research
NEW ZEALAND

# Survey of Stakeholders' Perceptions of NZTA
# 2013 Survey Results – NZTA Report

June 2013

# Survey of Stakeholders' Perceptions of the NZTA
# 2013 Survey Results – NZTA Report


| | |
|---|---|
| PREPARED BY | Emanuel Kalafatelis and Joe Hedditch |
| CONTACT DETAILS | Emanuel Kalafatelis<br>Research New Zealand<br>Phone 04 499 3088<br>www.researchnz.com |
| PROJECT NUMBER | #4470 |

# Contents


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Contents | | 3 |
| 1.0 | Executive summary | 4 |
| 2.0 | Stakeholders' perceptions of their current relationship with the NZTA | 6 |
| 2.1 | Stakeholders' current relationship | 6 |
| 2.2 | Changes in the relationship with the NZTA | 7 |
| 3.0 | Stakeholders' satisfaction with their relationship with the NZTA | 8 |
| 3.1 | Stakeholders' satisfaction with their current relationship | 8 |
| 3.2 | Examples illustrating stakeholders' satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the relationship | 9 |
| 4.0 | Stakeholders' satisfaction with specific aspects of the relationship | 12 |
| 4.1 | Stakeholders' views on the manner in which the NZTA engages with their organisation | 12 |
| 4.2 | Stakeholders' views on the NZTA's 'attitude' to engagement with their organisation | 14 |
| 4.3 | Stakeholders' satisfaction with the NZTA's provision of strategic information | 17 |
| 4.4 | Stakeholders' satisfaction with the manner in which the NZTA makes decisions | 20 |
| 5.0 | Stakeholders' trust and confidence in the NZTA | 23 |
| 5.1 | Stakeholders' beliefs about the NZTA's performance | 23 |
| 5.2 | Stakeholders' trust and confidence in the NZTA | 25 |
| 6.0 | Stakeholders' beliefs about the type of relationship they would prefer to have with the NZTA in the future | 28 |
| 6.1 | Stakeholders' beliefs about the type of relationship they would like to have with the NZTA in the future | 28 |
| 6.2 | Stakeholders' beliefs about the steps that the NZTA could take to develop their 'ideal' relationship | 29 |

# 1.0 Executive summary

This report presents the results of the 2013 Survey of Stakeholders' Perceptions of the NZTA. This is the second year in which the survey has been conducted, and therefore results for 2013 are compared against those of the Baseline Survey of 2012.

## Introduction & objectives

The 2013 survey was conducted using a mixed methodology. While the majority of stakeholders were again invited to participate online, selected stakeholders were offered the opportunity to participate in a more qualitative discussion, conducted by telephone or face-to-face.

This year, for the first time, Iwi were invited to complete the survey as a stakeholder group. The responses from Iwi stakeholders effectively establish a baseline for this group.

The online survey was open and interviews were held during April 2013. By the final close-off date, a sample of n=397 stakeholders had completed the survey, representing a response rate of 37 percent. This is an average rate for predominantly online surveys[1]. At an organisation level, the response rate was 47 percent. 224 organisations provided at least one response to the survey.

The purpose of the survey is to:

1. Measure stakeholders' current perceptions of their relationship with the NZTA; and to monitor and evaluate any changes in perceptions since the Baseline Survey.

2. Identify specific areas of focus to improve stakeholders' perceptions of their relationship with the NZTA.

## Summary of survey results

### Overview of 2013 results compared to the 2012 Baseline Survey

Across most of the measures of stakeholder perceptions which are included in the survey, the NZTA's performance has either remained consistent or has improved between the Baseline Survey, conducted in May 2012, and the most recent survey carried out in April 2013. Importantly, the NZTA's stakeholder engagement does not appear to have deteriorated in any of these measures of performance.

[1] A detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in the appendices of this report.

Among some stakeholder groups, particularly Local Government stakeholders, overall levels of satisfaction with the relationship and stakeholders' trust and confidence in the NZTA have both improved significantly year on year.

While there have been some significant gains, some areas of potential improvement remain evident. As observed in the Baseline Survey, the timeliness of the NZTA's decision-making continues to receive some negative ratings, and many stakeholders believe the agency could demonstrate a greater understanding of their constraints and limitations, and also of the implications of the decisions it makes.

Qualitative interviews with selected key stakeholders, conducted for the first time in 2013, have highlighted some real success stories in terms of how strong relationships can be developed, along with some constructive feedback on how relationships might be improved in future. One of the resounding messages from these interviews is that efforts must continue to be applied – the task of achieving a strong stakeholder relationship is not a 'one-off job'.

# Presentation of results in this report

The results of this survey are presented by six distinct groups of stakeholders; namely Central Government, Local Government, Suppliers, Industry, Lobby Groups and Iwi.

Iwi stakeholders were included in the survey for the first time this year, and their results are therefore presented for 2013 only. The majority of responses from iwi stakeholders came from interviews, and included only the key scale questions from the online survey. Results for iwi stakeholders therefore only appear in the tables relating to these questions. The overall response rate from this group was low.

Only statistically significant changes in results between surveys are quoted in the commentary of this report.

## Report sections

The results are presented in the following sections:

2. Stakeholders' perceptions of their current relationship with the NZTA.

3. Stakeholders' satisfaction with their relationship with the NZTA.

4. Stakeholders' satisfaction with specific aspects of their relationship with the NZTA.

5. Stakeholders' trust and confidence in the NZTA.

6. Stakeholders' beliefs about the type of relationship they would like to have with the NZTA.

7. Stakeholders' beliefs about the steps that the NZTA could take to develop their 'ideal' relationship.

# 2.0 Stakeholders' perceptions of their current relationship with the NZTA

This section of the report presents the results to survey questions which measured stakeholders' perceptions of their current relationship with the NZTA.

## 2.1 Stakeholders' current relationship

Stakeholders' perceptions of their current relationship with the NZTA were measured using the five relationship states in the NZTA's partnering continuum[2]:

1. Coexistence. Stakeholders know about each other but do not need to come together; not dependency or need to collaborate.

2. Networking. Stakeholders' relationship is based on information-sharing; establishing and maintaining relationships; and about knowing and understanding who is doing what.

3. Cooperation. Relationship is based on the acknowledgement of common issues, interests or agendas; and could involve helping another organisation achieve its project, task, etc.

4. Collaboration. Relationship is based on negotiated and agreed actions; and shared decision-making.

5. Partnership. Relationship involves a commitment to sharing values, risks and rewards, resources, accountability, visions and ideas, and decision-making. Processes, systems and mechanisms are developed to support the partnership.

Stakeholders were asked to describe their current relationship with the NZTA against the agency's partnering continuum. In doing so, they were given a full description of each of the five relationship states. As observed in the Baseline Survey, stakeholders' evaluation of their current relationship with the NZTA is varied and in part reflects the type of stakeholder that they are (Table 7).

Overall responses to this question were largely consistent between surveys. The only significant change is that one in five Central Government stakeholders (22 percent) described the relationship as "cooperation" in 2013 – up from six percent in 2012.

Central Government stakeholders were the most likely to categorise their relationship as either "collaboration" or "partnership" (68 percent), while Iwi stakeholders (33 percent) were least likely to do so.

[2] These states are based on the work of Craig & Courtney (2004) *Potential of partnership*, Waitakere City Council and Local Partnerships and Governance Research Group, Auckland.

Table 1: Stakeholders' current relationship with the NZTA

*Q. Using the following scale, which one of the following best describes the type of relationship your organisation currently has with the NZTA?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | | Iwi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Base = | 54 | 32 | 152 | 127 | 110 | 136 | 38 | 10** | 31 | 33 | 12** |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Coexistence | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Networking | 9 | 22 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 20 | 6 | 6 | 17 |
| Cooperation | 22 | 6 | 33 | 23 | 21 | 24 | 50 | 10 | 45 | 55 | 25 |
| Collaboration | 24 | 34 | 32 | 40 | 50 | 42 | 24 | 30 | 32 | 15 | 8 |
| **Partnership** | **44** | **38** | **27** | **29** | **12** | **16** | **18** | **40** | **16** | **24** | **25** |
| Don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

## 2.2 Changes in the relationship with the NZTA

Within three of the stakeholder groups, namely Local Government, Suppliers and Iwi stakeholders, the majority of respondents believe their relationship with the NZTA has stayed the same in the last 12 months. However, within these groups, the proportion of respondents stating that the relationship has "improved" (27 to 33 percent) significantly outweighs the proportion stating it has "taken a backward step" (zero to 12 percent, Table 8).

In the case of Central Government, Industry and Lobby Groups, large proportions of stakeholders believe the relationship has improved (42 to 58 percent).

There were no significant changes between surveys at a stakeholder group level.

Table 2: Changes in the relationship with the NZTA

*Q. In the last 12 months, would you say your organisation's relationship with the NZTA has …?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | | Iwi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Base = | 54 | 32 | 152 | 127 | 110 | 136 | 38 | 10** | 31 | 33 | 12** |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Improved | 48 | 44 | 32 | 29 | 27 | 21 | 58 | 40 | 42 | 30 | 33 |
| Stayed much the same | 46 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 60 | 61 | 37 | 60 | 42 | 58 | 67 |
| Taken a backward step | 2 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 |
| Don't know | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

# 3.0 Stakeholders' satisfaction with their relationship with the NZTA

This section of the report presents the results to survey questions which measured stakeholders' satisfaction with their current relationship with the NZTA.

## 3.1 Stakeholders' satisfaction with their current relationship

With the exception of Iwi stakeholders, one-half or more of all stakeholders in all groups stated they are satisfied with their current relationship with the NZTA (Table 9).

Results for the 2013 survey are largely consistent with those of the Baseline Survey, however satisfaction ratings have improved significantly for Local Government stakeholders year on year. Sixty-two percent reported being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" in 2013, up from 50 percent in the Baseline Survey. This is reflected in improved ratings from Local Government stakeholders in relation to a number of aspects of the relationship, examined later in this report.

Significant proportions of satisfied stakeholders can be found in all groups, although Suppliers (54 percent) and Iwi (42 percent) were the groups which were least likely to report being satisfied.

Across the six groups, between seven percent (Central Government) and 18 percent (Suppliers) of stakeholders reported being dissatisfied with the current relationship. Consistent across all groups, around one in four stakeholders provided a neutral response.

Table 3: Stakeholders' satisfaction with their current relationship with the NZTA

*Q. Overall, how satisfied are you with the current relationship your organisation has with the NZTA?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | | Iwi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Base = | 54 | 32 | 152 | 127 | 110 | 136 | 38 | 10** | 31 | 33 | 12** |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Very dissatisfied | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Dissatisfied | 7 | 6 | 12 | 21 | 14 | 17 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 15 | 8 |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 26 | 31 | 23 | 26 | 28 | 36 | 24 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 42 |
| Satisfied | 41 | 41 | 40 | 36 | 41 | 35 | 37 | 20 | 35 | 39 | 42 |
| Very satisfied | 22 | 22 | 22 | 14 | 13 | 8 | 32 | 50 | 29 | 24 | 0 |
| **Total 'satisfied'** | **63** | **63** | **62** | **50** | **54** | **43** | **69** | **70** | **64** | **63** | **42** |
| Don't know | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

## 3.2 Examples illustrating stakeholders' satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the relationship

Stakeholders were invited to give actual examples of their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with their current relationship with the NZTA.

### Respondents who are "very satisfied" or "satisfied"

As observed in the 2012 survey, common themes appearing within these positive examples include a sense of collaboration between the NZTA and the stakeholder (either at a specific project level or in general), and the support of NZTA staff.

> We have a free-flowing communications channel. Questions go back and forward between us and the NZTA. […] They respond promptly to our questions. *(Iwi)*

> *Field staff visit me on a frequent enough basis to know what is occurring but not so often as to be overbearing. The advice given is always beneficial and they assist me greatly in dealing with NZTA deadlines and reporting requirements. (Local Government).*

Opportunities for strategic input or engagement, and evidence that the NZTA is listening to stakeholders' views were also frequently identified as contributing factors in 2013.

> *The working party organised by [name] to address issues regarding take up of HPMV has achieved more in 12 months than previous 3 years. (Industry)*

*Listened to our organisation's concern on LTMA bill and worked with us to make changes. (Lobby Group)*

Like last year, regular communication and/or engagement was also deemed to be a factor contributing to satisfaction.

*Frequent engagement. Important projects initiated or in review. (Industry)*

*Good communication line established through monthly program meetings. (Local Government)*

## Respondents who are "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied"

Themes which appear frequently in the examples provided by dissatisfied stakeholders are:

- Insufficient communication, consultation or engagement.

  *There has been one courtesy contact from NZTA with the planning department in the last 7 years, other than that all contact has been initiated from planning staff on specific issues. Little or no engagement from NZTA in important planning processes. (Local Government)*

  *There is a fixation by NZTA with only operating at a 'high level' - being 'Mayors, Chairs & CEs' which creates information problems for the staff within those organisations who do the groundwork to support and advise those officials. Important correspondence sent solely to the Chair of our RTC, rather than being copied to the officers who need to deal with it. Meetings being held directly with elected councillors without the knowledge/presence of the officers who advise them. (Local Government)*

- Disagreement with the NZTA's decisions or priorities.

  *The lack of understanding of the contracting industry which works for NZTA. They are going to reduce the number of contractors who work for them from hundreds to 5. Surely this is not going to encourage competition and competitive pricing. (Suppliers)*

  *Funding provided is insufficient to meet the needs of our network. (Local Government)*

- Stakeholders' views not being given appropriate consideration.

  *Mock VLR consultation: no genuine evaluation of our submissions. (Supplier)*

  *Lack of respect shown to my organisation in considering a request. Lack of urgency given to that request, and to actioning that request. (Local Government)*

- Delays in providing information.

  *We were taking forward a joint project and it took considerable effort and nearly a month before we were provided with any information on what was happening on the project. (Central Government)*

  *Delay in procurement programme for M&O contracts, making it difficult to resource and plan future resource needs. (Supplier)*

# 4.0 Stakeholders' satisfaction with specific aspects of the relationship

This section of the report presents the results to survey questions which measured stakeholders' satisfaction with specific aspects of their current relationship with the NZTA, namely: the manner in which the agency engages with their organisation; the NZTA's 'attitude' to engagement with their organisation; the NZTA's provision of strategic information; and the manner in which the NZTA makes decisions.

## 4.1 Stakeholders' views on the manner in which the NZTA engages with their organisation

Stakeholders' opinions on the manner in which the NZTA engages with their organisation were measured using a series of agreement statements. Table 10 presents the aggregated results to this question, combining the responses of those who 'agree' or 'strongly agree' with each statement, and also combining 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' responses. Neutral and 'don't know' responses have been excluded. The key findings are as follows:

For most stakeholder groups, the NZTA is continuing to perform well with respect to making it clear to stakeholders what it wants from them when engaging in discussions. Between 61 percent and 81 percent of stakeholders agree that the NZTA currently does this.

More than half of the stakeholders in all groups also agree that the NZTA:

- *Engages with us in a coordinated way*
- *Makes good use of existing sector/industry channels to engage with us*
- *Clearly identifies who we should approach within the NZTA on matters that are of importance to us.*

When analysed at a stakeholder group level, there have been two significant changes since the Baseline Survey:

- In 2013 Central Government stakeholders were less likely to agree that the NZTA *engages with us in a coordinated way* (51 percent, down from 69 percent in 2012)
- In 2013 Local Government stakeholders were more likely to agree that the NZTA *makes good use of existing sector/industry channels to engage with us* (70 percent, up from 61 percent in 2012).

Table 4: Stakeholders' opinions on the manner in which the NZTA engages with their organisation

*Q. The following set of statements relate to the manner in which the NZTA currently engages with your organisation. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements? The NZTA...*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Base = | 53 | 32 | 145 | 127 | 110 | 136 | 36 | 10** | 27** | 33 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| *Engages with us in a coordinated way* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 23 | 9 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 23 | 11 | 10 | 19 | 18 |
| Agree | 51 | 69 | 67 | 61 | 59 | 57 | 67 | 80 | 70 | 76 |
| *Makes it clear to us what it wants from us when it engages with us in discussions* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 2 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 0 |
| Agree | 81 | 75 | 72 | 65 | 66 | 59 | 61 | 80 | 74 | 70 |
| *Makes good use of existing sector/industry channels to engage with us* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 15 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 19 | 0 |
| Agree | 68 | 66 | 70 | 61 | 59 | 62 | 69 | 80 | 67 | 55 |
| *Clearly identifies who we should approach within the NZTA on matters that are of importance to us* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 8 | 9 | 12 | 17 | 19 | 26 | 19 | 20 | 26 | 21 |
| Agree | 68 | 81 | 64 | 67 | 54 | 48 | 58 | 70 | 63 | 48 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

Stakeholders were also invited to provide commentary to clarify or expand on the way they had rated the NZTA in terms of the manner in which it engaged with their organisation.

Around one in five comments were positive; many of which compared the NZTA favourably against other government organisations.

> *NZTA sets a gold standard in terms of industry engagement. (Lobby Group)*

> *NZTA is very proactive and in my view a model for other government agencies to follow in the way they engage with industry. There could perhaps be better clarification on whom, within NZTA, to approach on some issues but this is a very minor issue. (Supplier)*

The most common themes emerging from the more negative comments were as follows.

- Lack of communication or co-ordination between NZTA departments or offices.

> *Again, disjoint between National and Regional Offices. Policies are being rushed, which means they are continually being redone, leading to churn for regions. (Local Government)*

> *Lack of co-ordination around all the areas that impact on a project outcome. (Central Government)*

> *It is often very difficult to understand such a complex organisation as NZTA, to the point where NZTA officers themselves often disagree about internal approval procedures and personnel. (Supplier)*

- Responsibility or accountability within the NZTA is not clear.

  *It is hard to find the person responsible for decisions. (Lobby Group)*

  *NZTA organisation chart showing responsibilities would be useful. (Lobby Group)*

- More engagement is needed.

  *NZTA's initiative in engaging is relatively limited. It requires a prompt from us, although it's getting better. (Central Government)*

  *There is a lack of local engagement in the early stages of consideration of some proposals. A reluctance to change when local views disagree, and a degree of arrogance towards local views and priorities. (Local Government)*

## 4.2 Stakeholders' views on the NZTA's 'attitude' to engagement with their organisation

Stakeholders' opinions on the NZTA's 'attitude' to engagement with their organisation were also measured using a series of agreement statements. Table 11 presents the aggregated results to this question.

As observed in the Baseline Survey, the majority of stakeholders agree that the NZTA *acknowledges our organisation's role and responsibilities* (from 67 percent of Suppliers and Lobby Groups to 83 percent of Central Government).

In all other aspects of the NZTA's attitude to engagement, responses vary significantly between stakeholder groups. On the whole, Central Government stakeholders responded most favourably while Suppliers responded least favourably.

Some significant improvements were observed in the 2013 survey, when compared to the Baseline Survey.

- Central Government stakeholders were significantly more likely to agree that the NZTA *seeks our opinion about issues of common interest and concern* (81 percent, up from 62 percent) and that the NZTA *genuinely listens to our point of view* (74 percent, up from 59 percent).

- Reflecting their increased satisfaction overall, Local Government stakeholders were significantly more likely to agree that the NZTA *seeks our opinion about issues of common interest and concern* (74 percent, up from 58 percent) and that the NZTA *understands our aims and goals* (73 percent, up from 64 percent).

However, two areas which require further improvement remain evident in 2013. Aspects of the NZTA's attitude to engagement which achieved relatively low agreement levels ratings for most groups, in both surveys, are:

- *Understand the constraints and limitations under which we operate*; and
- *Genuinely listens to our point of view*.

Table 5: Stakeholders' opinions on the NZTA's 'attitude' to engagement with their organisation

*Q. The following set of statements relate to the attitude that the NZTA brings to engagement with your organisation. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Base = | 53 | 32 | 145 | 127 | 110 | 136 | 36 | 10** | 27** | 33 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| *Acknowledges our organisation's role and responsibilities* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 6 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 0 |
| Agree | 83 | 81 | 86 | 82 | 67 | 68 | 78 | 80 | 67 | 91 |
| *Understands our aims and goals* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 6 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 21 | 22 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 0 |
| Agree | 66 | 72 | 73 | 64 | 50 | 47 | 61 | 50 | 67 | 82 |
| *Understands the constraints and limitations under which we operate* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 13 | 12 | 18 | 20 | 28 | 29 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 12 |
| Agree | 53 | 53 | 64 | 57 | 43 | 35 | 53 | 60 | 59 | 64 |
| *Seeks our opinion about issues of common interest and concern* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 4 | 19 | 10 | 17 | 15 | 23 | 11 | 10 | 26 | 6 |
| Agree | 81 | 62 | 74 | 58 | 53 | 46 | 75 | 70 | 63 | 64 |
| *Genuinely listens to our point of view* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 9 | 6 | 18 | 17 | 21 | 26 | 11 | 30 | 30 | 3 |
| Agree | 74 | 59 | 53 | 53 | 48 | 42 | 64 | 60 | 52 | 58 |
| *Acknowledges the value our organisation brings to discussions* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 8 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 15 | 22 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 3 |
| Agree | 74 | 72 | 61 | 59 | 55 | 48 | 53 | 60 | 59 | 67 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

Stakeholders were also invited to provide commentary to clarify or expand on the way they had rated the NZTA in terms of its 'attitude' to engagement with their organisation.

The most common themes emerging from comments were as follows.

- The NZTA has not genuinely listened.

  *We often feel that NZTA staff listen politely but don't hear what we are concerned about. (Local Government)*

  *Consultation and seeking of views is generally process-driven and certainly not genuine enquiry or consideration of our views. (Lobby Group)*

- There is a lack of consultation, dialogue or direct engagement.

  *There is no engagement, and therefore little understanding of what the direction of planning is for the city. (Local Government)*

*Individuals do, but collectively NZTA is poor in this area. Often it is not until after an issue occurs that dialogue gets underway to resolve something that could have been avoided if dialogue was undertaken earlier. (Industry)*

- Attitudes vary among NZTA staff and depending on the situation.

  *The degree of acknowledgement/understanding can vary across NZTA (functionally and geographically), though generally positive. (Central Government)*

  *The reasons for these neutral responses reflect both good and bad experiences. (Local Government)*

- The NZTA does not understand our business/sector.

  *Timing of various issues indicates a lack of understanding of TLA processes and timeframes. It appears that, on some occasions, less than genuine notice is taken of TLA consultation. Such as that for the HNO review, where the outcome seemed predetermined and has significantly reduced the options for collaboration/partnering with NZTA. "Do it my way or no way". (Local Government)*

  *There is no engagement, and therefore little understanding of what the direction of planning is for the city. (Local Government)*

A small number of positive comments were also provided, along with indications that the relationship is improving with regard to the NZTA's attitude to engagement.

*We have a collaborative approach and at times roles and responsibilities will change ... we both have to work at keeping up with the play - and in my work with NZTA we keep each other informed and up-to-date extremely well. (Central Government)*

*Our assistance is more often being sought and our input is appreciated, but until recently consultation appeared only to be done as an afterthought. For example, we would only be asked to comment on a finalised process or project, rather than having our views considered during the development stage. (Supplier)*

## 4.3 Stakeholders' satisfaction with the NZTA's provision of strategic information

Stakeholders' opinions on the NZTA's provision of strategic information were also measured using a series of agreement statements. Table 12 presents the aggregated results to this question.

At least 70 percent of stakeholders in all groups agree that the NZTA shares information to ensure they are well briefed.

While the majority of stakeholders also agree that the NZTA *provides our organisation with information that is clear and consistent* (63 to 70 percent) and *provides information in a timely fashion* (53 to 72 percent), considerable levels of disagreement remain among Suppliers, Industry and Lobby Group stakeholders.

Between surveys, there have been a number of significant improvements:

- Again reflecting their increased levels of overall satisfaction, in 2013 Local Government stakeholders were more likely to agree that:
  - the NZTA *shares information with our organisation to ensure we are well briefed* (88 percent, up from 76 percent in 2012); and
  - the NZTA *provides information in a timely fashion* (62 percent, up from 48 percent)
- In 2013, Central Government stakeholders were more likely to agree that the NZTA *provides information in a timely fashion* (72 percent, up from 53 percent)
- Suppliers were more likely to agree that the NZTA *provides our organisation with information that is clear and consistent* (66 percent, up from 52 percent in 2012).

Table 6: Stakeholders' satisfaction with the provision of strategic information

*Q. Outlined below are some statements about the information that the NZTA currently provides your organisation with. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Base = | 53 | 32 | 145 | 127 | 110 | 136 | 36 | 10** | 27** | 33 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| *Shares information with our organisation to ensure we are well briefed on relevant matters* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 6 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 18 | 14 | 10 | 15 | 6 |
| Agree | 79 | 75 | 88 | 76 | 71 | 62 | 81 | 70 | 74 | 76 |
| *Provides our organisation with information that is clear and consistent* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 11 | 3 | 12 | 20 | 17 | 24 | 17 | 10 | 22 | 12 |
| Agree | 68 | 72 | 70 | 63 | 66 | 52 | 69 | 70 | 63 | 64 |
| *Provides information in a timely fashion, with enough time for us to consider and respond to it if necessary* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 13 | 9 | 16 | 28 | 21 | 24 | 28 | 10 | 22 | 27 |
| Agree | 72 | 53 | 62 | 48 | 56 | 50 | 53 | 50 | 67 | 61 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

Stakeholders were also invited to provide commentary to clarify or expand on the way they had rated the NZTA in terms of its provision of strategic information.

One in five comments were positive, and suggested that there is currently a good level of communication and information provision from the NZTA.

> *NZTA staff generally keep us well informed with information through [name] meetings and regular one-on-one meetings. (Local Government)*

> *NZTA is improving the manner in which, and the type of information, it is sharing with [organisation name]. Strong, positive strides have been made recently to better understand [our] needs. (Central Government)*

Largely in line with the findings of the 2012 survey, the most common themes emerging from the more negative comments were:

- Communication is not timely.

> *We often find out about big safety investments too late to impact them to get better spend for us. (Local Government)*

> *For the third statement the negative response relates to NZTA's consultants not providing approvals in a timely fashion. (Supplier)*

- There is insufficient communication or information provision.

> *We do not receive information that is relevant to our region. The information we do receive is of little value and we do not have enough information to make business decisions about our future. (Supplier)*

*We still need to research the law and rule-changes ourselves, as they are not forthcoming with these changes. (Lobby Group)*

- Not all information is shared or there is a lack of transparency.

  *There is a willingness in some parts of NZTA to provide information, but in others (especially related to road project teams) there is a reluctance. This may be due to a culture of overprotectiveness, secrecy and suspicion. There is also the problem that information cannot be located because of the lack of record keeping and data/documentation control. (Supplier)*

  *Information is shared through the formal [group] mechanism and this is consistently clear, timely etc. [This] is only a snap shot. Not sure all information is provided. (Central Government)*

- Messages are not consistent.

  *Information-sharing and consistency of message need a lot of work. Information from National Office is often inconsistent with what regional office advises and vice versa. There need to be clear chains of communication - it appears that internally the communication is lacking. (Local Government)*

## 4.4 Stakeholders' satisfaction with the manner in which the NZTA makes decisions

Stakeholders' opinions on the manner in which the NZTA makes decisions were also measured using a series of agreement statements. Table 13 presents the aggregated results to this question.

The manner in which the NZTA makes decisions remains a particularly low-scoring area of stakeholder satisfaction in 2013. There have been no significant changes in this area between surveys.

For most of the attributes tested, between 30 and 60 percent of the stakeholders in each group agreed that the NZTA currently performs in the desired ways.

Starting with the most negatively rated aspect of the NZTA's performance, less than half of the stakeholders in all categories agree that the NZTA understands the implications of its decision-making on stakeholder organisations.

Among Local Government, Suppliers, Industry and Lobby Groups, there is considerable disagreement that the NZTA *makes decisions in a timely manner* (between 26 and 31 percent disagree).

There is also room for improvement with regard to ensuring stakeholders know the decisions it makes as early as possible, and clearly explaining the decisions it makes – particularly for Suppliers and Lobby Group stakeholders.

Table 7: Stakeholders' satisfaction with the manner in which the NZTA makes decisions

*Q. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements that describe the way the NZTA makes decisions?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 |
| Base = | 53 | 32 | 145 | 127 | 110 | 136 | 36 | 10** | 27** | 33 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| *Makes decisions in a timely manner* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 6 | 16 | 26 | 35 | 29 | 29 | 31 | 20 | 30 | 39 |
| Agree | 57 | 62 | 47 | 39 | 38 | 40 | 39 | 50 | 41 | 24 |
| *Ensures we know the decisions it makes as early as possible* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 8 | 22 | 13 | 23 | 19 | 24 | 25 | 10 | 33 | 27 |
| Agree | 53 | 38 | 56 | 51 | 49 | 41 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 39 |
| *Clearly explains the decisions it makes* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 11 | 6 | 14 | 18 | 22 | 25 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 24 |
| Agree | 64 | 53 | 61 | 51 | 45 | 44 | 61 | 60 | 48 | 45 |
| *Understands the implications of its decision-making on our organisation* | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree | 13 | 38 | 23 | 31 | 42 | 40 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 36 |
| Agree | 40 | 41 | 43 | 36 | 30 | 24 | 42 | 50 | 37 | 36 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

Stakeholders were also invited to provide commentary to clarify or expand on the way they had rated the NZTA in terms of the manner in which it made decisions.

Very few positive comments were provided, however some stakeholders acknowledged improvements that the NZTA makes decisions.

> *NZTA is often inconsistent - this is somewhat understandable given the wide range of responsibilities, and the even wider range of options available to NZTA staff in discharging responsibilities. Overall I think they are not bad, and improving. (Industry)*

> *NZTA strikes me as an organisation that can take difficult decisions, and front up even when those decisions are not popular. That said, I think it gets the right balance and is prepared to listen to the views of others before taking a stance, including ours. (Central Government)*

As was the case in 2012, the criticism raised most frequently by stakeholders in 2013 is that the NZTA's decision-making is not timely. Such comments were provided by stakeholders in all groups.

> *The issue here could well be a result of resources/workloads within NZTA. However, there is an impact on councils' ability to plan and report. (Local Government)*

> *Due to the size and varying functions of NZTA, the time it takes to get an official collective NZTA position can either cause delays or [we] have to factor in longer-than-ideal timing. (Central Government)*

Another theme of negative comments is that the NZTA does not understand the implications of its decisions. This also reflects 2012 results.

> *NZTA is government-focused, not really understanding the implications or recognising them at a local level. (Local Government)*

> *It would be good to have more commercial conversations for mutual benefit, as the financial impacts of different approaches are not always fully understood. (Suppliers)*

Some stakeholders in 2013 also stated that there is inconsistency in the NZTA's decision-making.

> *Different parts of the NZTA organisation perform at different levels of effectiveness. (Industry)*

> *Again quite regionally different in culture and process, etc. The centre is, as is expected in government departments in the past, rather bureaucratic and arguably out of touch with their regions in some issues, but this is improving little by little. (Suppliers)*

# 5.0 Stakeholders' trust and confidence in the NZTA

This section of the report presents the results to survey questions which measured stakeholders' trust and confidence in the NZTA. This includes stakeholders' beliefs about the performance of the agency in terms of its strategic goals.

## 5.1 Stakeholders' beliefs about the NZTA's performance

Based on their recent contact with the NZTA and their knowledge of the agency, stakeholders were invited to comment on the progress they believed it was making towards the achievement of its strategic goals. Table 14 (overleaf) presents the aggregated results to this question, combining the responses of those who 'agree' or 'strongly agree' with each statement, and also combining 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' responses. Neutral and 'don't know' responses have been excluded. The wording of several statements was amended in 2013, and therefore direct comparison with the 2012 results is not recommended for those statements.

The key findings are as follows:

- The majority of stakeholders agree with the following statements about the NZTA's performance:
  - *Works to provide transport users with positive travel experiences that are increasingly safe and efficient*
  - *Plans and invests in transport networks, from state highways and local roads, to public transport, rail and road freight networks*
  - *Invests in, builds and maintains state highways that are increasingly safe and meet the needs of New Zealand's aspirations for economic growth and social vitality.*
- In contrast, half or less of responding stakeholders agree with the following statements:
  - *Influences people to make smart choices in the transport networks they use and how they use them*
  - *The NZTA's expertise, leadership and passion is in providing a one network approach for customers to New Zealand's transport networks.*

Table 8: Stakeholders' beliefs about the NZTA's performance

*Q. The table below lists the work that the NZTA does. Based on the recent contact you have had with the NZTA and your knowledge of the organisation, how much do you agree or disagree that the NZTA is achieving this work?*

| | Central Government | Local Government | Suppliers | Industry | Lobby Groups |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Base = | 53 | 144 | 109 | 35 | 26** |
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| *Creates transport solutions for a thriving New Zealand* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 0 | 11 | 7 | 11 | 4 |
| Agree | 72 | 63 | 69 | 66 | 62 |
| *Works to provide transport users with positive travel experiences that are increasingly safe and efficient* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Agree | 74 | 81 | 75 | 74 | 62 |
| *Wherever feasible, works to invest in a range of travel choices based on people's preferences and locations* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 9 | 22 | 13 | 9 | 0 |
| Agree | 51 | 35 | 47 | 54 | 54 |
| *Shares responsibility for investing and delivering transport network solutions that meet the needs of New Zealand's aspirations for economic growth and social vitality* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 8 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 12 |
| Agree | 55 | 62 | 61 | 63 | 77 |
| *Plans and invests in transport networks, from state highways and local roads, to public transport, rail and road freight networks* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 6 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 4 |
| Agree | 75 | 74 | 67 | 71 | 81 |
| *Invests in, builds and maintains state highways that are increasingly safe and meet the needs of New Zealand's aspirations for economic growth and social vitality* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 2 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
| Agree | 81 | 73 | 73 | 77 | 73 |
| *Manages appropriate access to New Zealand transport networks through driver licensing, motor vehicle registration and other regulatory compliance requirements* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 23 |
| Agree | 75 | 72 | 72 | 63 | 58 |
| *Influences people to make smart choices in the transport networks they use and how they use them* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 11 | 19 | 17 | 20 | 8 |
| Agree | 40 | 34 | 31 | 40 | 27 |
| *The NZTA's expertise, leadership and passion is in providing an integrated approach to New Zealand's transport networks* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 8 | 22 | 20 | 17 | 8 |
| Agree | 49 | 39 | 39 | 51 | 46 |
| *The NZTA applies the Safe System Approach to road safety, helping to ensure safer journeys for all* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| Agree | 81 | 70 | 68 | 57 | 77 |
| *Works to improve freight supply chain efficiency* | | | | | |
| Disagree | 0 | 9 | 6 | 26 | 12 |
| Agree | 45 | 65 | 47 | 43 | 42 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
*Sub-sample based on those respondents who reached this stage of the survey.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

## 5.2 Stakeholders' trust and confidence in the NZTA

Stakeholders' current trust and confidence in the NZTA was measured using a 5-point scale, where 1= "No trust and confidence" and 5= "Full trust and confidence". Table 15 presents the results to this question.

There is less variation in the trust and confidence levels of different stakeholder groups in 2013, when compared to the Baseline Survey. However, it is clear that Central Government stakeholders have the highest levels of trust and confidence overall (73 percent have at least "quite a lot" of trust and confidence), while Suppliers and Iwi stakeholders have the lowest (49 percent and 27 percent respectively).

The trust and confidence ratings of Central Government and Local Government stakeholders have improved significantly year on year.

- Seventy-three percent of Central Government stakeholders have at least "quite a lot" of trust and confidence in the NZTA, up from 55 percent in 2012
- Fifty-six percent of Local Government stakeholders have at least "quite a lot" of trust and confidence in the NZTA, up from 42 percent in 2012

Table 9: Stakeholders' current trust and confidence in the NZTA

*Q. Finally, how much trust and confidence would you say you currently have in the NZTA?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | | Iwi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Base = | 54 | 31 | 151 | 121 | 109 | 134 | 37 | 10** | 30 | 32 | 11** |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| No trust and confidence | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Not much trust and confidence | 4 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 12 | 19 | 3 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 18 |
| Some trust and confidence | 22 | 42 | 34 | 44 | 35 | 32 | 35 | 30 | 23 | 47 | 18 |
| Quite a lot of trust and confidence | 54 | 39 | 46 | 33 | 39 | 46 | 41 | 40 | 53 | 41 | 27 |
| Full trust and confidence | 19 | 16 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 22 | 20 | 13 | 9 | 0 |
| Don't know | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

Stakeholders were also invited to provide commentary to clarify or expand on the way they had rated the NZTA in terms of their trust and confidence in the agency.

For some, the NZTA's actions, or delivery on its objectives, have instilled confidence.

> *Based on effectiveness of representation and contribution to the work we have in common. (Central Government)*

> *NZTA appear to have systems and processes in place that would remove unacceptable practices. (Supplier)*

High levels of trust and confidence are also achieved through established working relationships with NZTA staff.

> *Establishing a very good working relationship with NZTA personnel and the positive collaborative approach that has resulted. (Local Government)*

> *Have trust and confidence in the P&I team, because a strong historical relationship exists there. (Local Government)*

In 2013, several stakeholders commented positively about the professionalism, commitment or positive attitudes of NZTA staff members.

> *NZTA employs some very committed people that it has been my pleasure to work with and I have fostered these contacts, and where I have a choice they are my first point of reference. (Lobby Group)*

> *Positive leadership which is represented by the positive attitude of the staff that we have worked with at NZTA. I actually look forward to work when I know they are involved. (Central Government)*

The 2013 survey also collected a number of favourable comments about the competence, knowledge or skills of NZTA staff members.

> *The skills and knowledge of key NZTA managers is what makes NZTA a powerful organisation. (Supplier)*

> *NZTA has strong leadership, and smart, dedicated people in its ranks. It is a professional asset manager. My only concern is that it is leaving the rest of the state sector behind! I hope it shares its learnings with other asset managers in the state sector. (Lobby Group)*

As observed in 2012, low levels of trust and confidence were frequently a result of disagreement with the NZTA's decisions or priorities.

> *NZTA are concentrating on high volume roads at the expense of condition and safety on lesser state highways and local roads. (Local Government)*

> *Although NZTA are sympathetic to SME's causes, the fact is NZTA remains focused on relationships with large and overseas organisations for the delivery of construction and maintenance contracts. (Supplier)*

Also continuing the pattern observed in 2012, varied experiences in dealing with NZTA staff have had a negative impact on trust and confidence for some.

> *Lack of consistency and frequent restructures means staff are not settled in their work. External partners are continually guessing who to go to. Also various areas within NZTA do not seem to know what the other is doing, which compounds the issues previously described. (Central Government)*

> *I get different answers from different people in the organisation. I don't always believe the reasons given for change. Sometimes NZTA seems to be a black hole. (Local Government)*

A lack of consultation, understanding or genuine listening was another theme of comments provided in 2013.

> *NZTA often does not respond to suggestions raised by Industry. Some issues seem to be put into the 'never' plan. We can be told an idea will have to wait until a wider review in the area of the idea happens. When the wider review arises we are told the issue is 'out of scope'. So the issue remains unresolved. (Lobby Group)*

> *There is still a huge gap in communication from National Office, and also a lack of understanding of what councils do. Smaller regions are still forced to implement ridiculous decisions and policies as all policies etc. are written for Auckland and Wellington - there is still a one-size-fits-all approach - which is totally inappropriate for smaller regions. Head Office does not consider this. (Local Government)*

# 6.0 Stakeholders' beliefs about the type of relationship they would prefer to have with the NZTA in the future

This section of the report presents the results to survey questions which measured stakeholders' beliefs about the type of relationship they would like to have with the NZTA and assuming an improvement in the relationship was desired, what steps they felt the agency could take to affect the desired relationship.

## 6.1 Stakeholders' beliefs about the type of relationship they would like to have with the NZTA in the future

Using the five relationship states on the NZTA's partnering continuum, stakeholders were invited to identify the type of relationship they would like to have with the agency in the future. Table 16 presents the results to this question.

Reflecting the response to the Baseline Survey, despite being relatively satisfied with their current relationship with the NZTA, many stakeholders would prefer a relationship which is more engaged than the one they have presently.

For example, although 58 percent of Local Government stakeholders would prefer a *partnership*, only 27 percent believe they currently have this type of relationship with the NZTA (Table 7). While most pronounced among Local Government stakeholders, the gap between current and preferred relationship type is also evident in all other stakeholder groups.

Results are largely consistent between surveys, with Central Government and Local Government stakeholders tending to seek a more engaged relationship than other stakeholder groups overall. Despite the small sample, the response of iwi stakeholders suggests that a partnership is also the preferred relationship type for many in this group – something which only a minority are currently enjoying.

Table 10: The type of relationship stakeholders would like to have with the NZTA

*Q. Using the same scale as before, where would you ideally like your organisation's relationship with the NZTA to be in 24 months time?*

| | Central Government | | Local Government | | Suppliers | | Industry | | Lobby Groups | | Iwi |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Base = | 54 | 31 | 151 | 126 | 109 | 135 | 38 | 10** | 30 | 33 | 12** |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Coexistence | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Networking | 6 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| Cooperation | 13 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 20 | 16 | 29 | 20 | 20 | 27 | 8 |
| Collaboration | 17 | 19 | 31 | 23 | 39 | 29 | 29 | 20 | 40 | 30 | 17 |
| **Partnership** | **63** | **65** | **58** | **65** | **35** | **44** | **37** | **60** | **30** | **39** | **67** |
| Don't know | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

## 6.2 Stakeholders' beliefs about the steps that the NZTA could take to develop their 'ideal' relationship

Stakeholders who indicated they wanted to have a relationship with the NZTA that was further along the partnering continuum than their current relationship were invited to suggest positive steps that the agency could take towards this. Respondents who indicated a status quo were asked a similar question about improving the existing relationship overall.

Comments were grouped together into themes, and Table 17 (overleaf) lists the suggestions identified most frequently by stakeholders, ranked in descending order of the number of mentions received. The table also shows a comparative ranking for each theme in the 2012 survey, where applicable. Below the table are some examples of the comments appearing within the main themes.

There appear to be two prominent threads linking stakeholders' suggestions in the 2013 survey.

- The first is a need for the NZTA to demonstrate that the stakeholder is valued. This would be achieved by genuinely listening to their concerns; showing a knowledge and understanding of their situation and the impact that decisions have on them; consulting early and acknowledging the stakeholder's expertise; and working closely with the stakeholder in a collaborative manner.

- The second relates to improving the way the NZTA communicates with stakeholders. Communication needs to be open, honest and regular; the NZTA should be responsive and decisions should be communicated as early as possible; messages need to be communicated with one voice, and responsibilities and accountabilities within the NZTA should be made clear.

When compared with the 2012 Baseline Survey, comments provided in 2013 draw greater attention to the NZTA's internal coordination and its understanding of stakeholders' circumstances as potential areas for improvement. In contrast, suggestions provided in 2013 were less likely to mention the need for timely decision-making, or a need for increased regional engagement, when compared to the 2012 survey.

Table 11: Positive steps to develop or improve relationship

*Q. What, in your opinion, would be the most positive steps the NZTA could take to improve your organisation's relationship with it?*

| Rank 2013 | Suggestion | Rank 2012 |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Understand our situation/impact of decisions | 5= |
| 2= | Continue with current efforts | 11= |
| 2= | Improve internal coordination across NZTA | 11= |
| 4= | Greater collaboration/working more closely | 1 |
| 4= | Acknowledge our expertise, consult/engage early rather than dictate | 2= |
| 5 | Open/transparent engagement | 9= |
| 6= | Timely decision-making/information sharing; be more responsive | 2= |
| 6= | Changes to procurement/contracting | 11= |
| 8= | Changes to funding priorities or policy | 2= |
| 8= | More information sharing/updates on strategic direction or plans | N/A |
| 10= | Clarity of roles/responsibilities | 7= |
| 10= | Regular meetings/discussions | 9= |
| 12= | Investigate opportunities for shared services or shared resources | N/A |
| 12= | More frequent communication/engagement | N/A |
| 12= | Demonstrate trust and respect | N/A |
| 12= | Increased regional engagement | 5= |
| 12= | Improve skills/quality of staff | 15= |
| 12= | Expand the relationships between NZTA and stakeholder organisation | N/A |

Comments with a theme of 'understand our situation', or 'understand the impact of decisions', were particularly likely to be mentioned by Industry and Lobby Group stakeholders.

> *It would be helpful if there were a better understanding of the day-to-day issues we face as operators. (Lobby Group)*

> *NZTA has a very strong set of internal arrangements and internal logic for its planning and policy. Understanding the logic and pressures of external partners would help it make more out of these relationships. (Central Government)*

> *The difficulty for the Iwi authorities is building our own capacity to respond. It's the struggle that we have up and down the country. They believe we've got the time and it's just not true. (Iwi)*

Industry and Central Government stakeholders were most likely to suggest that the NZTA should continue with its current efforts.

> *Ensure close relationships (which work well in our area) continue and develop. It is very important that the people we work with on a regular basis are known and trusted. (Central Government)*

> *Keep on the track you appear to be taking. Keep in touch. Try to understand the difficulties operators face every day. Continue to work with the industry, both at individual company levels, and through industry associations. (Industry)*

The suggestion that the NZTA should improve its internal coordination was raised by several Central Government stakeholders, along with some Local Government and other stakeholders.

> *Having a single NZTA view on issues. If we are dealing with the NZTA we do not want to find that the work reflects an individual's view rather than the view of the organisation. (Central Government)*

> *Ensuring a more proactive approach with joint appearances (P&I and HNO) which ensures a consistent message from NZTA is provided, instead of mixed messages from separate groups. (Local Government)*

Local Government stakeholders were the most likely to suggest that greater collaboration is required, or that the NZTA should seek opportunities for shared services.

> *Spend more time at a governance level with us to explore opportunities for improvement in the way we both deliver services related to the transport network. (Local Government)*

> *Take the opportunity for further collaboration, particularly in specialist areas of work. Do more information sharing. Do more project sharing/delivery and embrace the one-network approach. (Local Government)*

Acknowledging stakeholder's expertise and engaging them earlier in the decision-making process was a suggestion raised by stakeholders in all groups, but particularly by Lobby Group stakeholders.

> *Keep talking to the transport industry, and seek clarification around those changes before implementing. (Lobby Group)*

> *Improved involvement of our sector prior to sector-specific research projects being determined and begun by NZTA. (Lobby Group)*