	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA				
Criteria	**1 (Poor)**	**2 (Below Expectations)**	**3 (Meets Expectations)**	**4 (Exceeds Expectations)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Value for Money	High costs. Limited benefits to be achieved. Long-term financial sustainability not sufficient.	Lower costs than poor, however, not delivering any value of scale. Unlikely to meet expectation of costs.	Adequate value, however, costs are not optimized. Long-term outlook achievable but may be called into question.	Strong value with achievable cost-savings.	Savings to rate payers clearly visible. Strong long-term outlook for financial sustainability.
Enhanced Delivery and Capability	Limited potential to realise increase to delivery as lacking scale. Unable to provide strong professional development for staff as constraints in options of career development. .	Slight ability to increase delivery but highly reliant on realising internal best practice. Limited scope for meaningful career development.	Some ability to enhance delivery but dependent on internal continuous improvement as opposed to economies of scale. Professional development opportunities available but not to the extent of a larger entity with clear specialised roles.	Opportunity to enhance delivery, however, cannot be fully optimised. Good opportunities for career development and specialisation.	Capital delivery to be fully optimised to allow for efficient and cost-effective delivery. Use of contractor panels possible. Strong growth potential for staff with clear development options and areas to specialise.
Increased Resilience	Lacking ability to react to events operationally. Potential fiscal constraint accessing funding in recovery situation due to lack of debt headroom.	Small ability to react to a significant event. Minimal head room to fiscally address recovery.	Ability to just meet the needs during a severe event. Adequate access to lending but may impact future delivery as capital projects may need to be rephased.	Some additional personnel available to be deployed in significant event. Debt headroom not an issue with minimal disruption to future CAPEX delivery.	Strong ability to allocate personnel to react to significant event. Adequate debt headroom and access to funding if required to respond to recovery without impacting future delivery.
Community and mana whenua engagement	Struggles to engage with adequately and meet the expectations of community and mana whenua.	Engagement has challenges but is achieved. Large trade-offs required to meet community expectations.	Engagement is fit for purpose but not as meaningful and connected as could be. Ability to meet expectations but may need some trade-offs.	Good opportunity for engagement and able to meet expectations with minimal trade-offs.	Enables strong engagement with community and mana whenua and has the best ability to meet their requirements.
Ease of Implementation	Highest degree of risk. Transition process seen as challenging with numerous obstacles to overcome. Higher establishment costs anticipated.	Moderate risk of implementation with considerable disruption. Notable costs.	Achievable implementation but will require adequate resourcing and planning to action effectively. Moderate costs.	Achievable implementation with minimal risk and minor disruption. Minor costs.	Essentially no, or very limited, risk of implementing. Minimal establishment costs.
Minimises Impact to Community	High disruption to end user. Completely new supplier with changes being reflected in billing, customer service, and fault attention. Significant planning and resource required to enable.	Noticeable disruption to consumer. Requires adequate planning and resource.	Some change to the end user but manageable and well communicated. Changes are well planned and worked through causing minimal disruption.	Minimal change resulting in effectively no disruption to end user.	Essentially no disruption of service and minimal notice of change to end user. Everything stays the same as much as possible.