the cost of flights for visitors and locals as well as eliminate the complexities that frustrate everybody who comes to Norfolk eg why do you have to depart from an international terminal and go through customs to get to an Australian territory or arrival cards which ask how long are you intending to be out of Australia...isn't Norfolk part of Australia?? It all adds to unnecessary confusion for visitors.

(d) Link Norfolk to the mainland comms network, mobile and internet. Apart from cost implications it continues to create confusion and frustration for locals, local businesses and visitors eg a lot of 1800 numbers can't be accessed, electronic banking can be hit and miss when identification requirements via text are not consistent, Norfolk's IP address precludes accessing some Australian sites etc.

The only caveat is that by the nature of its size, remoteness, and resource limitations Norfolk cannot satisfy an unlimited number of visitors, unlike other destinations such as Bali & Fiji. There will continue to be a need for the Island to receive material ongoing support from the Commonwealth and/or a State.

The current governance model that supports the Norfolk Island Regional Council under the Local Government Act 1993 (NSW)(NI)

I don't believe that the current governance model works for Norfolk Island. It was destined for administrative failure from the start by the adoption of the NSW local government model to be run in parallel with existing Norfolk Legislation which was to be phased out over time and replaced by Commonwealth legislation. This created confusion as the NSW local government Act used as the template for the applied Commonwealth Act referred to other NSW legislation that didn't apply to Norfolk. Also the phasing out of Norfolk Legislation has still not been completed which is understandable given the other legislative priorities of the Commonwealth parliament. However this has strongly contributed to the confusion and frustration created during the implementation of the NSW Local Government Act and the applied governance model, which I believe is ongoing to this day.

It does not help when the Department responsible for Norfolk appears to have learning on the job since the NIRC came into being, including some curious decision making processes eg building people moving tenders to transfer visitors from cruise liners (which have only been used 2/3 times) without providing for possible alternative uses such as moving containers. In that particular case the Department assumed NIRC would take over the running and maintenance of the tenders, and appeared to have not planned for where the tenders were to be stored. This probably reflects in many cases the what I assume is the general role of the Commonwealth to provide capital and leave the associated recurrent funding and operational activities to the States.

Even worse appears to be the Department's perceived prevarication on making decisions on major issues that from an external perspective seem a no-brainer in terms of addressing community concerns eg upgrading the Kingston and Cascade jetties so that more effective freight operations can occur, and the ongoing analysis of where to site the new hospital, GP clinic & Aged Care facility.

Alternative approaches to local government and local representation utilized across Australia

The key aspects I believe for any governance model to succeed on Norfolk are;

1. Clear, logical, timely and impartial decision-making capability
2. Local & Commonwealth/State representation
3. Relevant experience of participants/representatives
4. Clear lines of communication and accountability between the Commonwealth and the Island based governance body.
5. An appropriate funding model in place recognizing Norfolk's economic challenges
6. Recognition of the historical ties Pitcairn Islanders have with Norfolk Island & the importance of their contribution to the development of the Norfolk culture.

I believe as a first step it is important that the legal status of Norfolk Island be clarified. Issues with respect to historical links with the United Kingdom, what was or may have been agreed to by Queen Victoria, the indigenous status or otherwise of descendents of the Pitcairn settlers and the subsequent transfer of administrative responsibility to the Australian Commonwealth continue as sources of strong disagreement and frustration experienced by some in the community. This undercurrent has without doubt impacted on the ability of the community, Council of Elders, NIRC, and the Commonwealth to achieve the best outcomes for all of the community since 2016. While confirmation of a definitive legal position may not result in satisfaction for all stakeholders it would at least provide a solid platform for what ever governance structure is put in place (once the current administration ceases) by sidelining any potential ongoing disruptive debates regarding what was or was not said in the last 150+ years.

There are two potential governance models that I believe would address the key aspects identified above.

(a) The Lord Howe Island model where the island is administered by a Board. As described on the Lord Howe Island website (www.lhib.nsw.gov.au) the Board is a “NSW Statutory Authority established under the Lord Howe Island Act in 1953, which gives a high level of self-governance to the community. The Board reports directly to the NSW Minister for Environment and is charged with the care, control and management of the island. The Board comprises seven members, four of whom are appointed by the island community, with the remaining three members elected by the Minister to represent the interests of business, tourism and conservation.”

In Norfolk’s case such a Board could be established as a Commonwealth Government Statutory Authority, reporting to the Minister responsible for the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, and the Arts. If there are plans to allocate Norfolk Island to a mainland state then an equivalent reporting structure to NSW could apply.

The Board membership could follow the Lord Howe template with 7 members – 3 locally elected representatives, a Departmental representative, with the Chair and 2 other independent members selected by the Minister. The Chair and the 2 independent members would bring skill sets that would add value to the Board’s strategic planning & decision making for the Island eg finance, asset management, human resources, business development, and the environment.

A CEO would be engaged to implement the Board’s strategic objectives and manage day-to-day operations.

(b) a variation of the Lord Howe model where the current role of the Australian Government Administrator is expanded so that they actually become the Administrator of the Island with decision making responsibilities. The Administrator would be supported by an Advisory Council made up of locally elected members, representatives from the responsible Commonwealth Department and other experts as required. Day-to-day operational matters would be managed by a CEO/Executive Officer reporting to the Administrator. While some people may argue that this a benevolent dictator scenario (sometimes the best form of Government) I believe there are sufficient checks and balances to counter potential abuses of power.

Whether alternative approaches sustainably achieve the key outcomes of local government

I believe that either of the above proposed governance models would provide the necessary framework for effective and timely planning and impartial decision making that would benefit the Norfolk community. The models would go a long way to improving the management and coordination of resources which is not currently the case. There are multiple stakeholders on Island with different priorities, or in some the cases the same priorities but addressed in silos eg NIRC, multiple Commonwealth Departments, the Queensland Government and the Council of Elders.

Whether alternative approaches equitably increase local representation and decision-making

Either model proposed above would include significant local representation directly in a decision making or Advisory capacity.

Whether alternative approaches would appropriately support the additional functions the Norfolk Island Regional Council provide on behalf of the Commonwealth

Either model proposed would have capacity to support the existing additional functions provided on behalf of the Commonwealth. I would anticipate the quality and timing of the support could improve as a result of more effective coordination of resources, including communications between all stakeholders.

Conclusion

Whatever the final governance model ends up being, there needs to be a vast improvement in the coordination of local and Commonwealth/State resources and the communication of strategic plans for the Island. I would argue that the Commonwealth has not clearly articulated what its strategic objectives have been with regard to Norfolk since 2016, and how it planned to implement these operationally. In fact Commonwealth actions have appeared very adhoc and reactive rather than proactive. This has provided opportunities for some community members form more extreme, and non-productive views of the Commonwealth's intentions.

Attachment A – NIRC 2022/23 Draft Operational Plan – Annual Budget by Service/Function Area

Operational Plan - Annual Budget																	
INCOME STATEMENT 2022/2023 - Service/Function Areas																	
Unit	Service/Function	Rates and Annual Charges	Grants & Contributions - Operating	User Charge	Fees	Other Revenue	Interest and Investment Revenues	Total Operating Income	Employee Costs	Materials	Contracts	Consultants	Depreciation	Other Expenses	Total Expense	Surplus (Deficit)	
Governance	Office of the General Manager	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	399,702	5,000	60,000	40,000	-	148,000	652,702	(652,702)	
	Regional Council	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Governance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000	217,000	-	-	625,000	845,000	(845,000)	
	Records Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13,240	1,200	-	-	-	11,718	26,158	(26,158)	
	Finance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	269,321	-	240,000	-	-	58,286	567,607	(567,607)	
	Risk & Internal Audit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85,000	(85,000)	
	Legal Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Customer Care	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	242,741	4,000	-	-	-	10,800	257,541	(257,541)
	Human Resources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	113,775	3,000	-	-	-	9,000	125,775	(125,775)
	ICT Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	-	-	495,000	903,556	(903,556)
	Services Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	279,137	5,000	312,000	-	91,556	22,420	324,757	(324,757)
	Facilities Management	-	-	-	-	-	250,000	-	250,000	339,546	5,000	18,200	-	440,312	50,000	(603,058)	
	Facilities Repairs and Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	-	-	50,000	150,000	(150,000)
Works Management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176,253	2,000	10,000	-	80,262	39,000	307,515	(307,515)	
General Purpose Revenue	1,821,000	5,662,738	-	-	-	-	20,000	7,503,738	-	-	-	-	-	65,000	7,438,738		
Business	Waste Services	1,800,000	-	-	455,000	230,000	-	2,485,000	376,486	-	1,490,000	-	270,250	621,960	2,758,696	(273,696)	
	Airport Management	-	-	371,900	3,000,000	50,000	-	3,421,900	569,961	53,234	135,000	7,500	3,123,592	185,531	4,074,818	(652,918)	
	Airport - ARFFS	-	-	-	387,000	-	-	387,000	110,633	25,479	-	-	-	46,688	268,635	118,365	
	Sewerage Services	439,770	-	-	-	-	-	439,770	155,708	32,506	30,000	-	-	114,415	368,842	70,928	
	Telecom	-	-	1,613,000	969,000	560,000	-	3,142,000	542,475	45,000	1,197,900	-	-	850,339	335,214	2,970,928	171,072
	Electricity	-	-	5,000	3,500,000	15,000	-	3,520,000	718,707	50,000	50,000	-	-	722,745	1,440,500	2,981,952	538,048
Commercial	Liquor Mart	-	-	-	-	5,200,000	-	5,200,000	440,312	5,000	5,000	-	47,038	3,320,506	3,817,856	1,382,144	
	Norfolk Fuel	-	-	-	400,000	-	-	400,000	-	10,000	125,000	-	52,950	2,000	189,950	210,050	
	Tanalth Services	-	-	-	-	6,000	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	6,515	-	(515)	
	Cascade Quarry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Private Works	-	-	-	75,000	-	-	75,000	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	25,000	50,000	
Plant Operations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150,000	8,333	-	254,275	127,416	540,024	(540,024)		
Community	Council & Community Housing	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	50,000	-	25,000	-	-	32,349	-	57,349	(7,349)	
	Broadcasting Services	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	60,000	123,878	-	2,500	-	57,527	35,591	219,496	(159,496)	
	Library	-	-	-	-	5,085	-	5,085	46,022	10,000	-	-	6,921	10,080	73,023	(67,938)	
	Registry, Courts & Lands	-	-	-	3,000	-	-	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,200	1,200	1,800	
	Tourism Bureau	-	500,000	-	160,000	3,600	-	663,600	297,467	4,000	-	500,000	9,974	618,720	1,430,161	(766,561)	
	Economic Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	158,809	-	-	30,000	-	2,500	191,309	(191,309)	
Operational	Environment/Parks & Reserves	-	-	35,000	-	12,000	-	47,000	249,867	40,000	35,000	-	26,080	17,500	368,447	(321,447)	
	Sealed Roads	-	-	-	400,000	36,036	-	436,036	166,990	100,000	50,000	-	1,063,848	50,200	1,431,038	(995,002)	
	Garage Operations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	179,335	20,000	20,000	-	-	23,020	242,355	(242,355)	
	Works Store	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	115,100	-	-	-	3,088	-	118,188	(118,188)	
	Building & Development Control	-	-	-	43,000	-	-	43,000	108,948	-	38,000	-	-	600	147,548	(104,548)	
	Public Health & Safety	-	-	-	13,000	-	-	13,000	-	20,000	-	-	-	2,500	22,500	(9,500)	
	Emergency Services (NIRC)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	10,000	-	-	1,500	12,500	(12,500)	
	Pest & Noxious Weed Control (NIRC)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	169,130	-	-	-	-	-	169,130	(169,130)	
	Invasive Species Eradication	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	
	Operating Totals	4,060,770	6,192,738	2,084,900	9,455,000	6,367,721	20,000	28,181,129	6,363,543	729,419	4,122,133	577,500	7,300,724	8,587,810	27,681,128	500,000	
SDA	KAVHA	-	946,266	-	-	-	-	946,266	791,125	70,000	26,541	15,000	-	43,600	946,266	-	
	C/With Legal Services, Deceased Estates & Probates	-	12,608	-	18,799	-	-	31,407	7,207	-	-	-	-	24,200	31,407	-	
	C/Wealth - Courts, Tribunals, Boards & Stat Appoin	-	217,345	-	25,000	-	-	242,345	158,645	6,000	67,000	-	-	10,700	242,345	-	
	C/Wealth - Registry, Licencing & Regulatory	-	-	2,009,089	-	-	-	2,009,089	241,360	15,000	25,000	-	-	1,727,729	2,009,089	-	
	C/Wealth - Community Fire Service	-	725,028	-	-	22,000	-	747,028	455,328	35,000	120,000	-	-	136,700	747,028	-	
	C/Wealth - Offices of the Administrator	-	195,801	-	-	-	-	195,801	135,801	-	-	-	-	60,000	195,801	-	
	C/Wealth - Lotteries	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	150,000	-	
	C/Wealth - Pest & Noxious Weed Control	-	765,492	-	-	-	-	765,492	145,262	100,000	520,230	-	-	-	765,492	-	
	C/Wealth - Ports Management	-	163,464	250,000	-	-	-	413,464	227,464	10,000	90,000	20,000	-	-	66,000	413,464	-
	C/Wealth - Record Keeping	-	218,386	-	-	-	-	218,386	172,428	4,000	-	-	-	-	41,958	218,386	-
	C/Wealth - Spatial Planning & Policy	-	189,778	-	-	-	-	189,778	68,347	-	-	120,000	-	-	1,431	189,778	-
	KAVHA - Museums	-	410,366	165,000	-	74,500	-	649,866	528,532	7,312	7,500	-	-	-	106,522	649,866	-
	C/Wealth - SDA Manager	-	165,000	-	-	-	-	165,000	165,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	165,000	-
	C/Wealth - Ad-hoc Services	-	500,000	-	-	-	-	500,000	100,000	-	-	400,000	-	-	-	500,000	-
C/Wealth - Public Health	-	110,422	-	-	-	-	110,422	87,633	1,189	-	-	-	-	21,600	110,422	-	
C/Wealth - WHS Inspector	-	85,000	-	-	-	-	85,000	-	-	85,000	-	-	-	-	85,000	-	
SDA Total	-	4,704,956	415,000	2,202,888	96,500	-	7,419,344	3,284,132	248,501	941,271	555,000	-	-	2,390,440	7,419,344	-	
Budget Totals	4,060,770	10,897,694	2,499,900	11,657,888	6,464,221	20,000	35,600,473	9,647,675	977,920	5,063,404	1,132,500	7,300,724	10,978,250	35,100,472	500,000		