



## **AGENDA**

**FOR CEO REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING TO BE HELD ON**

**18 FEBRUARY 2025 AT 6.00PM**

**IN WITTBER & DR RUBY DAVY ROOMS, SALISBURY COMMUNITY HUB,**

**34 CHURCH STREET, SALISBURY**

### **MEMBERS**

Mayor G Aldridge (Chair)  
Deputy Mayor, Cr C Buchanan (Deputy Chair)  
Cr D Hood  
Cr P Jensen  
Cr S Reardon

### **REQUIRED STAFF**

Chief Executive Officer, Mr J Harry  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Mr C Mansueto

### **APOLOGIES**

### **LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

### **PRESENTATION OF MINUTES**

Presentation of the Minutes of the CEO Review Committee Meeting held on 22 October 2024.

---

**REPORTS**

*Reports*

9.1.1 Remuneration Tribunal draft determination on CEO remuneration.....5  
9.1.2 CEO Key Performance Indicators February 2025.....47

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

There are no Questions on Notice.

**MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

There are no Motions on Notice.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

*(Questions Without Notice, Motions Without Notice, CEO Update)*

**CLOSE**



**MINUTES OF CEO REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN LITTLE PARA ROOMS,  
SALISBURY COMMUNITY HUB, 34 CHURCH STREET, SALISBURY ON**

**22 OCTOBER 2024**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mayor G Aldridge (Chair)  
Cr C Buchanan (Deputy Chair) (*Via Video Conference Teams from 5:55pm*)  
Cr D Hood  
Cr P Jensen (*Via Video Conference Teams*)  
Cr S Reardon

**STAFF**

Chief Executive Officer, Mr J Harry  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Mr C Mansueto

The meeting commenced at 5:53pm.

The Chairman welcomed the Elected Members, members of the public and staff to the meeting.

**APOLOGIES**

Nil.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

**PRESENTATION OF MINUTES**

Moved Cr P Jensen  
Seconded Cr D Hood

The Minutes of the CEO Review Committee Meeting held on 5 August 2024, be taken as read and confirmed.

**CARRIED**

*Cr Buchanan joined the meeting via Video Conference Teams at 5:55pm.*

**REPORTS**

*Reports*

**9.1.1 Proposed CEO Key Performance Indicators 2024/2025**

Moved Cr C Buchanan  
Seconded Cr D Hood

That Council:

1. Approves the proposed 2024/25 CEO Key Performance Indicators as tabled for discussion at the CEO Review Committee meeting 22 October 2024.
2. Notes the overview provided by the Chief Executive Officer.
3. Notes the Chief Executive Officer will update the timelines of projects at the next CEO Review Committee meeting.

**CARRIED**

*CEO Key Performance Indicators included as Attachment 1.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Nil.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

Nil.

**OTHER BUSINESS / MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

Nil.

The meeting closed at 6:09pm.

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

<b>ITEM</b>	9.1.1
	<b>CEO REVIEW COMMITTEE</b>
<b>DATE</b>	18 February 2025
<b>HEADING</b>	Remuneration Tribunal draft determination on CEO remuneration
<b>AUTHOR</b>	Rudi Deco, Manager Governance, CEO and Governance
<b>CITY PLAN LINKS</b>	4.2 Our council is a great place to work 4.1 Our council’s services are delivered in an effective and efficient manner

**SUMMARY** This report presents the South Australian Remuneration Tribunal’s draft report and draft determination following its 2024 review of Local Government Chief Executive Officers’ remuneration. Feedback can be submitted to the Remuneration Tribunal by 12 March 2025 after which the Remuneration Tribunal anticipates finalising its binding determination, intended to take effect from 1 January 2025.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

1. Notes the South Australian Remuneration Tribunal Letter sent 20 January 2025 on Local Government Chief Executive Officer Remuneration (Attachment 1, Item no 9.1.1, CEO Review Committee, 18 February 2025).
2. Notes the draft report and draft determination issued by the South Australian Remuneration Tribunal on the minimum and maximum Local Government Chief Executive Officer Remuneration (Attachment 2 and 3, Item no 9.1.1, CEO Review Committee, 18 February 2025).
3. Notes that the draft determination (Attachment 3, Item no 9.1.1, CEO Review Committee, 18 February 2025) ranks City of Salisbury in “Band One”, with the total Chief Executive Officer remuneration package for this band (as defined with inclusion of specific components) being \$353,839 up to \$419,580 based on new assessment criteria being operating income (being the single most important characteristic), projected population growth, population dispersion, distance from Adelaide and socio-economic advantage/disadvantage.
4. Notes this draft determination (Attachment 3, Item no 9.1.1, CEO Review Committee, 18 February 2025) now positions City of Salisbury in the same Band as City of Onkaparinga, City of Charles Sturt, City of Port Adelaide Enfield and City of Playford.

5. Notes that South Australian [Remuneration Tribunal Determination 4 of 2023](#) (current determination) grouped City of Salisbury in “Band Three” together with Campbelltown City Council, City of Mitcham, City of Onkaparinga, City of Unley, Mount Barker District Council, and grouped City of Port Adelaide Enfield, City of Charles Sturt and City of West Torrens in “Band Two”, which Council by resolution on 26 June 2023 did not support, challenging the band criteria applied.
6. Notes that the South Australian Remuneration Tribunal invites written submissions on the draft report and determination (Attachment 2 and 3, Item no 9.1.1, CEO Review Committee, 18 February 2025) by 12 March 2025 via e-mail to [remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au](mailto:remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au) and anticipates a binding determination to be issued soon after, intended to take effect from 1 January 2025.
7. Requests the Mayor to write to the South Australian Remuneration Tribunal to express Council’s support for the proposed updated band and remuneration classification for the City of Salisbury (Attachment 3, Item no 9.1.1, CEO Review Committee, 18 February 2025).

## ATTACHMENTS

This document should be read in conjunction with the following attachments:

1. SA Remuneration Tribunal Letter 20 January 2025
2. Draft SA Remuneration Tribunal Report 2025
3. Draft SA Remuneration Tribunal Determination CEO Remuneration

### 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The South Australian Remuneration Tribunal Consultation Paper relating to minimum and maximum remuneration for Local Government Chief Executive Officers was noted by Council at its meeting on 25 March 2024. The Mayor was asked by Council resolution to make a submission on behalf of Council whereby consideration was to be given to categorising Chief Executive Officer (CEO) remuneration similar to those council groups as is currently the case for Elected Members, with City of Salisbury being in Group 1A, having regard to the role, the size, population and revenue of the council, and any relevant economic, social, demographic and regional factors in the council area, and redistributing the current outcomes from the [Remuneration Tribunal Determination 4 of 2023](#) accordingly.
- 1.2 This Determination 4 of 2023 saw City of Salisbury being grouped together in the same band as Campbelltown City Council, City of Mitcham, City of Onkaparinga, City of Unley and Mount Barker District Council, which Council by resolution on 26 June 2023 did not support, challenging the remuneration band criteria applied.
- 1.3 The South Australian Remuneration Tribunal (Tribunal) anticipated progressing a more comprehensive review in 2024, and communicated in December 2024 that it would circulate a draft report and determination in January 2025.

- 1.4 The anticipated draft report and determination have now been received via a letter from the Tribunal sent 20 January 2025 (Attachment 1) and are included in attachments 2 and 3 in this report.

## 2. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION / COMMUNICATION

- 2.1 A sector wide response by the Local Government Association (LGA) is anticipated.

## 3. DISCUSSION

### Tribunal Objectives

- 3.1 The Tribunal has adopted an approach whereby it seeks to achieve the following broad objectives:
- 3.1.1 Minimum and maximum remuneration amounts need to reflect the complexity of roles and responsibilities necessary to allow councils to recruit and retain appropriately skilled and qualified CEOs.
  - 3.1.2 Remuneration minimums and maximums must provide a significant degree of assurance to council ratepayers, that their CEO is being remunerated accordingly.
  - 3.1.3 The minimum and maximum remuneration amounts need to provide an appropriate degree of guidance to elected members to assist them in setting and reviewing CEO remuneration.
  - 3.1.4 Any system of setting minimum and maximum remuneration must be capable of simple and low-cost revision to facilitate regular review.

### Remuneration Framework – Council Characteristics:

- 3.2 The Tribunal engaged Mercer to assist with the consideration of council characteristics. The Tribunal has adopted the position that the single most significant characteristic to be assessed is total operating income. Following this, the Tribunal has selected four other criteria which are factors taken into consideration when determining the appropriate bands, being projected population growth, population dispersion, distance from Adelaide and socio-economic advantage / disadvantage.
- 3.3 To this end, the key intent of Council's earlier submission to the Tribunal (refer paragraph 1.1 of this report) has been reflected in these newly proposed criteria.

**Remuneration Definitions:**

3.4 The Tribunal has adopted the following definitions of remuneration components for inclusion in the draft determination:

<b>Component</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Monetary remuneration	Base salary (cash component).
Superannuation	Includes the statutory minimum employer contributions, any salary sacrifice component, and any additional payments made by a Council.
Annual Leave Loading	As defined in the relevant employment contract.
Additional Leave Entitlements	Dollar value of additional leave provided over and above statutory entitlement, except where this is provided to allow remotely based CEOs to travel to their hometown or capital city to commence / return from leave.
Bonuses	Dollar value of any bonuses or performance incentives, whether received in cash or kind.
Motor Vehicle	The value of the cash allowance or the private benefit value of the motor vehicle to the CEO using either the Prime Cost (depreciation), Operating Cost, or Statutory Formula in accordance with the ATO rules. Must include FBT payable by the CEO. Refer to: <a href="https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator">https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator</a>
Housing Allowance	The dollar value of any housing allowance or rental subsidy and associated FBT. Consistent with the ATO remote area fringe benefit tax requirements.
Other Fees and Allowances	Includes, but not limited to, any or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School or childcare fees, including school uniforms</li> <li>• Newspaper/magazine/online subscriptions</li> <li>• Value of perquisites provided to the CEO i.e. memberships</li> <li>• Personal travel or any other benefit taken in lieu of salary by the CEO (and immediate family at the discretion of the council)</li> <li>• Health insurance</li> <li>• Any and all other allowances</li> <li>• Any other form of payment - cash or otherwise</li> <li>• Any Fringe Benefits Tax paid by council in respect of any of the above</li> </ul>
<b>Total Remuneration Package (TRP)</b>	<b>The total of all the above components.</b>

3.5 For the avoidance of doubt, mobile telephones and portable computing equipment, fundamentally for work purposes, professional development costs directly related to the performance of CEO duties, and membership of professional associations are not included in the total remuneration package.



### Operative date and compliance

3.6 Given this process has taken longer than anticipated, the Tribunal is proposing that the final determination to be issued by March 2025 will have an operative date of 1 January 2025, so as to not disadvantage any Council.

Despite the operative date, the Tribunal intends on adopting a phased in compliance approach, by providing councils with 12 months to comply with the relevant band. Unless compliance involves increases, or reductions, of a CEO's total remuneration package greater than \$5,000 per annum, in which case compliance is to be achieved over a two-year period.

### CEO's current total remuneration package amount

3.7 The current CEO remuneration listing the component elements of the total remuneration as per the table in paragraph 3.4 is outlined below.

Component	Dollar Value
Monetary Remuneration (base salary cash component)	\$340,465
Superannuation	\$39,921
Annual Leave Loading	nil
Additional Leave Entitlements	\$6,676
Bonuses	nil
Vehicle	No vehicle package
Housing	nil
Other fees and allowances	nil
<b>Total Remuneration Package</b>	<b>\$387,062</b>

### Frequency of reviews

3.8 The Tribunal is proposing that the remuneration amounts of each band subsequently be reviewed annually. Whether a council meets the criteria to be within a band, is proposed to be reviewed every two years.

### Other matters

3.9 The LGA Chief Executive Officer has advised that the LGA President has engaged with Mayors on the Tribunal's draft determination.

3.10 The LGA have engaged King's Counsel advice on behalf of the sector about any potential issues arising from the draft determination, and the LGA foreshadowed a formal sector-wide response to the Tribunal.

3.11 While LGA are working through this, councils are encouraged to consider and review the draft determination and consider providing their own submission to the Tribunal.

#### **Feedback**

3.12 Whilst the Tribunal has not limited the range of factors about which comments may be made, comments about the nature of the remuneration framework or about potential implementation issues are particularly invited.

3.13 Submissions can be sent to remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au by no later than 12 March 2025.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

4.1 This report presents the South Australian Remuneration Tribunal's draft report and determination on its 2024 review of Local Government Chief Executive Officers' remuneration. Feedback can be submitted to the Remuneration Tribunal by 12 March 2025 after which the Remuneration Tribunal anticipates finalising its binding determination intended to take effect from 1 January 2025.

4.2 Given the draft status of the 2025 Determination of the Tribunal, it is proposed that Council respond to the request for feedback advising the Tribunal of its support of the band and remuneration classification for the City of Salisbury CEO position.

OFFICIAL: Sensitive



REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL

Please address  
all correspondence to  
[remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au](mailto:remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au)

GPO BOX 1045  
ADELAIDE SA 5001  
(08) 8429 4141  
[www.remtribunal.sa.gov.au](http://www.remtribunal.sa.gov.au)

20 January 2025

Local Government Councils of South Australia  
*Distributed via email*

Dear Councils

**REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL – DRAFT REPORT AND DETERMINATION FOR 2024 REVIEW OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT CEO MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM REMUNERATION**

On 18 December 2024, the Remuneration Tribunal (**Tribunal**) advised that it would provide a draft report and determination in relation to its 2024 review of Local Government Chief Executive Officers (**CEO**) minimum and maximum remuneration amounts, to allow feedback to be provided before it is formally issued.

Enclosed is a copy of the draft report and determination.

The Tribunal invites written submissions on the draft report and determination **by no later than 5.00pm (ACDT) 12 March 2025**. The Tribunal does not intend to provide extensions of time. Written submissions can be sent via email to [remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au](mailto:remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au). A binding determination will be issued soon after, which is intended to take effect from 1 January 2025.

The Tribunal notes that the draft report is extensive and therefore provides the following high-level summary:

- **Tribunal Objectives:** the Tribunal has adopted an approach whereby it seeks to achieve the following broad objectives:
  1. Minimum and maximum remuneration amounts need to reflect the complexity of roles and responsibilities necessary to allow Councils to recruit and retain appropriately skilled and qualified CEOs.
  2. Remuneration minimums and maximums must provide a significant degree of assurance to council ratepayers, that their CEO is being remunerated accordingly.
  3. The minimum and maximum remuneration amounts need to provide an appropriate degree of guidance to elected members to assist them in setting and reviewing CEO remuneration.
  4. Any system of setting minimum and maximum remuneration must be capable of simple and low cost revision to facilitate regular review.
- **Remuneration framework / Council characteristics:** the Tribunal engaged Mercer to assist with consideration of Council characteristics. The Tribunal has adopted the position that the single most significant characteristic to be assessed is total operating income. Following this, the Tribunal has selected four other criteria which are factors taken into consideration when determining the appropriate bands, being projected population growth, population dispersion, distance from Adelaide and socio-economic advantage / disadvantage.

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

- **Remuneration Definitions:** the Tribunal has adopted the following definitions of remuneration components for inclusion in the draft determination:

Component	Definition
Monetary remuneration	Base salary (cash component).
Superannuation	Includes the statutory minimum employer contributions, any salary sacrifice component, and any additional payments made by a Council.
Annual Leave Loading	As defined in the relevant employment contract.
Additional Leave Entitlements	Dollar value of additional leave provided over and above statutory entitlement, except where this is provided to allow remotely based CEOs to travel to their hometown or capital city to commence / return from leave.
Bonuses	Dollar value of any bonuses or performance incentives, whether received in cash or kind.
Motor Vehicle	The value of the cash allowance or the private benefit value of the motor vehicle to the CEO using either the Prime Cost (depreciation), Operating Cost, or Statutory Formula in accordance with the ATO rules.  Must include FBT payable by the CEO.  Refer to: <a href="https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator">https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator</a>
Housing Allowance	The dollar value of any housing allowance or rental subsidy and associated FBT. Consistent with the ATO remote area fringe benefit tax requirements.  Note, designated remote areas are exempt from FBT – refer to:  <a href="https://www.ato.gov.au/api/public/content/0-2f3d266d-5f78-4188-add6-f218387a0485?1730844950186">https://www.ato.gov.au/api/public/content/0-2f3d266d-5f78-4188-add6-f218387a0485?1730844950186</a>
Other Fees and Allowances	Includes, but not limited to, any or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School or childcare fees, including school uniforms</li> <li>• Newspaper/magazine/online subscriptions</li> <li>• Value of perquisites provided to the CEO i.e. memberships</li> <li>• Personal travel or any other benefit taken in lieu of salary by the CEO (and immediate family at the discretion of the council)</li> <li>• Health insurance</li> <li>• Any and all other allowances</li> <li>• Any other form of payment - cash or otherwise</li> <li>• Any Fringe Benefits Tax paid by council in respect of any of the above</li> </ul>
Total Remuneration Package (TRP)	The total of all the above components.

For the avoidance of doubt, mobile telephones and portable computing equipment, fundamentally for work purposes, and professional development costs directly related to the performance of CEO duties and membership of professional associations are not included in the total remuneration package.

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

OFFICIAL: Sensitive

The Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction nor desire to provide tax advice to Councils, relating to FBT, but notes different approaches to these issues and recommends that individual Councils review those approaches.

- **Operative Date & Compliance:** the Tribunal is proposing that the operative date of the determination be 1 January 2025. Despite the operative date, the Tribunal intends on adopting a phased in compliance approach, by providing Councils with 12 months to comply with the relevant band. Unless compliance involves increases, or reductions, of a CEO's total remuneration package, which is greater than \$5,000 per annum, in which case compliance is to be achieved over a two year period.
- **Obtaining CEOs current total remuneration package amount:** the Tribunal strongly urges elected members of Councils to seek from their staff a complete explanation of their current CEO remuneration against the component elements of the total remuneration which is explained in the draft report and determination. Without such an understanding, there is a substantial risk that the draft report could be misunderstood and misapplied because the component parts of a CEO's remuneration under the terms of a contract or even traditional reporting structure may differ from the approach adopted by the Tribunal.
- **Frequency of Reviews:** the Tribunal is proposing that the remuneration amounts of each band subsequently be reviewed annually. Whether a Council meets the criteria to be within a band, is proposed to be reviewed every two years.
- **Providing Comment:** whilst the Tribunal has not limited the range of factors about which comments may be made, comments about the nature of the remuneration framework or about potential implementation issues are particularly invited. Written submissions must be sent to [remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au](mailto:remunerationtribunal@sa.gov.au) by no later than 5.00pm (ACDT) 12 March 2025.

Yours sincerely



Matthew O'Callaghan  
PRESIDENT

OFFICIAL: Sensitive





No. X of 2024

**REPORT OF THE REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL**  
**2024 Review of Minimum and Maximum Remuneration for Local Government Chief Executive Officers**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. In September 2021, section 99A of the *Local Government Act 1999* (**LG Act**) came into effect. This section requires the Remuneration Tribunal (**Tribunal**) to determine the minimum and maximum remuneration payable to Chief Executive Officers (**CEOs**) of Councils.
2. On 16 June 2023, the Remuneration Tribunal issued its inaugural Determination and Report of Local Government CEO minimum and maximum remuneration levels. Report 4 of 2023 details the approach of the Tribunal at that time and the issues which led to the inaugural Determination.
3. On 28 June 2024, the Tribunal issued a second Report and Determination in which it advised that it was undertaking a substantial review of the inaugural Determination, which it anticipated would be concluded by the end of 2024. As an interim step, the Tribunal provided a 2% increase to the maximum remuneration amounts.
4. The Tribunal has been provided with a substantial amount of information, together with widely divergent submissions.
5. In this Report the Tribunal has detailed its approach to this comprehensive review and explained the process and approach adopted to establish a series of bands which consider key Council characteristics. The Tribunal has taken the unusual step of issuing a draft Determination based on this Report and is providing the opportunity for comment on this until 12 March 2025. That Determination, once finalised, will have effect from 1 January 2025.
6. The Tribunal has adopted a framework for the grouping of Councils which is substantially based on total operating income as the primary indicator of CEO role complexity. Four other Council characteristics have been incorporated into this framework to recognise critical distinguishing factors between Councils (projected population growth, population dispersion, distance from Adelaide, socio-economic advantage / disadvantage). The framework provides for eight bands of Councils, with a separate category for the Adelaide City Council. Minimum and maximum remuneration levels have then been allocated to each band.

Page 1 of 25

**Table of Contents**

Topic	Page
Legislative Provisions	2
The Inaugural Report	3
Submissions	3
Individual Council Applications	10
The Tribunal's approach to review	10
What is included in the total remuneration package	12
Characteristics that differentiate Councils	16
Remuneration Ranges	22
Proposed Council groups	23
Phased in compliance	24
Frequency of Reviews	24
Opportunity to Comment	24
Next Steps for Councils	25

**Legislative Provisions**

7. Section 14 of the *Remuneration Act 1990* (SA) (**Act**) provides that the Tribunal has jurisdiction to determine the remuneration, or a specified part of the remuneration, payable in respect of certain offices, if that jurisdiction is conferred upon the Tribunal by any other Act or by the Governor, by proclamation.
8. Section 99A of the LG Act confers jurisdiction upon the Tribunal to determine the minimum and maximum remuneration that may be paid or provided to CEOs of Councils constituted under the LG Act.
9. That jurisdiction is confined to the specification of minimum and maximum amounts only. It is not within the Tribunal's jurisdiction to determine allowances in addition to the minimum and maximum remuneration amounts. It follows that the Tribunal must adopt a consistent approach to the definition of what is, and what is not, included within the definition of remuneration. This Report seeks to provide further clarity in this respect.
10. Additionally, it is important that the Tribunal notes that section 147(5) of the *Statutes Amendment (Local Government Review) Act 2021* (SA) is significant in that it refers to CEOs who were holding office at the commencement of the LG Act.
11. This section states:
 

"The remuneration of a chief executive officer holding office on the commencement of section 99A of the principal Act (as inserted by this Act) is not affected during the term of that office by a determination under section 99A."
12. The Tribunal has adopted the position that Councils who had contracts with their CEO in place prior to 20 September 2021, when the LG Act commenced, are not obligated to comply with the Tribunal's determinations, to the extent to which these contracts may be inconsistent. The Tribunal has not sought to differentiate between Councils in this respect, given the stated object of the LG Act was that the Tribunal should set salaries for Council CEOs to provide assurances to communities that CEOs are paid appropriately for the work they do.



13. Any Council that is unsure about its obligations to comply with this Report and Determination, or the various components that constitute remuneration as provided for in this Report or Determination, should seek legal and/or tax advice.

#### **The Inaugural Report**

14. Information initially provided to the Tribunal in 2023 demonstrated widely divergent approaches to how remuneration was defined and assessed, and demonstrated significant and largely unexplained diversity between remuneration amounts for Councils. The inaugural Determination placed Councils in remuneration bands that were determined based on the data provided by Councils in relation to the total remuneration package of their CEO. The bandwidth for each band varied between \$6,240 and \$32,240. This inaugural Report identified significant differences in how Councils assessed and reported on CEO remuneration. The most significant differences related to how the value of motor vehicles, housing and additional leave entitlements were recognised. In the inaugural Report the Tribunal set out its approach to the definition and quantification of remuneration, which stated:

“67. The Tribunal’s preference is to progress toward establishing minimum and maximum remuneration levels founded on an assessment of skill and competence levels. Such an approach would allow the flexibility to set remuneration consistent with the challenges confronting a given council. However, the limited information available to the Tribunal, combined with the very small number of submissions, simply does not support such an approach at this time. Councils are encouraged to make submissions about such an approach in the future.

68. The Tribunal is not able to determine the minimum and maximum remuneration levels based on factors such as the geographical size of the council, revenue of the council and other factors as listed in paragraph 18 above. It considers these factors to be sensible criterion to guide any future determinations of the Tribunal, however, under the current legislation such an approach requires the cooperation of councils.

69. For this inaugural review, the Tribunal has determined to group councils into eight bands. While these bands have some generally common characteristics, the Tribunal recognises differences and potential anomalies in terms of council characteristics within and between some of these bands. Each band is based on the data provided by councils in relation to the total remuneration package of their CEO. The Tribunal has then applied assumptions in relation to the value of the provision of a motor vehicle and any additional leave entitlements beyond that of usual administrative staff. This has resulted in a figure described as an “adjusted total remuneration package” for each CEO who is covered by this review.”

15. In June 2024, the Tribunal issued Report and Determination 1 of 2024 which noted that a substantial review of the inaugural Determination was being undertaken and provided for a 2% increase to the maximum amounts. In that Report the Tribunal indicated its intention to complete this review by the end of 2024.

#### **Submissions**

16. Following the inaugural Determination the Tribunal received limited feedback from Councils about its approach. This went to concern about groupings and the extent to which individual Councils would seek reviews based on their circumstances.

17. The Tribunal met with the Local Government Association to discuss future approaches, including the costs associated with any review. The Tribunal notes that these costs are ultimately allocated to Councils by virtue of the LG Act.
18. In February 2024, the Tribunal issued a brief consultation paper which identified options for comment and consideration by Local Government CEOs, Mayors, and elected members. Consistent with the requirements of section 10(2) of the Act, the Premier and the Minister for Local Government were also invited to make submissions in response to this paper.
19. The Tribunal received 35 submissions in response to the consultation paper. The entities that made submissions are listed below.

Council	Submission made on behalf of	Summary of issues raised
Kangaroo Island Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Position description and small amount of information provided in relation to remuneration arrangements.</li> </ul>
District Council of Ororoo Carrieton	CEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remote locality issues and access to essential services.</li> <li>Considerations of size of the workforce.</li> <li>Legislative responsibility is the same for all CEOs.</li> <li>Support for individual expert review.</li> </ul>
Mayor, Wattle Range Council	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested use of elected member bands and noted close alignment with McArthur Categories and Australian Council of Local Government classifications.</li> </ul>
City of Tea Tree Gully	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided specific Council characteristics and complexities of the role.</li> <li>Suggested use of elected member bands.</li> </ul>
Lower Eyre Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for individual expert review.</li> <li>Whilst it was not resolved by Council, some members wanted to raise concerns about the Tribunal inadvertently placing Council's under financial pressure to provide a remuneration package they cannot afford and suggested another viable option may be to allow Council's to determine remuneration for their CEO.</li> </ul>
Whyalla City Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported an individual expert review.</li> <li>Suggested use of elected member bands.</li> <li>Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration with increased regional allowances.</li> <li>Noted that the motor vehicle setting process needs to be clarified as well as the provision of accommodation.</li> <li>Noted the salary for a temporary/interim/acting CEO has not been considered by the Tribunal.</li> </ul>

City of Mount Gambier	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided specific Council characteristics and complexities of the role.</li> <li>• Proposed use of a combination of elected member bands and the WA system.</li> <li>• Suggested further clarification of remuneration definitions.</li> </ul>
Administrator, District Council of Coober Pedy	Administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed an individual expert review with costs shared by the SA Government.</li> <li>• Requested better recognition of regional and remote locality issues, access to essential services including accommodation and cost of living issues, resourcing issues and additional responsibility for distribution of electricity and water supply.</li> </ul>
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested use of elected member bands and/or Australian Council of Local Government classifications and/or McArthur salary survey.</li> <li>• Utilise information already received by the Tribunal.</li> </ul>
Mayor, City of Marion	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested use of WA model and elected member bands.</li> <li>• Considerations to geographic size, revenue, number of electors, diversity and complexity of CEO functions and duties.</li> <li>• Possible use of Local Government Association grouping approach to determine membership fees.</li> </ul>
Mayor, District Council of Yankalilla	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported an individual expert review.</li> <li>• Suggested use of elected member bands.</li> </ul>
Southern Mallee District Council	CEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the Port Adelaide Enfield Council CEO submission.</li> </ul>
City of Charles Sturt	CEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the Port Adelaide Enfield Council CEO submission.</li> <li>• Supported an individual expert review, with the cost shared on a scalable formula, rather than an equal basis.</li> </ul>
Copper Coast Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported an independent expert review and/or use of elected member bands.</li> <li>• Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration increasing regional allowances and excluding Fringe Benefits Tax.</li> </ul>
The Rural City of Murray Bridge	CEO and elected members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration with increased regional allowances, akin to WA model.</li> </ul>

Manager, People and Culture, City of Port Lincoln	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported an individual expert review.</li> </ul>
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	CEO with support indicated by 51 CEOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No support for an independent expert review.</li> <li>Support for the WA type approach linked to existing elected member bands and suggested banding approach in this regard.</li> </ul>
City of Adelaide	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for an independent expert review.</li> </ul>
City of Campbelltown	Council CEO performance management review Panel Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for an independent expert review.</li> </ul>
Mayor, City of Holdfast Bay	Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the WA type approach linked to existing elected member bands, with the opportunity to make submissions where unique factors exist.</li> <li>There should be capacity for individual Councils to obtain reviews based on work value considerations.</li> </ul>
City of Playford	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported equivalent banding between elected members and CEOs with remuneration levels assessed by a consultancy firm.</li> <li>Future reviews should reflect the complexities of growing communities.</li> </ul>
City of Salisbury	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported use of an independent expert review whereby consideration is given to categorisation similar to elected member bands, having regard to role, size, population, revenue, economic, social, demographic and regional factors.</li> </ul>
Barunga West Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported consideration of elected member bands.</li> <li>Supported use of an independent expert review, with the same entity engaged who developed the WA model.</li> <li>Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration with increased use of regional allowances and excluding Fringe Benefits Tax.</li> <li>Proposed a remoteness allowance.</li> </ul>
Mayor, District Council of Kimba	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported an individual expert review.</li> <li>Suggested use of elected member bands.</li> <li>Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration with increased regional allowances.</li> <li>Noted that the motor vehicle setting process needs to be clarified as well as the provision of accommodation.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted the salary for a temporary/interim/acting CEO has not been considered by the Tribunal.</li> </ul>
Wakefield Regional Council	CEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested some variables may include rateable and type of properties, size of LGA, proximity to major urban centres, assets under management vs ability to raise rates, commercial operations, community facilities, lack of services.</li> <li>With impacts on remuneration including security of tenure, length, complexity of role, organisational structure, physical location, vehicle and housing allowances, competition from other employment sectors, relevant experience required.</li> </ul>
Tatiara District Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported use of an independent expert review and consideration of use of the elected member bands.</li> </ul>
Wudinna District Council	CEO and Mayor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported consideration of elected member bands.</li> <li>Supported use of an independent expert review, with the same entity engaged who developed the WA model.</li> <li>Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration with increased use of regional allowances and excluding Fringe Benefits Tax.</li> </ul>
City of Onkaparinga	Council CEO Performance Management Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported use of an independent expert review / adoption of the WA model.</li> <li>Supported use of the elected member bands.</li> </ul>
Coorong District Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported the Port Adelaide Enfield Council CEO submission.</li> <li>Supported adoption of the WA model linked to existing elected member bands.</li> <li>Proposed increased flexibility for Councils to set CEO remuneration.</li> </ul>
	Elected members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEO remuneration should be a self-determining role of Councils.</li> <li>Regional Councils need flexibility in package arrangements to compete against larger metropolitan Councils.</li> </ul>
The District Council of Ceduna	CEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported an individual expert review.</li> <li>Suggested use of elected member bands.</li> <li>Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration with increased regional allowances.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the motor vehicle setting process needs to be clarified as well as the provision of accommodation.</li> <li>Noted the salary for a temporary/interim/acting CEO has not been considered by the Tribunal.</li> <li>Provided some Council characteristics.</li> </ul>
Yorke Peninsula Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information about current remuneration and position description provided.</li> </ul>
Mid-Murray Council	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed use of an independent expert review with consideration of the WA model and possible application of the elected member bands.</li> <li>Any anomalies to be reviewed by exception.</li> <li>Recommended the bands be indexed annually by an independent standard such as CPI with the opportunity to request exemptions based on individual circumstances or performance.</li> <li>Reviews to then be considered on a 4-year cycle.</li> </ul>
The Corporation of the Town of Walkerville	Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported the use of an independent expert review.</li> <li>Raised concerns about the effectiveness of the legislation and provided information about its recent recruitment process.</li> </ul>
District Council of Grant	CEO and elected members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported use of the elected member bands consistent with the Port Adelaide Enfield Council CEO submission.</li> <li>Noted that salary bands should be broader and overlapping.</li> <li>Suggested the Tribunal be tasked with reviewing unfair contract clauses/conditions.</li> <li>Proposed a more limited definition of remuneration with increased use of regional allowances and excluding Fringe Benefits Tax.</li> </ul>
City of Port Augusta		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEO Remuneration information and position description provided.</li> </ul>

20. On 14 May 2024, the Tribunal met with Mark Withers (CEO City of Port Adelaide Enfield), Tony Harrison (CEO City of Marion) and Maree Wauchope (CEO Barunga West Council). The Tribunal also separately met with the following representatives from the Whyalla City Council, Mayor Phill Stone, Kathy Jarrett (Director Corporate), Grant Jennings (Manager Finance and Knowledge Management) and Sue King (Manager People and Culture).

21. While there was broad support for a changed approach to setting minimum and maximum remuneration amounts, there was substantial diversity in the proposed approach. Very few

submissions addressed current remuneration arrangements as distinct from proposing a broad approach.

22. The submissions indicated little support for consideration of Councils on an individual basis.
23. There was substantial support for the Tribunal's proposition that it could engage a specialist remuneration advisor to review individual CEO roles and provide advice to the Tribunal. Some concerns about the cost associated with this approach were noted.
24. Council submissions referred the Tribunal to various approaches, including the Western Australian approach and the current groupings for Local Government elected members.
25. Despite a request to this effect, less than a third of the Councils provided their CEO's position description.
26. A group submission made by the Port Adelaide Enfield CEO, supported by a significant number of Council CEOs, proposed an approach, broadly modelled on the Western Australian system, which reflected "market rates" and recognised regional issues, provided for 7 bands with substantial differences between the minimum and maximum amounts in each band.
27. The Tribunal has also accessed and considered substantial data about the characteristics and attributes of Councils. This data includes the following information:
  - ACLG Codes and Council in Focus groups
  - Council total operating income
  - Council staff size
  - Council areas
  - Council locations, including distance from Adelaide
  - Population density
  - Population dispersion
  - Council growth projections and histories
  - Socio-Economic indexes for Councils (based on Australian Bureau of Statistics data)
28. The Tribunal has consulted directly with 21 Mayors about how CEO performance and remuneration issues are addressed. The information these Mayors provided, together with the submissions, disclose a reasonable degree of consistency of approach to remuneration setting processes. This process consistency contrasts sharply with the significant differences in remuneration amounts for similar Councils, which were noted in the Tribunal's inaugural Report.
29. The Tribunal noted that Councils utilise external advisors to assist them, or a sub-committee of the Council, in reviewing CEO performance. On the premise that the Council is satisfied with that performance, the external advisor then commonly provides advice about comparable remuneration or remuneration increases. This advice typically proposes increases aligned with the Council's general enterprise agreement, whilst noting remuneration ranges of Councils based on the external advisor's knowledge of other Councils. In this regard, the comparisons may not relate to objectively determined groups of Councils. This approach has resulted in substantial intermittent remuneration adjustments. The approach to setting a remuneration level when a new CEO is appointed is highly variable, with some Councils bringing in new, and less experienced CEO's at substantially lower remuneration rates than their predecessors, with the expectation that rates for these CEOs will increase significantly as their performance develops. Many of the Mayors with whom the Tribunal consulted advised that they relied

heavily on the bands set by the Tribunal as a guide to reviewing CEO remuneration. The Tribunal noted substantially different approaches to remuneration in predominantly rural areas and in areas where there has been a long serving CEO.

#### **Individual Council applications for increased maximum remuneration amounts**

30. On 9 July 2024, the Tribunal received an application and submission from the Principal Administrator of the District Council of Coober Pedy, for an increase in the maximum amount of remuneration it could pay to recruit a new CEO. This application followed multiple unsuccessful recruitment attempts. The Tribunal addressed this application in its Report 4 of 2024.
31. During the consultations with Mayors, another Council foreshadowed an application to increase the maximum amount payable to attract an appropriate candidate. This Council did not subsequently formally pursue this request, and the Tribunal was advised that a suitable applicant had been selected within the existing bands.
32. On 11 September 2024, the City of Holdfast Bay applied to have the maximum amount it could pay to a new CEO increased. While the City of Holdfast Bay subsequently advised that it received a range of applications, and the Tribunal has noted that an appointment has been made, the City of Holdfast Bay maintained its request to have the maximum amount increased. This application was addressed by the Tribunal in its Report 18 of 2024 where the Tribunal declined to make an individual Council Determination and advised that the City of Holdfast Bay position would be considered as part of this broader review.
33. The Tribunal has reviewed each of these Councils as part of this broader review.

#### **The Tribunal's approach to reviewing minimum and maximum amounts**

34. Consistent with its inaugural Report, the Tribunal considers that a more sustainable longer-term approach is necessary. Notwithstanding all the information which the Tribunal now has, it remains aware that some Councils have not provided submissions, that most of the Councils have not provided position descriptions and that a significant proportion of the submissions note unique characteristics of their Council.
35. It is also clear to the Tribunal that at least some Councils may have misunderstood the definition of remuneration and particularly, motor vehicle costing approaches and that some elected members, and possibly some CEO's may benefit from clarification of the principles being applied by the Tribunal. The Tribunal has provided additional clarification later in this Report.
36. The Tribunal acknowledges at the outset that the nature of its jurisdiction is inherently limited to the specification of minimum and maximum remuneration. It is not within the Tribunal's jurisdiction to determine allowances in addition to the minimum and maximum remuneration amounts. Accordingly, the Tribunal has reviewed an array of factors that are commonly considered in establishing remuneration levels. These range from regional attraction and retention components of remuneration to the recognition of the many functions undertaken by Local Governments that are outside of traditional expectations.
37. The Tribunal has adopted an approach whereby it seeks to achieve the following broad objectives:



- Minimum and maximum remuneration amounts need to reflect the complexity of roles and responsibilities necessary to allow Councils to recruit and retain appropriately skilled and qualified CEOs.
  - Remuneration minimums and maximums must provide a significant degree of assurance to Council ratepayers, that their CEO is being equitably remunerated.
  - The minimum and maximum remuneration amounts need to provide an appropriate degree of guidance to elected members to assist them in setting and reviewing CEO remuneration.
  - Any system of setting minimum and maximum remuneration must be capable of simple and low-cost revision to facilitate regular review.
38. The Tribunal has reviewed possible approaches against these broad objectives. The significant diversity of remuneration levels noted in the inaugural Report means that some Councils with similar characteristics pay their CEOs quite different remuneration, while some CEOs are paid similar remuneration despite working for Councils with substantially different characteristics.
39. The information available to the Tribunal confirms that the capability and performance of both elected members and CEOs impacts on remuneration considerations. However, recognition of performance issues is the prerogative of elected members and, if necessary, the State Government. Councils have the capacity to take account of CEO performance issues when setting remuneration between the minimum and maximum amounts set by the Tribunal.
40. The Tribunal does not consider a system whereby individual Council's apply to the Tribunal to review and set CEO remuneration is sustainable. Such a system would be administratively cumbersome and could create perceived or actual remuneration discrepancies between Councils.
41. A common argument was that the grouping arrangement traditionally applied by the Tribunal to assess elected member allowances should have been used as the basis for the grouping of CEO remuneration. These propositions similarly fail to meet the Tribunal's broad objectives. In its Report 2 of 2022, the Tribunal expressed reservations about the current groupings and invited Local Government to consider alternative approaches. The current groupings have their genesis in very dated population comparisons. If these same groupings were applied to CEOs, they would create significant anomalies and fail to recognise other characteristics of Councils relevant to the role complexity of CEOs. Furthermore, the gap between minimum and maximum remuneration levels would likely be so substantial that the objectives of providing assurances to Council ratepayers and guidance to elected members would not be met.
42. The Tribunal also considered use of the Australian Classification of Local Government (**ACLG**) categories, determined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, as the basis for setting remuneration. The ACLG categories are based on population and population density and result in 16 categories for South Australian Councils. The Tribunal was not satisfied that the factors included in this system properly characterised CEO functions and, in any event, using such a system led to unsustainably large and inconsistent remuneration groupings.
43. The Tribunal has reviewed the Western Australian system of specifying minimum and maximum remuneration levels. This approach was considered in the development of the LG Act. That Western Australian system has now been in operation for many years and was initially established following a comprehensive review of each then current CEO job role. Of more recent times the number of groups of Councils has been reduced by regulation. Western Australia also has a longstanding and relatively consistent approach to the recognition of regional locations across public and many private sector occupational groups. There is no

equivalent mechanism in South Australia. The Western Australian local government structures are significantly different to the South Australian structures in that there are many more smaller Councils. Finally, the adoption of the Western Australian approach would result in gaps between minimum and maximum remuneration amounts that are so substantial that they would also fail to meet the objectives of providing assurances to local communities and guidance to elected members.

44. The approach suggested by the significant group of CEOs also results in such a gap between minimum and maximum remuneration amounts that it fails to meet the Tribunal's objectives. Additionally, the Tribunal is not satisfied that such an approach would be sustainable on a long-term basis, particularly given the reservations it expressed in 2023.
45. The Tribunal considered engaging a remuneration specialist to consult individually with each Council to assess appropriate remuneration arrangements. It has decided such an approach would be both time consuming, and unnecessary given the substantial material already available to compare Councils. Such an approach would also impose a significant additional cost burden on the Local Government sector and would have the potential to become obsolete quickly.
46. The Tribunal has adopted an approach which takes account of key Council characteristics that impact on the complexity of the role. These characteristics need to have appropriate weightings attached to them. The overall approach must be consistent with common remuneration setting processes applied to public and private sector organisations.
47. A specialist remuneration advisory firm, Mercer Consulting (Australia) Pty Ltd (**Mercer**), was engaged to assist the Tribunal in ensuring the integrity and consistency of the component parts of remuneration considerations, and to facilitate a process by which the Tribunal could assess and weight the characteristics of Councils considered relevant to remuneration.
48. The brief given to Mercer had two broad components. Firstly, Mercer was asked to review the Tribunal's approach to, and definition of total remuneration package components, to provide maximum assistance to Councils and ensure a consistent and equitable approach to establishing minimum and maximum remuneration levels, in accordance with the direction on the total remuneration spread being provided to Mercer by the Tribunal.
49. Secondly, Mercer was asked to assist the Tribunal in developing bands or groups of Councils within a framework comprising of minimum and maximum remuneration levels determined by the Tribunal. For the avoidance of doubt, Mercer was not engaged to undertake an individual review of each Council, which would have had a significant cost associated with it.
50. In selecting the appropriate remuneration advisor, the Tribunal complied with the South Australian Government contracting approach. Additionally, because of the potential for any acknowledged expert in this field to be associated in some way with Local Government, the Tribunal received advice and guidance about its contracting processes from a probity advisor and has ensured that Mercer has undertaken this function in a manner which is separate from the remuneration advice that it may provide to Councils. It is appropriate that the Tribunal notes the Mercer contribution with thanks.

#### **What is included in the Total Remuneration Package**

51. In its inaugural Report the Tribunal stated the following:

"44. In determining what constitutes remuneration, the Tribunal has considered the following components:

- Monetary remuneration
  - Superannuation, including the statutory minimum employer contributions, any salary sacrifice component and any additional payments made by a council
  - Annual leave loading
  - Additional leave entitlements
  - Bonuses and performance incentives - in cash or otherwise
  - The private benefit value of any motor vehicle and/or equipment (excluding mobile telephones and portable computing equipment provided to the CEO by the council)
  - School or childcare fees, including school uniforms
  - Newspaper/magazine/online subscriptions
  - Personal travel or any other benefit taken in lieu of salary by the CEO (and immediate family at the discretion of the council)
  - Health insurance
  - Any and all allowances
  - Any other form of payment - cash or otherwise
  - Any Fringe Benefits Tax paid by council in respect of any of the above."
52. While the Tribunal is satisfied that the inclusion of these components is consistent with commonly applied remuneration definitions, it has reviewed these considerations as part of this Report.
53. The consultations with Councils disclosed a degree of confusion on the part of some Councils about how certain components should be costed.
54. The Tribunal has reviewed remuneration approaches through the survey information available from its 2022/23 CEO survey. Mercer has provided additional guidance on these issues, which has been, with the exception of housing and accommodation, generally accepted by the Tribunal. Consequently, the Tribunal confirms the following approaches to matters included within the concept of a total remuneration package, which it is satisfied reflect common public and private sector practices.

#### **Motor Vehicles**

55. The Tribunal notes that Councils may approve the provision of a motor vehicle to a CEO as part of the CEO's remuneration package, as a tool of trade or offer a motor vehicle allowance by way of additional remuneration.
56. The Tribunal obtained advice from Mercer on the inclusion of motor vehicles in a CEO's remuneration package. The Tribunal noted that a combination of accounting and remuneration packaging approaches are applied by Councils and concluded that, because of the diversity of vehicle cost assessments, and private use components, it is not possible to establish a common benefit value that can notionally be attached to the provision of a vehicle.
57. Having considered Mercer's advice, the Tribunal is of the view that if a motor vehicle is provided as part of the remuneration package, determining a benefit value depends on the type and cost of vehicle, and the extent of personal use of the vehicle along with other assumptions. The provision of the vehicle will be subject to Fringe Benefits Tax (FBT). The benefit value of the

vehicle and FBT attributable to the personal use of the vehicle and all other monetary components and allowances in lieu of provision of a motor vehicle, other than as a tool of trade, must be included in the CEO's total remuneration and must not cause the CEO's total remuneration package to exceed the maximum of the remuneration range of the relevant band. Councils are responsible for complying with the requirements of the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) in relation to the calculation of the benefit and FBT, using any of the ATO approved methods. If a motor vehicle is provided as a tool of trade, no FBT is payable.

58. Further, a cash equivalent allowance in lieu of a motor vehicle will form part of the total remuneration package and form part of the CEO's total remuneration.
59. The Tribunal has not detailed the different approaches to motor vehicle costings adopted by the ATO as these are readily available to Councils. However, the Tribunal strongly recommends that Councils recognise that any benefit, relating to a motor vehicle, including the associated FBT, is included in, and not separate from, the CEO's total remuneration package.

#### **Housing and Accommodation**

60. The information available to the Tribunal confirms that Councils may offer housing or accommodation, or a housing allowance to a CEO to attract and/or retain that CEO or where suitable housing is not available.
61. The Tribunal acknowledges that the provision of housing in designated remote areas is exempt from FBT under the *Fringe Benefit Tax Assessment Act 1986* (Cth) and that the ATO is currently reviewing the relevant definitions and that the cost of Council owned housing is variable.
62. Mercer recommended that the provision of housing/accommodation or a housing allowance in a remote location not be included in the definition of remuneration. The Tribunal has not accepted this recommendation because it is concerned that such an approach creates potential substantial inequities, depending on the definition of remoteness for FBT purposes. Additionally, the Tribunal is concerned that the exclusion of housing provision or allowances from the definition of a total remuneration package, effectively invites its inclusion in areas where this is not currently applicable or required, with consequent cost implications for the Councils concerned. However, as explained later in this Report, the Tribunal has recognised locational remoteness as a factor in setting minimum and maximum remuneration bands.
63. This means that the cost of housing or accommodation, or an allowance for housing is a component of remuneration and should be recognised as such. The determination of the amount to be included in the total remuneration of the CEO is the amount that would be used to calculate the FBT payable (whether FBT is payable or not per ATO Remote Area definitions). The application of FBT is then a matter which is dependent on whether the relevant town or city is exempted from FBT by the ATO.

#### **Superannuation**

64. There are multiple different superannuation arrangements adopted for Local Government CEOs. These include accumulation-based schemes and defined benefit funds, with varying employee contributions. The Tribunal has adopted the position that, irrespective of whether the scheme is an accumulation or a defined benefit fund, the standard position is that superannuation costs should reflect the minimum employer contribution, which is currently 11.5%. If a Council contributes in excess of the minimum employer contribution amount, the superannuation component should be increased accordingly.

**Annual Leave of more than 4 weeks per annum**

65. Two discrete arrangements for additional annual leave have been considered by the Tribunal.
66. Arrangements for purchased additional leave, whereby the additional leave is funded by additional working hours or through a reduction in weekly or monthly pay, do not represent an additional benefit.
67. In contrast, the Tribunal is aware of arrangements for CEOs where annual leave of more than four weeks per year is part of the remuneration package without any reduction in remuneration. This circumstance represents an additional cost imposed on a Council so that the amount of leave in addition to four weeks needs to be added to the annual total remuneration package amount. The Tribunal is of the view that where additional leave is granted to remotely based CEOs to enable them to travel or return to their hometown or city without unduly impinging on the annual leave entitlement, this additional leave grant should not be included in the calculation of total remuneration.

**Remuneration Definitions**

68. The Tribunal has adopted the following definitions of remuneration components for inclusion in the Determination accompanying this Report:

<b>Component</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Monetary remuneration	Base salary (cash component).
Superannuation	Includes the statutory minimum employer contributions, any salary sacrifice component, and any additional payments made by a Council.
Annual Leave Loading	As defined in the relevant employment contract.
Additional Leave Entitlements	Dollar value of additional leave provided over and above statutory entitlement, except where this is provided to allow remotely based CEOs to travel to their hometown or capital city to commence / return from leave.
Bonuses	Dollar value of any bonuses or performance incentives, whether received in cash or kind.
Motor Vehicle	The value of the cash allowance or the private benefit value of the motor vehicle to the CEO using either the Prime Cost (depreciation), Operating Cost, or Statutory Formula in accordance with the ATO rules.  Must include FBT payable by the CEO.  Refer to: <a href="https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator">https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator</a>
Housing Allowance	The dollar value of any housing allowance or rental subsidy and associated FBT. Consistent with the ATO remote area FBT requirements.  Note, designated remote areas are exempt from FBT – refer to:

	<a href="https://www.ato.gov.au/api/public/content/0-2f3d266d-5f78-4188-add6-f218387a0485?1730844950186">https://www.ato.gov.au/api/public/content/0-2f3d266d-5f78-4188-add6-f218387a0485?1730844950186</a>
Other Fees and Allowances	Includes, but not limited to, any or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School or childcare fees, including school uniforms</li> <li>• Newspaper/magazine/online subscriptions</li> <li>• Value of perquisites provided to the CEO i.e. memberships</li> <li>• Personal travel or any other benefit taken in lieu of salary by the CEO (and immediate family at the discretion of the council)</li> <li>• Health insurance</li> <li>• Any and all other allowances</li> <li>• Any other form of payment - cash or otherwise</li> <li>• Any Fringe Benefits Tax paid by council in respect of any of the above</li> </ul>
Total Remuneration Package (TRP)	The total of all the above components.

69. Consistent with the approach taken in the inaugural Report, the Tribunal has concluded that mobile telephones and portable computing equipment provided to CEOs, fundamentally for work purposes, but which may be used for reasonable personal use, should not be regarded as remuneration for these purposes. The Tribunal considers that these items are inherent requirements for a CEO function and, in any event, any additional reasonable use represents a minimal additional cost such that separating personal and business use involves unreasonable administrative costs.
70. The Tribunal has not included professional development costs that directly relate to the performance of CEO duties and membership of professional associations related to the performance of CEO functions in its assessment of remuneration.
71. The Tribunal has not included one-off payments that relate directly and solely to relocation expenses in its consideration of remuneration.

#### **Characteristics of Councils that differentiate between Council CEOs**

72. To develop its approach to grouping and comparing Councils, the Tribunal has received substantial assistance from Mercer to ensure that its consideration of Council characteristics properly relate to expectations of CEOs. This analysis of Council characteristics that relate to the demands on CEOs has been conducted in two stages. The initial stage involved a comparison of the characteristics considered relevant to the complexity of the CEO role to establish a framework for consideration of Councils. The second stage has involved identifying appropriate minimum and maximum remuneration amounts.
73. As was the case in its inaugural Determination, the Tribunal has not included Roxby Downs Council in this review. This is because Roxby Downs Council operates under an indenture agreement and has an entirely different funding and operating base to every other Council.
74. In consultation with Mercer, the Tribunal considered all the available data about Council characteristics. It then selected the following primary and modifying criteria:

CRITERIA		KEY MEASURE (SOURCE)	RATIONALE
PRIMARY CRITERIA	Revenue	Total operating income (Source: Council's Financial Statements)	Total operating income - General Rates; Other Rates; Other Charges; Mandatory and Discretionary Rebates & Remissions and Write-offs; Total Rates; Statutory Charges; User Charges; Grants, Subsidies and Contributions; Investment Income; Reimbursements; Other Income; Share of Profit - Joint Ventures & Associates. Reflects the scale and complexity of operations on an ongoing basis.
	Projected population grown	Annualised population growth based on data from 2021 to 2031 (Source: SA Department for Trade and Investment)	Adopting both a historical and projected view over a 10 year period smooths out/reduces any potential projection anomalies/errors. Any significant infrastructure and service delivery impacts on Council as a result of projected population growth would tend to be based on a longer term planning horizon. This measure picks up the complexities associated with future planning and infrastructure development that is not captured in the total operating income of Council or the other modifying criteria.
MODIFYING CRITERIA	Population Dispersion	Population dispersion based on estimated average distance (in kilometres) between each person in the council area and the centre of population for the region (Source: Keystone Data)	Population dispersion considers both population and geography. It reflects the travel demands placed on Chief Executives in geographically dispersed councils that is not captured by total operating income, or the other modifying criteria. It also acts as a proxy for a travel allowance.
	Distance from Adelaide	Distance of primary council location from Adelaide (Source: SA Remuneration Tribunal)	Recognises the need to travel to access services not available within the council area (e.g. medical and education) which, while not directly impacting the complexity of the CEO role, creates greater distance and travelling challenges for CEOs in rural and remote areas.
	Socio-economic Advantage / Disadvantage	SEIFA index of relative socio-economic disadvantage, decile (Source: ABS)	SEIFA is a commonly used measure to assess the socio-economic status of an area and accounts for differences in complexities of councils with different levels of socio-economic advantage/disadvantage. Council areas with a lower decile are considered more complex.

75. The Tribunal has adopted the position that the single most significant characteristic of Councils that impacts on the CEO roles is total operating income (as defined in reports periodically issued by the SA Local Government Grants Commission) as described in the above table. There is a close correlation between total operating income and staffing numbers and close

links between recognition of significant additional functions undertaken by some Councils beyond the normal range of Council activities. In short, as operating income increases, so too does the overall complexity of the CEO role.

76. The Tribunal has utilised the SA Local Government Grants Commission's total operating income data for the 2022/2023 financial year as the latest available data.
77. The Tribunal's initial assessments excluded Adelaide City Council and involved the allocation of each Council to one of eight bands based on the total operating income ranges shown below.

Category	Upper	Lower
1	\$210M	\$140M
2	\$140M	\$76M
3	\$76M	\$56M
4	\$56M	\$38M
5	\$38M	\$21M
6	\$21M	\$15M
7	\$15M	\$6M
8	\$6M	\$0

78. The Tribunal has considered the most appropriate approach to be applied to the Adelaide City Council given its relatively high total operating income, its relatively low population base, and the extent to which there are over 400,000 daily users of council facilities and services, most of which involve non-residents. The Adelaide City Council has a vastly different constituent base consisting of predominantly corporate enterprises. It also has a strong commercial focus, owns, and manages two significant subsidiary operations (the Adelaide Central Market Authority and the Adelaide Economic Development Authority), together with the Kadatilla/Adelaide Park Lands Authority.
79. While the option of a market-based assessment for the Adelaide City Council, drawing on data from similarly sized organisations across Australia was considered, this approach was ultimately rejected because it did not properly consider local government specific characteristics. Comparisons with other capital city CEOs was also not preferred because of the diversity of the other state approaches.
80. Ultimately, the Tribunal determined to create an additional band for the Adelaide City Council, using the same methodology that was applied to other Councils. This approach most accurately reflects the recruitment patterns for the Adelaide City Council over the past 15 years. It means that, while there are 9 bands of Councils, the highest band is applicable only to the Adelaide City Council. None of the modifying criteria considered below have application to the Adelaide City Council.
81. The Tribunal has selected four other criteria which are factors most likely to require further differentiation between Councils which was not captured by total operating income considerations.
82. These are:
- Projected population growth which impacts on a Council's planning and service delivery requirements and hence the demands and expectations of a CEO. This was determined to be the most significant modifying factor.
  - Population dispersion which is a measure of the estimated average distance between each person in a Council area and the population centre for that region. This is a measure of relevance to regional Councils as it represents additional



- service delivery and complexity demands on the CEO. The Tribunal has relied on data from 2021 to 2031 provided by the SA Department for Trade and Investment.
- c. Distance from Adelaide measured from the primary Council location. This reflects isolation, attraction, and retention issues, together with the challenges associated with functioning in more remote locations with substantially increased distances.
  - d. Socio-economic advantage/disadvantage. This has been assessed using the Australian Bureau of Statistics Socio-Economic Index for Areas and takes account of differences in the complexities of Councils with differing levels of socio-economic advantage or disadvantage. The greater the degree of comparative disadvantage, the greater the complexity of the CEO role.

83. The Tribunal defined measures of each of these modifying criteria and attached a score of between 1 and 3, depending on the characteristics of the Council. These scores were then weighted, depending on the Tribunal's assessment of the significance of the modifying criteria.
84. This approach is summarised in the following Table prepared by Mercer.

Level of Complexity	Score	Projected population Growth	Population Dispersion	Distance from Adelaide	Socio-economic Status (SEIFA)
Low Complexity	1	Less than 0.56% per annum	Less than 8.45km	Less than 187.1km	Greater than or equal to decile 7
Medium Complexity	2	From 0.56% up to 0.89% per annum	From 8.45km up to 17.3km	From 187.1km up to 382km	Between decile 6 and 4
High Complexity	3	Greater than or equal to 0.89% per annum	Greater than or equal to 17.3km	Greater than or equal to 382km	Less than or equal to decile 3
Weighting		60%	10%	10%	20%

85. Except for the SEIFA score, the Tribunal applied a low complexity or score of 1 to Councils with less than the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile for that category. A medium level complexity or score of 2 was allocated to Councils between the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile and a high complexity rating or score of 3 was applied to Councils in the upper 25<sup>th</sup> percentile. The reverse approach was applied with respect to the SEIFA Index. These percentiles are based on the actual distribution of data across the Councils.
86. The weighted average was then utilised to determine if a Council could increase levels by one category from its initial placement using total operating income. This was done by using a cut-off point of a weighted average greater than 2.2, which recognises a prudent buffer above the weighted average medium complexity score of 2, as shown in paragraph 84. This is consistent with the approach adopted by the Tribunal in setting the highest level of complexity for each of the modifying criterion at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile.
87. A table showing the application of these modifying criteria is shown below.

Council	Projected Population Growth	Population Dispersion	Distance from Adelaide	Socio-Economic Status
Onkaparinga	2	1	1	2
Charles Sturt	3	1	1	1
Salisbury	2	1	1	3
Port Adelaide Enfield	3	1	1	2

Playford	3	1	1	3
Marion	2	1	1	1
Tea Tree Gully	2	1	1	1
Holdfast Bay	1	1	1	1
West Torrens	2	1	1	1
Mitcham	1	1	1	1
Mount Barker	3	1	1	1
Campbelltown	3	1	1	1
Alexandrina	3	2	1	2
Unley	2	1	1	1
Burnside	2	1	1	1
Adelaide Hills	2	2	1	1
Norwood Payneham & St Peters	3	1	1	1
Murray Bridge	3	1	1	3
Barossa	3	2	1	1
Mount Gambier	2	1	3	3
Yorke Peninsula	2	3	2	2
Copper Coast	3	1	1	3
Whyalla	1	1	3	3
Gawler	3	1	1	2
Port Augusta	1	1	2	3
Victor Harbor	3	1	1	2
Wattle Range	1	3	3	3
Port Pirie	1	1	2	3
Mid Murray	2	3	1	3
Light	3	2	1	1
Prospect	2	1	1	1
Loxton Waikerie	1	3	2	2
Port Lincoln	2	1	3	3
Berri Barmera	1	1	2	3
Renmark Paringa	1	1	2	3
Kangaroo Island	3	3	2	1
Naracoorte Lucindale	1	2	2	2
Tatiara	1	3	2	2
Clare and Gilbert Valleys	1	2	1	1
Coorong	1	3	1	3
Wakefield	1	3	1	3
Grant	2	2	3	1
Cooper Pedy	1	1	3	3
Lower Eyre Peninsula	1	3	3	1
Adelaide Plains	3	2	1	2
Yankalilla	3	1	1	2
Northern Areas	1	2	2	2
Goyder	1	3	1	3
Streaky Bay	1	3	3	1
Ceduna	1	2	3	3
Walkerville	2	1	1	1
Franklin Harbour	1	1	3	2
Mount Remarkable	1	3	2	2
Southern Mallee	1	3	2	1
Kingston	1	2	2	2

Robe	1	1	2	1
Barunga West	1	2	1	3
Tumby Bay	2	2	3	1
Cleve	2	2	3	2
Wudinna	1	2	3	1
Kimba	1	2	3	1
Flinders Ranges	1	3	2	3
Peterborough	1	1	2	3
Elliston	1	3	3	2
Karoonda East Murray	1	3	1	2
Orroroo Carrieton	1	2	2	1

88. The adoption of this approach resulted in 11 Councils being moved up into the next highest band.
89. A Table showing the final Council grouping after the modifying criteria were applied is shown below.

Council	Initial Band based on Total operating income	Weighted Average Modifying Categories	Adjusted Band
Onkaparinga	1	1.8	1
Charles Sturt	1	2.2	1
Salisbury	1	2.0	1
Port Adelaide Enfield	1	2.4	1
Playford	2	2.6	1
Marion	2	1.6	2
Tea Tree Gully	2	1.6	2
Holdfast Bay	2	1.0	2
West Torrens	3	1.6	3
Mitcham	3	1.0	3
Mount Barker	3	2.2	3
Campbelltown	3	2.2	3
Alexandrina	3	2.5	2
Unley	3	1.6	3
Burnside	4	1.6	4
Adelaide Hills	4	1.7	4
Norwood Payneham & St Peters	4	2.2	4
Murray Bridge	4	2.6	3
Barossa	4	2.3	3
Mount Gambier	4	2.2	4
Yorke Peninsula	4	2.1	4
Copper Coast	4	2.6	3
Whyalla	4	1.6	4
Gawler	5	2.4	4
Port Augusta	5	1.5	5
Victor Harbor	5	2.4	4
Wattle Range	5	1.8	5
Port Pirie	5	1.5	5
Mid Murray	5	2.2	5

Light	5	2.3	4
Prospect	5	1.6	5
Loxton Waikerie	5	1.5	5
Port Lincoln	5	2.2	5
Berri Barmera	5	1.5	5
Renmark Paringa	5	1.5	5
Kangaroo Island	5	2.5	4
Naracoorte Lucindale	5	1.4	5
Tatiara	6	1.5	6
Clare and Gilbert Valleys	6	1.1	6
Coorong	6	1.6	6
Wakefield	6	1.6	6
Grant	6	1.9	6
Cooper Pedy	6	1.6	6
Lower Eyre Peninsula	6	1.4	6
Adelaide Plains	6	2.5	5
Yankalilla	6	2.4	5
Northern Areas	7	1.4	7
Goyder	7	1.6	7
Streaky Bay	7	1.4	7
Ceduna	7	1.7	7
Walkerville	7	1.6	7
Franklin Harbour	7	1.4	7
Mount Remarkable	7	1.5	7
Southern Mallee	7	1.3	7
Kingston	7	1.4	7
Robe	7	1.1	7
Barunga West	7	1.5	7
Tumby Bay	7	1.9	7
Cleve	7	2.1	7
Wudinna	7	1.3	7
Kimba	7	1.3	7
Flinders Ranges	7	1.7	7
Peterborough	7	1.5	7
Elliston	7	1.6	7
Karoonda East Murray	8	1.4	8
Orroroo Carrieton	8	1.2	8

#### Remuneration Ranges

90. Having developed a model for the grouping of Councils, the Tribunal has applied the 2022/23 CEO remuneration levels to this structure with a further increase factored in for the period from the July 2024 Interim Report and Determination.
91. A \$190,000 minimum remuneration amount has been adopted as the minimum remuneration amount. This is less than the current minimum CEO remuneration level and hence gives Councils in that lower range enhanced capacity to apply a lower starting salary to a new, inexperienced CEO.
92. The Tribunal has then applied an increase to this minimum to arrive at the mid-point for the lowest band 8. That mid-point then becomes the minimum remuneration level for band 7. This pattern has been repeated for each band. The eight bands determined the range size based around a midpoint assessment for each band. Therefore, the bandwidth increases as the remuneration amounts increase.

93. This reflected the extent to which the Council CEO market is essentially an internal South Australian market. The operation of the model has identified those Councils that are, on the model criteria, out of step with comparable Council CEOs. The Tribunal has assessed the maximum remuneration payable on the basis of overall remuneration trends within the South Australian Local Government sector.
94. The Tribunal has established overlapping remuneration ranges. These provide Councils with increased flexibility in establishing remuneration levels, particularly when recruiting inexperienced CEOs.
95. Whilst it has some reservations, the Tribunal has also increased the remuneration bandwidth for each band. This is intended to provide added flexibility to attract and retain CEOs and to recognise performance in the role.
96. The Tribunal reviewed its decision that, without considering Adelaide City Council, eight bands was a sustainable grouping of Councils. It considered a lesser number of bands, but this created such a broad bandwidth that the value of the banding to elected members and Council ratepayers would be substantially reduced and hence run counter to the established objectives. An increased number of bands was also considered but this created a system which required substantially more maintenance and more frequent reviews, which again ran counter to the sustainability objective.
97. The remuneration minimum and maximum for the Adelaide City Council has been established using the same methodology as outlined earlier in this section.
98. The allocation of Councils to the bands is shown in the Table below.

Band	Number of Councils	Minimum	Maximum	Bandwidth
Adelaide City Council	1	\$386,710	\$458,557	\$68,847
1	5	\$353,839	\$419,580	\$65,741
2	4	\$323,763	\$383,916	\$60,153
3	8	\$296,243	\$351,283	\$55,040
4	10	\$271,062	\$321,424	\$50,362
5	12	\$248,022	\$294,103	\$46,081
6	8	\$226,940	\$269,104	\$42,164
7	18	\$207,650	\$246,230	\$38,580
8	2	\$190,000	\$225,301	\$35,301

99. The Tribunal's interim 2024 Report and Determination applied a 2% increase to the maximum remuneration levels. For the purpose of this assessment, the Tribunal applied a further increase, since that interim 2024 decision. This approach appears broadly consistent with enterprise agreement based wage increases in the Local Government sector. It does not consider any significant CEO remuneration adjustments that may have occurred since 2022/23. Again, this forms part of the Tribunal's decision to issue a draft Determination.
100. The Tribunal has noted that, based on the 2022/23 remuneration data there are a small number of Councils that are likely to be significantly above or below the proposed minimums and maximums.
101. The Tribunal's assessment of increases since 2023 indicates that 62% of Councils are remunerating their CEOs at levels consistent with these bands. A small percentage of Councils appear likely to be more than \$5000 above or below a band. More accurate estimates will

require that Councils review CEO remuneration components against the definitions set out by the Tribunal and that they confirm actual FBT obligations.

#### **Phased in Compliance**

102. Nevertheless, the Tribunal is acutely conscious that significant deviations from its minimum or maximum remuneration levels have the capacity to adversely impact Councils in terms of potential cost imposts or the loss of key staff. To this end, the Tribunal proposes to provide Councils with the capacity to phase in compliance with the relevant minimum or maximum remuneration over the next year. Where achievement of compliance involves increases, or reductions, that are greater than \$5,000 per annum, compliance should be achieved over a two year period.

#### **Frequency of Reviews**

103. The Tribunal proposes that the remuneration amounts incorporated in the proposed framework will be reviewed annually. While it recognises that the normal Local Government enterprise agreement approach is to link wage movements with consumer price movements, the Tribunal has declined to establish an automatic linkage of that nature. There are many organisations and occupations where CEO remuneration is not automatically tied to inflation and, particularly relative to Local Government, which is substantially funded by ratepayers, an absolute guarantee of inflation matching wage increases is not considered appropriate.

104. Independently of the remuneration amounts, the Tribunal has adopted the position that the bandings will be reviewed every two years, against each of the relevant criteria incorporated in the framework. These reviews will also provide an opportunity to review the remuneration framework.

#### **Opportunity to Comment**

105. The Tribunal has determined to provide a draft Determination consistent with this Report to give Councils and CEOs an opportunity to identify issues they consider may not have been adequately considered in the development of this remuneration framework.

106. Most Councils, Mayors and CEOs who have put views to the Tribunal, have asserted that their Council is unique or different. The Tribunal has adopted an approach which seeks to recognise this diversity, while meeting the specified objectives. Whilst the Tribunal has not limited the range of factors about which comments may be made, comments about the nature of the remuneration framework, or about potential implementation issues are particularly invited.

107. The Tribunal notes it arrived at a separate assessment for the District Council of Coober Pedy in September 2024 because of its unique circumstances (see Determination 4 of 2024). The application of the approach in the framework adopted in this Report results in a different maximum amount applicable to Coober Pedy. The Tribunal notes that the District Council of Coober Pedy, as the most remote Council and most differentiating Council, may wish to provide advice to the Tribunal about this approach.

108. Any responses to this invitation should be provided to the Tribunal by 12 March 2025. The Tribunal does not currently intend to provide extensions of time. A binding Determination will be issued soon after this date. The Tribunal expects that this final Determination will take effect from 1 January 2025, consistent with the advice it has already provided to Councils.

109. The adoption of this approach does not prohibit a Council from seeking an individual review of its banding. Councils with demonstrable concerns about the effect of their band allocation will be expected to provide information that establishes the basis for their position relative to other Councils. Requests of this nature should also identify the impact of the currently specified minimum and maximum amounts, in the context of the model that the Tribunal has outlined in this Report, rather than simply referring to traditional comparisons with other Councils.

#### Next Steps for Councils

110. The Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction nor desire to provide tax advice to Councils, relating to FBT, but notes different approaches to these issues and recommends that individual Councils review those approaches.
111. The Tribunal strongly urges elected members of Councils to seek from their staff a complete explanation of their current CEO remuneration against the component elements of the total remuneration which is explained in this Report and the draft Determination. Without such an understanding, there is a substantial risk that this Report could be misunderstood and misapplied because the component parts of a CEO's remuneration under the terms of a contract or even traditional reporting structure may differ from the approach adopted by the Tribunal. Further, the Tribunal's discussions with Mayors disclosed continuing potential for a misunderstanding of the legislative function of minimum and maximum remuneration levels.
112. As only a third of the Councils provided the Tribunal with position descriptions for their CEOs, Councils are urged to ensure that these descriptions exist and are in a form which facilitates the accurate assessment of performance. To the extent that some Councils may not be able to reach a consensus on CEO performance expectations, this is also essential.
113. Any objections to the draft Determination should include the current CEO remuneration components and movements since 2022/23 in accordance with the remuneration definitions set out in paragraph 68.
114. It is the responsibility of each Council to set CEO remuneration within the specified minimums and maximums.
115. The Tribunal anticipates that Councils will also consider the implications of remuneration adjustments for their CEOs, on the senior staff who report to their CEOs.
116. As the Tribunal has already noted, section 147(5) of the *Statutes Amendment (Local Government Review) Act 2021*, may impact on the requirement to comply with the specified minimum and maximum remuneration levels. Again, as the Tribunal has noted, that is a matter for those Councils to consider.







No. X of 2024

**DRAFT DETERMINATION OF THE REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL  
Minimum and Maximum Chief Executive Officer Remuneration**

**SCOPE OF DETERMINATION**

1. This Determination applies to Chief Executive Officers of Local Government Councils to whom section 99A of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) applies.
2. For the reasons provided in the accompanying report, The Municipal Council of Roxby Downs is not covered by this Determination.
3. This Determination is provided in draft form to enable consideration of it by Local Government Councils, CEOs, and any other interested parties with any submissions invited by close of business 12 March 2025.
4. Subject to revisions that the Tribunal may make, it is anticipated that a Determination in final form will be issued later in March 2025.

**MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM REMUNERATION**

5. In accordance with section 99A of the *Local Government Act 1999* (SA) (**LG Act**) the Remuneration Tribunal hereby determines the following rates of minimum and maximum remuneration for Chief Executive Officers of Local Government Councils in South Australia:

<b>Band</b>	<b>Total Remuneration Package</b>
Adelaide City Council	\$386,710 - \$458,557
1	\$353,839 - \$419,580
2	\$323,763 - \$383,916
3	\$296,243 - \$351,283
4	\$271,062 - \$321,424
5	\$248,022 - \$294,103
6	\$226,940 - \$269,104

Page 1 of 5

7	\$207,650 - \$246,230
8	\$190,000 - \$225,301

6. Remuneration figures are expressed on a total remuneration package basis as is detailed below:

Component	Definition
Monetary remuneration	Base salary (cash component).
Superannuation	Includes the statutory minimum employer contributions, any salary sacrifice component, and any additional payments made by a Council.
Annual Leave Loading	As defined in the relevant employment contract.
Additional Leave Entitlements	Dollar value of additional leave provided over and above statutory entitlement, except where this is provided to allow remotely based CEOs to travel to their hometown or capital city to commence / return from leave.
Bonuses	Dollar value of any bonuses or performance incentives, whether received in cash or kind.
Motor Vehicle	The value of the cash allowance or the private benefit value of the motor vehicle to the CEO using either the Prime Cost (depreciation), Operating Cost, or Statutory Formula in accordance with the ATO rules.  Must include FBT payable by the CEO.  Refer to: <a href="https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator">https://www.ato.gov.au/calculators-and-tools/fringe-benefits-tax-car-calculator</a>
Housing Allowance	The dollar value of any housing allowance or rental subsidy and associated FBT. Consistent with the ATO remote area fringe benefit tax requirements.  Note, designated remote areas are exempt from FBT – refer to: <a href="https://www.ato.gov.au/api/public/content/0-2f3d266d-5f78-4188-add6-f218387a0485?1730844950186">https://www.ato.gov.au/api/public/content/0-2f3d266d-5f78-4188-add6-f218387a0485?1730844950186</a>
Other Fees and Allowances	Includes, but not limited to, any or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School or childcare fees, including school uniforms</li> <li>• Newspaper/magazine/online subscriptions</li> <li>• Value of perquisites provided to the CEO i.e. memberships</li> <li>• Personal travel or any other benefit taken in lieu of salary by the CEO (and immediate family at the discretion of the council)</li> <li>• Health insurance</li> <li>• Any and all other allowances</li> <li>• Any other form of payment - cash or otherwise</li> <li>• Any Fringe Benefits Tax paid by council in respect of any of the above</li> </ul>
Total Remuneration Package (TRP)	The total of all the above components.

Page 2 of 5

7. For the avoidance of doubt, mobile telephones and portable computing equipment, fundamentally for work purposes, and professional development costs directly related to the performance of CEO duties and membership of professional associations are not included in the total remuneration package.
8. A list of Council groupings is included at attachment 1.
9. Any decision in relation to an annual increase for CEO remuneration within the bands set by the Tribunal remains a matter for each Council in accordance with section 99A(1) of the LG Act.
10. Councils have until 1 January 2026 to comply with the minimum and maximum remuneration amounts. Where achievement of compliance involves increases, or reductions, that are greater than \$5,000 per annum, compliance must be achieved by 1 January 2027.

**DATE OF OPERATION**

11. This Determination shall have operative effect on and from 1 January 2025.

DRAFT

## ATTACHMENT 1

Council	Band
City of Onkaparinga	1
City of Charles Sturt	1
City of Salisbury	1
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	1
City of Playford	1
City of Marion	2
City of Tea Tree Gully	2
City of Holdfast Bay	2
Alexandrina Council	2
City of West Torrens	3
City of Mitcham	3
Mount Barker District Council	3
City of Campbelltown	3
The Rural City of Murray Bridge	3
The Barossa Council	3
City of Unley	3
Copper Coast Council	3
City of Burnside	4
Adelaide Hills Council	4
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters	4
City of Mount Gambier	4
Yorke Peninsula Council	4
City of Whyalla	4
Town of Gawler	4
City of Victor Harbor	4
Light Regional Council	4
Kangaroo Island Council	4
Corporation of the City of Port Augusta	5
Wattle Range Council	5
Port Pirie Regional Council	5
Mid Murray Council	5
City of Prospect	5
District Council of Loxton Waikerie	5
City of Port Lincoln	5
Berri Barmera Council	5
Renmark Paringa Council	5
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	5
Adelaide Plains Council	5
District Council of Yankalilla	5
Tatiara District Council	6
Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council	6
Coorong District Council	6
Wakefield Regional Council	6
District Council of Grant	6
District Council of Coober Pedy	6
Lower Eyre Peninsula Council	6
Northern Areas Council	7
Regional Council of Goyder	7
District Council of Streaky Bay	7
District Council of Ceduna	7
Corporation of the Town of Walkerville	7
District Council of Franklin Harbour	7

Page 4 of 5

District Council of Mount Remarkable	7
Southern Mallee District Council	7
Kingston District Council	7
District Council of Robe	7
Barunga West Council	7
District Council of Tumby Bay	7
District Council of Cleve	7
Wudinna District Council	7
District Council of Kimba	7
The Flinders Ranges Council	7
District Council of Peterborough	7
District Council of Elliston	7
District Council of Karoonda East Murray	8
District Council of Orroroo Carrieton	8

DRAFT



<b>ITEM</b>	9.1.2
	<b>CEO REVIEW COMMITTEE</b>
<b>DATE</b>	18 February 2025
<b>HEADING</b>	CEO Key Performance Indicators February 2025
<b>AUTHOR</b>	John Harry, Chief Executive Officer, CEO and Governance
<b>CITY PLAN LINKS</b>	1.1 Our city has a diversity of housing that meets the needs of our community 3.2 Our city’s growth is well planned and supported by the integrated delivery of infrastructure 3.3 Our city centres are active and prospering
<b>SUMMARY</b>	This report provides a status update on progress towards achievement of adopted Key Performance Indicators for the Chief Executive Officer for the 2024/2025 performance review period.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

1. Notes the progress towards achievement of the 2024/2025 Key Performance Projects and Initiatives, as per Attachment 1 (Item 9.1.2, CEO Review Committee, 18 February 2025).

**ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments to this report.

**1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Employment Agreement provides that the CEO will undergo a performance review in accordance with the Personal Evaluation System in May each year for the Term of the Agreement.
- 1.2 In October 2024, the CEO Review Committee approved the proposed 2024/25 CEO Key Performance Indicators as tabled.  
Consultation / communication
- 1.3 Internal
  - 1.3.1 The Executive Group has been consulted regarding progress towards the achievement of the 2024/2025 Key Performance Indicators and Projects.

**2. REPORT**

- 2.1 This report provides an update on the 2024/25 CEO Key Performance Indicator Projects for review and endorsement by the CEO Performance Review Committee.

- 2.2 Feedback is sought from this Committee on any matters in relation to the key projects and any other feedback regarding CEO performance as part of this progressive review of status for inclusion into the KPI schedule.
- 2.3 The schedule has been prepared by the CEO following consideration of:
- The Council endorsed City Plan.
  - The ongoing delivery of City Centre initiatives
  - Council priorities towards the delivery of housing opportunities for vulnerable people
  - Longer term development of land west of Port Wakefield Road
  - Provision/development of social and recreational infrastructure across the City.

### **3. CONCLUSION / PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 It is considered that significant progress has been made in the delivery of the projects contained within the KPI schedule. However, it is also flagged that the delivery of a number of projects, particularly relating to strategic development, will be dependent upon external resourcing utilising consultant resourcing. Similarly, the schedule needs to have regard to parallel works being undertaken such as finalisation of club lease management.
- 3.2 The next consideration of Key Performance Indicators achievement will occur following the end of Quarter 3.



**CEO KPI STATUS REPORT UPDATE  
FEBRUARY 2025**

<b>City Development</b>	
Project 1: Walkley's Road redevelopment opportunity	
Description	Proposed residential development in Ingle Fam
Budget	\$42 million revenue \$23 million expenses (including new playground)
Status Update/Timeframe	Detailed design is being finalised. The planning application has now been verified and referrals have been released. It is anticipated that the development application will be presented to CAP in March/April 2025 with onsite works commencing by June 2025.
City Plan Link	Our urban growth is well planned and our centres are active We deliver quality outcomes that meet the needs of our community We engage meaningfully and our community is aware of Council initiatives

<b>City Development</b>	
Project 2: Construction commences on Lake Windemere residential development	
Description	35 allotment residential development in Salisbury North
Budget	\$5.12M revenue \$3.25M expenditure
Status Update/Timeframe	All allotments are now sold, with 80% settled. Construction of housing is expected to commence by February 2025. 31% of housing has been delivered at 10% below the State Government's gazetted affordable housing figure. The development is forecast to achieve a 47% uplift in net proceeds from original approved budget.
City Plan Link	Our urban growth is well planned and our centres are active We deliver quality outcomes that meet the needs of our community We engage meaningfully and our community is aware of Council initiatives

<b>City Development</b>	
Project 3: Contractual arrangements entered into for the sale/development of the Len Beadell site in the Salisbury City Centre	
Description	Contractual arrangements entered into for the sale/development of the Len Beadell site in the Salisbury City Centre
Budget	\$19.383M revenue \$20M multideck car park expenditure \$5M Church Street extension expenditure
Status Update/Timeframe	In April 2024 Council approved entering into a Land Facilitation Agreement with the preferred proponent on four sites within the City Centre including Len Beadell, Wiltshire car park, Sexton car park and the former Civic Centre site. Planning approval has been lodged for sites 1 and 2 (Len Beadell and Wiltshire car park) and construction is expected to commence before May 2025.
City Plan Link	Enhance the Salisbury City Centre by upgrading Church and John Streets and attracting investment by the private sector into surplus Council sites. Attract firms to Salisbury, providing job opportunities for residents.

<b>City Development</b>	
Project 4: Council endorsement final Sustainability Strategy	
Description	Sustainability Strategy 2035 – Climate Change Adaption Action Plan
Budget	
Status Update/Timeframe	<p>The Sustainability Strategy 2035 was adopted by Council in June 2023 and implementation is ongoing. Two progress reports have been provided to Council to date – in March and November 2024.</p> <p>The November 2024 report advised that 30 actions are on track, 16 actions are progressing, but scope or funding needs to be resolved, one action is complete and one action is very dependent on State Government partnership and funding.</p> <p>Key actions being progressed in 2024/25 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establishing organisational greenhouse gas emissions inventory reporting and development of an Emissions Reduction Action Plan, and</li> <li>• development of a Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan.</li> </ul>
City Plan Link	<p>Salisbury has a balance of green spaces and natural environments that support biodiversity</p> <p>We make the most of our resources including water, waste and energy</p> <p>Our community, environment and infrastructure are adaptive to a changing climate</p>

<b>City Development</b>	
Project 5: Review of Growth Action Plan and Economic Growth Strategy	
Description	Growth Action Plan and Economic Development Strategy
Budget	
Status Update/Timeframe	Draft Growth Action Plan and Economic Strategy will be presented to Council for approval in March/April 2025.
City Plan Link	<p>Salisbury's businesses are successful and part of our community</p> <p>Salisbury is a place of choice for businesses to start, invest and grow</p> <p>Our infrastructure supports investment and business activity</p> <p>Our urban growth is well planned and our centres are active</p>

<b>City Development</b>	
Project 6: Council response to GARP Report with specific regard to Strategic Land Development West of Port Wakefield Road	
Description	Initiation of Code Amendment for establishment of Eco/Industrial Precinct.
Budget	
Status Update/Timeframe	Aurecon has been engaged to commence investigations for the establishment of an Eco-Industrial Precinct. A report will be presented to Council in the second half of 2025 with the proposed next steps. Council has received endorsed response to DRAFT GARP initiative at Special Council in October 2024. CEO remains member of the North-Western Growth & Infrastructure Executive Steering Group.
City Plan Link	Our urban growth is well planned and our centres are active We deliver quality outcomes that meet the needs of our community We engage meaningfully and our community is aware of Council initiatives

<b>City Development</b>	
Project 7: Dry Creek Redevelopment - State Government / Private Sector Project	
Description	Redevelopment of Dry Creek site west of Port Wakefield Road (As per GARP report 2024).
Budget	
Status Update/Timeframe	Cross Government and Private Sector Steering Group and Working Group established in September 2022. Initial meetings were held in first half of 2023 and a set of principles was drafted. A Code Amendment proposal has been initiated by the Minister for Planning in November 2024 and investigations have started. CEO remains member of the North-Western Growth & Infrastructure Executive Steering Group.
City Plan Link	Our urban growth is well planned and our centres are active We deliver quality outcomes that meet the needs of our community We engage meaningfully and our community is aware of Council initiatives

<b>Community Development</b>	
Project 1:	
Description	<b>Deliver THRiVE Strategy Action Plans</b>
Budget	TBC
Status Update/Timeframe	<p><b>Salisbury Fit Club</b> is progressing and to be launched in Q3 and Q4 to introduce group exercise classes in public parks.</p> <p><b>Little Para Trail Maps</b> – investigations have commenced to digitalise our trails and sporting facilities via a digital web map to increase awareness and usage of our open space and sport clubs.</p> <p><b>Social and modified sports</b> – Three Walking Football Sessions have taken place as a Come and Try at Salisbury North Football Club in partnership with SANFL and ECH.</p> <p><b>Libraries Alive After Dark</b> - Continues three nights a week with consistent attendance for studying and quiet work.</p> <p><b>BiblioTrek</b> –is a program promoting nature activities through engagement with the Library service and promotion of outdoor spaces. In School Holidays more than 250 people participated.</p> <p><b>Burton Community Hub</b> – Repositioning as ‘Hive’ to provide Cost of Living Forums to the community.</p> <p><b>Thrive Action</b> Plan – as endorsed in November 2023 also includes other initiatives, including the Cost of Living response.</p>
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 2.1 – Our community’s wellbeing is prioritised.

<b>Community Development</b>	
Project 2:	
Description	<b>Foster ongoing engagement and strengthen relationships with First Nations people</b>
Budget	N/A
Status Update/Timeframe	Ongoing. New Chair is in place and Governance structure with new committee members is progressing. The Phoebe Wanganeen Scholarship report has been finalised. Report considered by Intercultural Sub Committee in Feb 2025.
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 3.3 – Our city is committed reconciliation and actively engages with First Nations people.

Community Development	
Project 3:	
Description	<b>Investigate and seek Council endorsement for provision of Housing to Vulnerable Groups</b>
Budget	N/A
Status Update/Timeframe	Ongoing – Through the Housing and Homelessness Working Group 5 suitable parcels of land have been identified that can be developed for housing vulnerable people. The EOI for the first parcel Bagster Rd, Salisbury North has gone out to market. Other ‘meanwhile’ uses to support homeless and vulnerable people have been explored and Renewal SA is yet to respond. ‘White Paper’ being prepared for Working Party in March 2025.
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 1.1 Our community’s most vulnerable are protected.

Community Development	
Project 4:	
Description	<b>Investigate/Implement strategies to support those most vulnerable in our community and to help relieve the cost of living pressures for our community</b>
Budget	Cost of Living pressures \$175K
Status Update/Timeframe	Ongoing. The Burton Community Hub has been opened as the HIVE - Burton Cost of Living Centre. This will offer support and capacity building activities to the community in the areas of Household Costs, Financial Literacy and Food Security. The Bagster Rd Community Centre has opened a new Toy Library for free community use. Negotiations with the Food Centre to establish and expand a social supermarket or pantry in our Council area are ongoing. Council endorsed approach in October 2024
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 1.1 – Our community’s most vulnerable are protected.

Community Development	
Project 5:	
Description	<b>Promote and facilitate use of the Salisbury Aquatic Centre, Tree Climb, recreation centres and golf course</b>
Budget	N/A
Status Update/Timeframe	Ongoing. <b>The Salisbury Aquatic Centre</b> has exceeded its KPIs with 963 gym memberships (+163 against KPI's) and 1028 swim school participants (+428) at the end of this quarter.  <b>The Little Para Golf Course</b> has sold 21%, 46% and 12% more driving range balls across October, November and December respectively than the prior year, with a total of 336,775 balls hit at the driving range this quarter. There were almost 6,000 rounds of golf sold this quarter which is up by 400 more than the prior year.

	<b>Tree Climb at Harry Bowey</b> opened in late December and has been well received by the community. Administration are working closely with the operator to ensure a smooth transition and to ensure service levels in the reserve are meeting community demand.
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 2.1 – Our community’s wellbeing is prioritised. 2.2 – Our open spaces and recreation centres support community wellbeing. 2.3 – Our community has access to health and community services.

### Community Development

Project 6:	
Description	<b>Provide opportunities for all life stages and abilities by engaging with our Youth and implementing the Ability Inclusion Strategic Plan (AISP)</b>
Budget	TBC
Status Update/Timeframe	Ongoing / On Track. The Youth Action Plan has been endorsed in October 2024. A new Youth Mental Health service will be launched at Twelve25 this quarter in partnership with Sonder.
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 3.1 – Our city provides opportunities for all life stages and abilities.

### Community Development

Project 7:	
Description	<b>Delivery of Updated (i) Social Infrastructure Plan and Future Strategy (ii) Open Space and Recreation Plan</b>
Budget	TBC
Status Update/Timeframe	The Social Infrastructure Plan and Future Strategy is nearing completion. It will be presented to a CEO briefing in Q3 24/25. The Open Space and Recreation Plan has commenced with a project scope and brief currently out to market for Stage 1.
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 3.1 – Our city provides opportunities for all life stages and abilities.

Business Excellence	
Project 1:	
Description	Business Transformation
Budget	As approved through the Business Transformation Future Fund by Council
Status Update/Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Project Connect phase 2 and commence Phase 3 modules for FY 24/25               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CRM implementation phase 2 – June 2025 – on schedule to be delivered</li> <li>- Employee Lifecycle – Onboarding and Performance Development Modules – June 2025 – on schedule to be delivered</li> <li>- Continue developing Bi modules and associated dashboards - Ongoing</li> <li>- Implement new Document Management system – November 2024 – the go live date has been moved to 31 March to allow update of Gov365 module (integration with MS Teams) and sufficient time to train staff on new system</li> <li>- Enhance the Procurement module – November 2024 – User acceptance training identified issues with functionality, requiring Go_live to be deferred to allow vendor to upgrade their system</li> </ul> </li> <li>Project Management – June 2025 – a review is being undertaken to assess the likelihood of meeting this timeframe               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Finance module – June 2025– a review is being undertaken to assess the likelihood of meeting this timeframe</li> <li>- Assist with the Pathway UX upgrade and optimise the Licensing and Compliance, Receipting and Property and Rates modules as part of Phase 3 work into 2025/26 - Pathway upgrade scheduled to go live in March 2025</li> <li>- Report to Business &amp; Innovation Committee re Status in Feb 2025</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
City Plan Link	Use technology so people can better access Council services Improve how we use data to better inform decision making

Business Excellence	
Project 2:	
Description	Technology & Digital Solutions
Budget	
Status Update/Timeframe	<p>Continue to deliver Cyber Enhancements – June 2025 – progress on increasing staff awareness of Cyber risks and continuing program to enhance system. Quarterly reports presented to the Audit &amp; Risk Committee IT Disaster Recovery Plan update and the creation of Cybersecurity Playbooks – March 2025 – on track to have a draft plan and playbooks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complete the installation and configuration of the data Back Up Solution – December 2024 - completed</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rollout of MS Telephony and Genesys Call Centre – February 2025 – Completed in January 2025</li> <li>- Rollout of Office 365 to all users – December 2024 - completed</li> <li>- Procurement and implementation of new solutions including volunteer management solution and Lab results solution March 2025 – assessment of volunteer mngt solution still in progress</li> <li>- Complete upgrading Wi-Fi at all Community Centres – June 2025 – on schedule</li> <li>- Supporting Business Transformation to deliver the outcomes for Project Connect, including document migration for Objective, Pathway UX upgrade, Finance 1 upgrade and configuration of CoS Data Lake Ongoing – progress continuing</li> </ul>
City Plan Link	Better use of technology.

Business Excellence	
Project 3:	
Description	Finance & Procurement
Budget	
Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of Efficiency Framework to monitor progress – June 2025 – not yet finalised</li> <li>- Support transition to new Finance, Procurement and Rates modules as part of Project Connect – delayed with review of system underway (Refer Business &amp; Innovation Committee Feb 2025)</li> <li>- Pre-ESCOSA Review Assessment – June 2025 – not yet commenced</li> <li>- Support for Strategic projects, City Centre &amp; Walkleys Property Development – timing aligned to project delivery – support provided as required</li> </ul>
Update/Timeframe	
City Plan Link	

Business Excellence	
Project 4:	
Description	Community Experience
Budget	
Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enhancements of Salesforce as part of Project Connect to deliver further features and Community Portal – June 2025 – in progress and on schedule</li> <li>- Develop and deliver a Community Experience Strategy that encompasses our approach to Community engagement – March 2025 – Executive sign off to progress this with revised timeframe of May 2025 for completion</li> <li>- Develop and deliver a Communications &amp; Marketing Strategy – June 2025</li> </ul>
Update/Timeframe	
City Plan Link	



Business Excellence	
Project 5:	
Description	People & Performance
Budget	
Status Update/Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop and commence implementation of a People Strategy – February 2025 – Strategy completed and rollout commenced</li> <li>- Support the implementation of the new employee lifecycle system to ensure it aligns to the People Strategy – aligned to Project Connect delivery – in progress</li> </ul>
City Plan Link	

Business Excellence	
Project 6:	
Description	Strategic Projects - CEO /Deputy CEO – Alternate Land Fill and Water Business Unit Development
Budget	
Status Update/Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the progression of the Alternate Landfill Project with NAWMA and constituent Councils – Ongoing/Outcome by June 2025 – continued support as part of Project Steering Group.</li> <li>- Consider and deliver a strategic approach to delivering a business model for a regional water and other sustainability priorities – March 2025 – work has progressed with the City of Playford to look at opportunities to leverage both water businesses in support of the growth occurring in the north.</li> </ul>
City Plan Link	

Business Excellence	
Project 7:	
Description	Financial Targets
Budget	Financial Indicators  Operating Surplus Target Range 0.5% - 5% Budget 2.4% Asset Renewal Funding Target Range 90% - 110% Budget 100% Net Financial Liabilities Target Range <70% Budget 59.4%
Status Update/Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> <li>- First Quarter Review Results – YE Fcsts:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Operating Surplus 2.45%</li> <li>o Asset Renewal Funding 137%</li> <li>o Net Financial Liabilities 56.27%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
City Plan Link	

City Infrastructure	
Project 1:	Little Para River Masterplan – Carisbrooke and Harry Bowey Reserve
Description	Development of a Little Para Masterplan and agreed priorities for Stage 1 of the Masterplan
Budget	
Status Update	A report was submitted to Council in December 2024 on the Little Para Landscape Structure Plan. Council approved the preparation of the plan and provided a budget of \$120,000 for the preliminary stages to occur in 2024/25. Project Brief has been prepared.
Timeframe	Landscape and Infrastructure Structure Plan prepared by June 2025.
City Plan Link	<p>A Welcoming and Liveable City</p> <p>2. Our community is physically and mentally healthy and connected.</p> <p>2.1 Our community's wellbeing is priorities.</p> <p>2.1.1 Deliver the Thrive Strategy and associated Action Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These programs include community-led small-scale projects, skills sharing, a Salisbury Fit Club, activating the Little Para River, digitalising our trails and recreation facilities, introducing modified sports, celebrating Salisbury's history, partnerships with non-Council organisations for volunteering opportunities, Libraries After Dark, Bibliotrek and a Cost of Living Strategy.</li> </ul>

City Infrastructure	
Project 2:	Strategic Asset Management Plan Review of Public Lighting Category
Description	Complete a review of public lighting throughout the Salisbury City Centre, at public transport interchanges and popular trails and identify opportunities for improvement where required
Budget	
Status Update	The Project Brief has now been finalised with the next step being the development of an improvement plan for submission to Council by June 2025.
Timeframe	June 2025
City Plan Link	<p>A Welcoming and Liveable City</p> <p>4. Our city is attractive and safe.</p> <p>4.1 Our public spaces, residential areas and environs are safe and inviting.</p> <p>4.1.1 Work with stakeholders to improve community safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes strategies to improve community safety in activity centres such as the Salisbury City Centre, public transport interchanges and popular trails.</li> <li>• Includes a review of lighting provisions in these areas as a way to make them feel more welcoming.</li> </ul>

City Infrastructure	
Project 3: School Transport Framework	
Description	Update the School Transport Framework in line with the transport safety strategy
Budget	
Status Update	The Transport Safety Strategy is being completed.  A review of the existing School Transport Framework to highlight key achievements and opportunities for improvement has commenced.
Timeframe	June 2025
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 4. Our city is attractive and safe. 4.1 Our public spaces, residential areas and environs are safe and inviting. 4.1.3 Improve safety of roads through the city around schools. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner with State and/or Federal Government to implement the School Transport Framework and general Road Safety Action Plan to improve safety on roads around or adjacent schools.</li> </ul>

City Infrastructure	
Project 4: Transport Safety Strategy	
Description	Develop a Transport Safety Strategy and have it endorsed by Council
Budget	
Status Update	Stage 1 of the Transport Safety Strategy, now known as the Safe Journey Strategy, is well underway with an update report provided to Council in December 2024.  Stage 1 involves identifying transport safety related issues through research, consultation, industry best practices, and a gap analysis to determine priorities for efficiency and road safety improvements.  Speed Induction Unit Trials around school zones have commenced.  A CEO Briefing will be held in March 2025 to provide further updates and advise of next steps leading to Stage 2 and the adoption of the Strategy by Council.
Timeframe	Strategy endorsed by Council by June 2025
City Plan Link	A Welcoming and Liveable City 4. Our city is attractive and safe. 4.1 Our public spaces, residential areas and environs are safe and inviting. 4.1.3 Improve safety of roads through the city around schools. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner with State and/or Federal Government to implement the School Transport Framework and general Road Safety Action Plan to improve safety on roads around or adjacent schools.</li> </ul>

City Infrastructure	
Project 5:	Urban Greening and Cooling Strategy
Description	Prepare an Urban Greening and Cooling Strategy
Budget	
Status Update	The Project Brief has now been finalised with an interim report to be submitted to the Urban Services Committee in March 2025
Timeframe	June 2025
City Plan Link	<p>A sustainable city</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our city's green spaces and natural environments are valued and biodiverse.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Our City is cooler and greener.                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.1 Strategically address cooling and greening across our city.                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed by Green Adelaide's Urban Greening Strategy and tree canopy data 2024, prepare an Urban Greening and Cooling Strategy that identifies approaches to response to urban heat that is specific to the City of Salisbury context.</li> <li>• Ensure that the planting palette chosen is appropriate to the urban landscape and acceptable to residents.</li> <li>• Continue to improve the amenity of streetscapes through the programmed renewal of street trees with more appropriate tree species for the space available within our city's streets.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>

City Infrastructure	
Project 6:	Biodiversity Management Plan
Description	Update the Biodiversity Management Plan and progressive establishment of biodiversity management plans for key sites
Budget	
Status Update	The Project Brief has now been finalised with an interim report to be submitted to the Urban Services Committee in March 2025
Timeframe	Management Plan updated June 2025
City Plan Link	<p>A sustainable city</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our city's green spaces and natural environments are valued and biodiverse.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2 Our city's biodiversity is protected.                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2.2 Improve biodiversity management across key corridors.                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the Biodiversity Corridors Action Plan 2010 (an action of the Sustainability Strategy).</li> <li>• Establish biodiversity management plans for key sites across the Council area.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>

City Infrastructure	
Project 7: Create an Organisational Energy Plan	
Description	Prepare an organisational energy plan for Council owned assets to address Scope 1 to Scope 3 emissions.
Budget	
Status Update	An Energy Audit for buildings and facilities will be going out to market shortly. Following this, consultant advice will be sourced to inform the procurement of future Energy Contracts.
Timeframe	June 2025
City Plan Link	<p>A sustainable city</p> <p>2. Our city and community are carbon responsible.</p> <p>2.1 Our city's emissions are reduced.</p> <p>2.1.1 Prepare and implement an emissions reduction plan for our operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes an Organisational Energy Plan that addresses energy efficiency, renewal energy, electric vehicle charges and fleet management.</li> </ul>

City Infrastructure	
Project 8: Infrastructure Planning for Growth Areas of Salisbury	
Description	Prepare network plans for Council infrastructure (Roads and Stormwater) in growth areas of our City aligned with the release of the final GARP in February 2025 and supported by State Government Infrastructure Plans.
Budget	
Status Update	<p>The two major stormwater management plans have been finalised, namely Greater Edinburgh Parks and Adams Creek Catchments, and have now been submitted to the Stormwater Management Authority for review.</p> <p>Negotiations continue with Department for Infrastructure and Transport and the City of Playford on road network requirements to accommodate expected growth.</p>
Timeframe	June 2025
City Plan Link	<p>A growing city that creates new opportunities</p> <p>2. Our city's growth is well planned and supported by the integrated delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>2.1 Our city's infrastructure (including Council-owned) is delivered with a long-term focus in an equitable and orderly way.</p> <p>2.1.1 Coordinate the delivery of stormwater solutions and road network upgrades for growth areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalise the Dry Creek, Little Para River, Greater Edinburgh Parks and Adams Creek Stormwater Management Plans and plan for other stormwater solutions.</li> <li>To be development ready, prepare stormwater solutions for large parcels of vacant land to ensure efficient delivery of Council resources and facilitate quality development outcomes.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be development ready, review and road systems, people and vehicle movement, hierarchy, current and project loads in preparation for residential and industrial growth areas across the Council area.</li> </ul>
--	---

City Infrastructure	
Project 9:	Review Council Integrated Transport Plan
Description	Update Council Integrated Transport Plan
Budget	
Status Update	The Project Brief has now been finalised with a Consultant engaged in preparation for Stakeholder engagement in March 2025.
Timeframe	Progressive Draft Strategy by June 2025
City Plan Link	<p>A growing city that creates new opportunities</p> <p>2. Our city's growth is well planned and supported by the integrated delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>2.2 Our city's transport networks are well planned for future growth.</p> <p>2.2.1 Review and public our transport plan to improve movement across the city, including our road network, paths and trails and modes of transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen east-west connections with a focus on the role of Kings Road.</li> <li>Ensure the transport network supports the growth of the north-west sector of the city.</li> </ul> <p>2.2.2 Update the integrated transport plan for the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and publish our transport plan to improve movement across the city, including our road network, paths and trails, and modes of transport.</li> <li>This includes reviewing opportunities to provide or upgrade existing cycling network and infrastructure, improving walkable neighbourhoods, planning for electric vehicles, and investigating alternative modes of transport such as micro-mobility initiatives and the Council's community bus service.</li> <li>Continue to collaborate with the State Government on providing well-connected public transport across the city, and improving the road network in alignment with the Northern Adelaide Transport Study and Greater Adelaide Regional Plan.</li> </ul>

City Infrastructure	
Project 10:	Update Council's Strategic Asset Management Plan
Description	Update Council's Strategic Asset Management Plan
Budget	
Status Update	Work is continuing on Sports Lighting, Bridges and Roads in preparation for the next revision of the Strategic Asset Management Plan.
Timeframe	March 2025
City Plan Link	<p>Innovation and Business Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our Council's services are delivered in an effective and efficient manner.</li> <li>1.2 Our financial and procurement frameworks and operations enable delivery of strategic priorities, financial sustainability, intergenerational equity, and value for money. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2.1 Prepare Strategic Asset Management Plans which ensure the sustainability of our infrastructure services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the Strategic Asset Management Plan and Long-Term Financial Plan, ensure that the development and enhancement of the city's infrastructure, assets and places are financially responsible, based on strategic priorities, equitable considerations, and in consultation with the community and relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>• Update the plans to ensure relevant alignment to other Council plans and strategic initiatives.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>