

# APPENDIX A

## **Appendix A – Darebin City Council motions to the 2009 National General Assembly of Local Government and Municipal Association of Victoria State Council Meeting**

### **MOTION TITLE**

Establishing a Federal Community Infrastructure Fund

### **MOTION**

That this National General Assembly (the MAV) advocate for the establishment of a Federal Community Infrastructure Fund, similar to the "Regional & Local Community Infrastructure Fund", to support local governments in providing and renewing community infrastructure for local communities.

### **NATIONAL OBJECTIVE**

That this National General Assembly (the MAV) advocate for the establishment of a Federal Community Infrastructure Fund, similar to the "Regional & Local Community Infrastructure Fund", to support local governments in providing and renewing community infrastructure for local communities.

### **BACKGROUND**

It is estimated that Local Governments manage over \$110 billion in assets across the country. Local governments face the challenge of keeping these assets in good condition, by funding their renewal and upgrade. Most local governments have a sizable gap between the level of infrastructure funding required, and the level of funding that can be provided, and this results in a gradual running down of assets.

The federal government established the "Roads to Recovery" fund in 2001, which supports Local Government in renewing its 650,000 km of roads. In 2008, the Federal Government introduced the Regional & Local Community Infrastructure Fund (RLCIF), which provided \$250 million in much needed funding for Community Infrastructure Projects.

Community Infrastructure such as facilities and open space are vital to support healthy and vibrant community life, and the ageing of these assets has a detrimental impact on the community. A continuation of this funding program on an ongoing basis would support Local Government to bridge the infrastructure funding gap, and renew its ageing community assets.

**MOTION TITLE**

Treatment of voluntary measures in the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS)

**MOTION**

That this National Assembly (the MAV) request the Federal Government to amend the CPRS to ensure voluntary measures including the purchase of Green Power result in emission reductions beyond the currently proposed target.

**NATIONAL OBJECTIVE**

This issue relates to proposed federal legislation which will have significant impacts on local governments and their communities. The motion seeks to provide opportunity for local governments to reduce emissions beyond national targets.

**BACKGROUND**

Many local governments and communities are aiming to reduce emissions far beyond the currently proposed CPRS targets of 5-15 percent. Under the current CPRS design the majority of voluntary emission reductions, including the purchase of Green Power, will only contribute to the capped target and will not reduce emissions beyond this but act to reduce the price of abatement for larger entities.

GreenPower is government accredited renewable energy. Individuals and local government buy GreenPower to both reduce emissions and invest in the renewable energy market. Including GreenPower purchases as part of the CPRS overall target will undermine this program as purchases will only contribute to the national target and reduce the cost of abatement for large industry.

## **MOTION TITLE**

Federal government investment in Early Childhood Services

## **NATIONAL OBJECTIVE**

This motion calls for the establishment of a Federal Childcare Infrastructure Fund and for increased Federal government investment in early childhood development services. The motion seeks to establish a basis for integrated high quality education and care for children.

## **MOTION**

That the ALGA (Municipal Association of Victoria) call upon the Federal government to reinvest in not for profit childcare and early years education in Australia by creating an infrastructure fund and by providing program support funding for not for profit centres.

## **BACKGROUND**

All levels of government share responsibility for providing high quality child care and early years education for Australian children. An effective child care system is a vital to support workforce participation and to achieve our shared vision for an integrated high quality education and care for children.

Demand for early years services is forecast to grow faster than supply and research undertaken by the Allen Consulting Group for the Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) shows that this gap is being filled by for-profit providers, particularly for long day care while demand for not for profit care remains high<sup>1</sup>. The dangers of an over-reliance on for profit providers have been highlighted by the collapse of ABC Learning Centres.

While Commonwealth tax subsidies for child care are high and continue to grow, Australian public expenditure on early childhood education and care remains low compared to other OECD countries. Australia invests 0.1 per cent of GDP in early childhood education compared to an OECD average of 0.5 per cent<sup>2</sup> and only 42% of 3-4 year olds are enrolled in Australia compared with the 69% OECD average<sup>3</sup>.

Local governments are substantial owners of early childhood infrastructure and fully understand the important role that viable infrastructure plays in the delivery of an effective early childhood system. Rent and maintenance comprise the greatest outlay for childcare systems after wages and staffing costs. Local governments and charitable providers are struggling to maintain quality infrastructure in the face of growing demand and increased expectation around the role of childcare.

Federal government re-investment in early childhood infrastructure is urgently required to ensure that a range of quality early years services are available to the community into the future.

---

<sup>1</sup> MAV 2009 *A sustainable model for early childhood infrastructure in Victoria*

<sup>2</sup> OECD 2006 *Standing Strong II – Early Childhood Education and Care*

<sup>3</sup> OECD 2008 *Education at a glance – OECD Indicators*

# APPENDIX B

## Appendix B – Darebin City Council motion to the Municipal Association of Victoria State Council Meeting relating to International Students

### MOTION TITLE

Call for the Municipal Association of Victoria to advocate on issues relating to International Students

### MOTION

That the Municipal Association of Victorian in partnership with the Victorian Local Governance Association and Darebin City Council bring together local, state and federal government agencies, registered training organisations, educational institutions, housing services, international student services to discuss international student issues at a local operational level with a view to the establishment of an *Overseas Student Coordination Committee* with formal links to the Victorian Government's Overseas Student Education Experience Taskforce.

### BACKGROUND

Recent media reports have brought to public attention the plight of overseas students in Melbourne. The figures below demonstrate the increase in overseas student numbers in recent years, the difficulties they face as well as the monetary benefit that they contribute to the state economy:

- Students from 187 different countries studied in Victoria in 2007 with students from India being the largest nationality representing 25% of all international students, followed by China with 23%. The number of student enrolments from Vietnam increased by 43% and those from Sri Lanka increased by 38% in 2007
- International student enrolments in Victoria between 2002 and 2007 have grown from 74,433 to 133, 454, with almost half this growth occurring in 2007 (AEI:2007)
- Although international students on the whole report positive experiences, many are affected by key issues including social exclusion, threats to welfare and safety, exploitation by unscrupulous business operators and landlords and lack of affordable accommodation (Overseas Student Education Experience Taskforce, 2008)
- The value of international education to Victoria was \$3.5 billion and \$11.3 billion to the Australian economy, the third highest export for Australia (June 2007).

There are numerous agencies and institutions at national and state government as well as private sector levels whose responsibility it is to support international students. Although individual educational institutions may attempt to coordinate services to meet the needs of their own students, a lack of a coordinated service response which ensures fair and effective outcomes for this group has contributed toward poor outcomes for international students in general.

There is a need for strategic coordination at an operational level among relevant service providers to address social justice and human rights anomalies relating to students' needs for mental and physical health, employment and career development, visa and permanent residency requirements, education, social inclusion, cultural and religious practice, civic participation, security and affordable housing.

In addition other related issues also require consideration, notably social cohesion (encouraging harmonious communities, community safety and opportunities for belonging and interaction through addressing community suspicion and negativity toward overseas students), compliance issues (enforcement of building and health regulations yet also ensuring overseas students are not left homeless) and safeguarding a valuable state income stream (ensuring 'value for money' services and experiences for overseas students).