

TRENTHAM COMMUNITY GROUPS FORUM

Submission to the Hepburn Shire Council Draft Proposed Budget 2012 - 13

Introduction and overview:

The Trentham Community Groups FORUM (the FORUM) is a voluntary coalition of representatives of community groups who are committed to working together for the overall betterment of Trentham and districts through active representation and advocacy.

This submission is informed by the campaign for 'rate equity – a fair go for Trentham' led by the FORUM over the past year on behalf of the Trentham community and addresses the Prepared Budget in that context and directly. Seven of the community members who attended the information session, 7 May 2012 are also members of the FORUM.

In addressing the draft Budget we are very aware that Hepburn Shire is a small rural municipality with limited resources and, over the past couple of years, an alarmingly high turnover of senior management. Nonetheless the Budget is the key instrument for Council to action its responsibilities and plans and, while there has obviously been some attempt to include something for everyone, our general observation is that the Budget is disappointing for the opportunities it fails to take. The FORUM is not satisfied that its voice has been really heard by Council and takes this opportunity to document its legitimate and long-standing grievances about the way Trentham has been treated . . . this necessitates a lengthy and detailed submission. We acknowledge the regular meetings we have had with the CEO and senior managers which have significantly assisted our understanding of the basis on which Council operates and, in particular, wish to record our appreciation of the role played by the Interim CEO, Mr Reeve for his leadership and the contributions of those General Managers who have responded to the issues raised with them. There have been several specific Trentham projects which have received support and we are appreciative of this – however negligible progress has been made on our core concerns regarding the 'structural' and process issues which underpin the inequity and disadvantages experienced by Trentham. These matters have been raised exhaustively with senior management and much of this submission is directed at Councillors who have the responsibility to set the overall direction and priorities for the Council.

We note that we have proposed a 3-way collaborative partnership with Council which clearly identifies the responsibilities and authorities of the three partners: councillors, officers and community. The 'authority' of the community is the social licence as much as being the rate-paying base of the Council and we would still wish to pursue such a model which we see as fundamental to the survival of Hepburn Shire. The importance of the community is fundamental not least because it is the social and economic continuity of the region: while councillors, officers and even municipal boundaries come and go, the community endures.

Summary of main recommendations:

On behalf of the Trentham community, the FORUM:

1. Welcomes the inclusion of some Trentham projects in the budget in comparison with previous years;
2. Decries the lack of any commitment to addressing the underlying causes of the disadvantages suffered by Trentham over many years;
3. Calls on Council, as a matter of urgency, to make immediate and sufficient provision to progress the preparation of asset management plans for all major community facilities in Trentham and the associated service level agreements so that these are completed and operational in time for the preparation of the 2013-14 Council Budget
4. Notes and endorses (with qualification) inclusion of proposed provision (in the Local Government Infrastructure Fund) for implementation of the Trentham Facilities Review and calls on Council to make an interim, minimum contingency provision in the 2012-13 Budget (no less than \$50,000) to address urgent action identified through the now long-delayed Review.
5. Requests Council bring forward the Trentham Town Plan into 2012-13.

6. Urges Council to pursue the proposed collaborative Council-community model for local governance, based on Trentham as a pilot, the Trentham Community Plan and our community's demonstrated capacity for efficient, value-for-money project management, and progressively extend the concept of delegated responsibility into areas including setting priorities for use of the Open Space Levy, town planning directions, streetscape, etc
7. Questions the lack of action on the Draft 10-year Financial Management Plan proposed in May 2011 and subsequently withdrawn.
8. Calls on Council to initiate a wide-ranging review of its viability, the range and quality of facilities and services, rates and value for money it delivers for its communities. The review should take account of the Whelan Report (2010), the Auditor General's Report (2011), the lack of a current financial plan, staff turnover rates and seek active community engagement.

Or, in the absence of a substantial response to the above,

9. Strongly urges Council to make budgetary provision for the appointment of a mutually-agreed independent reviewer to investigate and report, with recommendations, on what has become an unsatisfactory and unsustainable relationship between Council and the Trentham community.

Conclusion:

Council's failure to provide fair and equitable facilities and support to the Trentham community is wrong.

That Council knows Trentham does not get a fair go and refuses to act is wrong.

That this budget offers no substantial measures to address these inequalities is wrong.

Equity delayed is equity denied.

While the FORUM calls for Council to commit to a serious examination of its viability and its capacity to provide the best possible services to its residents, we nonetheless reiterate our offer to seek a mutually respectful working partnership with Council based on open, honest and professional processes and fair treatment for our community.

Background – the 'rate equity – a fair go for Trentham' campaign

1. There is a long-standing belief in the community that Trentham doesn't get a fair go. (see Note 1 re allocations over recent years and the 2011-12 allocation to the Trentham Library project which provides an instructive case study)
2. At the core of Trentham's concerns regarding equity is the unwritten but frequently stated policy that Council will only spend money on assets it either owns or manages. (see Note 3 below)
3. To pursue its quest for 'a fair go' the FORUM initiated the rate equity campaign with a focus on obtaining the information necessary to demonstrate our claims. The campaign was 'launched' in the lead up to the October meeting of Council in Trentham when the 'milking cow' theme was activated and many of the large attendance of community members were forced to stand or sit on the floor.
4. Formal questions were asked at the October, November and February meetings of Council seeking information regarding the FORUM's rate equity claims. (see a review of these Questions under Note 4)
5. The FORUM now has what we believe to be conclusive evidence that Council does not, and has not for many years, spent in Trentham anything commensurate with the rates paid by this community. Based on expenditure figures provided by Council we believe that, on a percentage basis, Trentham receives only approximately half of the rates it pays to support community facilities and services (see Note 2 re rate equity).

6. Our claims of not receiving a fair go have been further confirmed by acknowledgements from various senior officers that “Trentham has been (disadvantaged) for years”. This admission has more recently been accompanied by a rather lame explanation that our disadvantage is a result of Trentham lacking asset management plans and appropriate service level agreements.
7. This situation is totally unacceptable to the Trentham community and should be a source of shame for Council in that it has known about the situation for a long time and has thus far failed to take any substantial corrective or remedial action.
In relation to the budget the question must be: is Council content to allow this situation to continue, whereby the ratepayers in Trentham and Coliban Ward generally (and Holcombe Ward) subsidise other parts of the Shire yet receive fewer facilities and services?

Responses to the Prepared Budget 2012-2013

1. We acknowledge with appreciation the inclusion of several Trentham project initiatives in the draft Budget, notably Stage 2 Lighting for the Sportsground (dependent on external funding for Stage 1 this year), Domino Trail works from Trentham to Lyonville, and the Wombat Trail linking public reserves.

We note however that there is minimal investment of Council funds in these initiatives: \$15,000 for the Wombat Trail (total value \$40,000), other funding coming from other government funds which we understand are subject to separate approval. The \$15,000 for the Wombat Trail represents 3.95% of the total \$380,000 invested by Council in new capital works and initiatives. While we were assured at the 7 May Budget briefing meeting that the proposed government funding is ‘good’, we question the basis on which Council determined which projects would receive its direct support and the symbolism of such a miniscule Council investment for Trentham projects. Furthermore we note significant Council funds going into projects which have already received large amounts of funding this year. The proposed funding, while relatively modest, is a huge improvement on previous years when Trentham has had to mount a ‘rearguard’ action to get any Trentham projects included in the budget – we have sought, and will continue to request (ref Note 3), information on all Council project initiatives over the past five years which we believe will further demonstrate the disadvantage suffered by Trentham over many years.

In short, the allocations to Trentham projects are probably reasonable for any given year if all other factors were equal – however they do not address the continuing, underlying disadvantages to which Trentham is subject.

2. Our most trenchant criticism of the draft Budget is that it makes no provision for action to address either the ‘structural’ or process problems that underpin Trentham’s continuing disadvantage.

Arising from the ‘rate equity’ campaign it is clear that Trentham is disadvantaged and that Council knows this and has known this for some considerable time.

There are two main areas in which this disadvantage is ‘institutionalised’:

- a. the grossly inequitable distribution of community facilities and maintenance support for these facilities. As a minimum we would have expected to see some specific allocations for getting asset management plans in place for an equivalent pro rata range of facilities in all of the Shire’s communities. We have been told repeatedly that this is the core of the disadvantage Trentham suffers and at the same time that Council has difficulties in attracting suitably-qualified staff to undertake this work but no suggested alternative has been forthcoming. If Council is serious in wanting to address this inequity surely a budget allocation to ensure action in the 2012-13 year is indicated?
- b. the more subtle lack of support from Council officers for the development and preparation of project proposals and ‘getting these on the agenda’. An ‘attitude problem’ within Council has been acknowledged and Trentham’s recent agitation for a fair go, which has brought some rather grudging action, has been cited in turn as unreasonable. This is quite unfair and, if anything, seems to be more a measure of guilt: all we are asking for is an informed, open,

transparent and accountable process whereby all parts of the Shire are treated fairly. This matter needs further examination.

A case in point regarding this general issue is the proposed Trentham Facilities Review study. This community-developed initiative was first raised with Council officers in July 2009 and has been a high priority within the Community Plan since its earliest draft. The proposed Review is a highly responsible attempt to look at all existing facilities, their 'fit for purpose, maintenance needs, management arrangements, etc and identify gaps in the range of facilities available to this growing community. It is a model that Council should apply to its own facilities and across all the communities in the Shire (we note Initiative 1 under Good Governance p 15 re disposal of poorly utilised, inefficient or surplus assets but hold little expectation that this will address some of the high maintenance white elephants maintained by Council). The Facilities Review has been a priority item of report at the regular meetings between the FORUM and CEO/Senior Managers since August 2010 and, despite the \$10,000 in the Budget waiting matching State funding, it is still to be commenced. Our grievance here is (i) that the lack of results from this study have been used as a basis to defer consideration of priority Trentham facilities projects (effectively a case of our initiative being used to our disadvantage), and (ii) the apparent lack of officer commitment to getting this project underway.

We therefore request Council give priority to getting asset management plans in place and make an interim provision for urgent needs arising from the Facilities Review (which otherwise will not be implemented until the 2013-14 Budget, nearly 3 years after the former CEO assured us that this was Council's highest priority for Trentham. Apparently Council has been told that DPCD sees this project as highly innovative and the sort of project they want to support – why then is it languishing?

We note the inclusion of \$2m for Implementation of the Facilities Study in the Potential Projects for the Local Govt Infrastructure Program but note also officer advice (7 May) that there is no identified source of matching funding and that the project is not cross-listed to any of the Program's funding years 12-13, 13-14 or 14-15 and we must therefore question what is the real commitment by Council to this project or is this listing just 'window dressing' given that all the funds available under this funding program have been provisionally allocated?

3 The review/update of the Trentham Town Plan is recommended in the MSS Review Report for budget year 2013-14. We asked our Ward Councillor to represent bringing this study forward to 2012-13 . . . apparently without success. Our need for this rests mainly on the rapid rate of growth in this community and the former CEO's observation that Trentham will absorb a disproportionate share of the growth in the municipality over coming years. Through our consultations with Coliban Water we are acutely aware that the security of Trentham's water supply (until now a major strength) will start declining rapidly in the next 10-15 years. We are also concerned that our community had only one opportunity to make input to the MSS Review and have had no opportunity to comment on the consultant's recommendations, which Council appears to have accepted without question. Our 'process' concerns are (i) that the limited consultation did not provide sufficient opportunity to canvass the larger contextual issues that are fundamental to determining the priority for the Town Plan, and (ii) that all the regional context in the MSS Review Report was based on Ballarat and Grampians Region Plans and Strategies. With respect to the latter, the Trentham community is far more influenced by the Calder Corridor and our historical social and commercial connections to Kyneton and Woodend.

While the Town Plan is not directly a 'rate equity' issue we believe that the above context is important in the budgetary considerations inasmuch as Trentham's projected share of the rates paid will continue to increase (we are advised this is currently ~ 15%) as a result of growth and higher valuations. Bringing the Town Plan forward would offer Council and this community an opportunity to work together collaboratively and provide some symbolic commitment by Council to the Trentham community through an acknowledgement of the very different circumstances of this eastern outpost of the Shire –and the even more remote, eastern part of the Ballarat/Grampians region.

We further note the successful collaboration we have enjoyed with Coliban Water who now seek our active involvement in their consultation processes for a number of reasons, not least that they get much greater participation than the previous approach of simply placing an advertisement in the newspaper

and hoping someone will turn up. The consultant undertaking the MSS Review advised us that the Trentham attendance was greater than in any of the other towns (and therefore even greater on a percentage basis) and that the level of engagement was much higher.

We are a community that gets its act together and, as such, offer Council an outstanding opportunity to pioneer new collaborative approaches in localism and collaborative local governance. **We therefore request that Council re-consider its priorities for the Trentham Town Plan and make the necessary budget adjustments for this to be undertaken in 2012-13.**

4 We note with interest the following **financial and resource matters** in the draft Budget:

- the distorting effect on the overall budget of unbudgeted income, notably flood recovery money, and the significant additional capital works this has enabled in the current year;
- the availability of the State-funded Local Government Infrastructure Program, which has provided a better basis for financial planning (refer to comments elsewhere in this submission regarding allocations to Trentham projects);
- the negative underlying financial sustainability projected for 2012-13 following the massive positive result expected for 2011-12 (due to various unpredictable funding and end-of-year anomalies): the projected marginal results for the next three years are of continuing concern;
- the financial position as measured by the working capital ratio which is projected to fall below 100%, including an allocation of \$250,000 to cash reserves, and only marginally improve over the subsequent three years. We understand that this ratio needs to be above 150% to be considered satisfactory. The opportunities of major additional funding in 2011-12 to address these measures of required financial management clearly have not been taken;
- that while no new loans are signalled, the budget projects a net debt on borrowings of \$3,624,000 at 30 June 2013 after loan repayments of \$550,000;

And, notwithstanding the above, the following which seem anomalous in the overall package:

- a surplus of \$2,020,000 (Table 2.5) – this is qualified by the underlying operating deficit of \$490,000 (Table 4.1) projected to return to surplus in 2013-14, which still appears to be sailing too close to the wind;
- the decision to reduce rate increases to 4.5%, perilously close to known cost increases as per the MAV Local Govt Index, costs arising from the EBA, etc While the FORUM does not want to comment on the wisdom of this reduction which will no doubt be popular with rate-payers, we simply observe that any yo-yo increase in rates next year is likely to be received very badly.

Our general observation is that, unless there is some more complex strategy underpinning the main financial decisions above of which we are not aware, the opportunities of major additional income via the flood recovery funding have not been taken. If the rationale for a reduction in rates is to share the ‘good fortune’ of these funds we submit that there are more lasting measures that might have been taken to address the social inequalities across the Shire. In the more general context we still do not understand the reasons for the withdrawal of the 10-year Financial Management Plan which was circulated for comment this time last year and which the FORUM endorsed as providing “valuable context and demonstrate(ing) Council’s willingness to confront the main problems as it sees them and is bound, by its statutory responsibilities, to address.”

We also note:

- the removal of the Municipal Charge and the Environment Levy which, as regressive charges, we endorse strongly as fairer treatment for lower income households;
- inclusion of an initiative for ‘disposing of poorly utilised, inefficient or surplus assets’ (p 15) – as much of Trentham’s disadvantage results from there being negligible Council-maintained built assets for community use, we note the extent to which Council is encumbered with high maintenance facilities in other towns and the priority claim these make on operating funds: we therefore encourage Council to be decisive in its implementation of this initiative;

- Statutory reserves of \$854,000 which we understand to be predominantly the accumulated funds collected under the Open Space Levy – and also note that no allocation from this reserve is proposed for the 2012-13 budget. We are concerned that these funds are collected for the specific purpose of extending or improving land for use for public recreation or public resort, as parklands or for similar purposes as per the Subdivision Act 1988 and are currently not being used by Council. Refer also Note 3 and questions asked by the FORUM regarding these funds. The FORUM subsequently wrote formally to the CEO (17 January 2012) proposing that the community should be involved in setting the priorities for use of these funds on the principle of subsidiarity and based on the funds being raised from subdivisions, the direct effect of such development on the general amenity of the town and the interest of the townspeople in having input to how the character of the town can be shaped. That proposal was effectively rebuffed but we again raise the proposal as a potentially good example of where Council and community should be cooperating. The reasons given by Council smacked of ‘we know what’s good for you’ and left us with the unfortunate conclusion that Council either wanted to retain these funds for discretionary purposes or, leaving them unspent, to ensure a more favourable balance sheet. We invite Council to revisit this opportunity.

Our overall comment on the financial measures in the draft Budget is that they paint a picture of a marginally viable enterprise – consistent with the findings of the Whelan Report 2010 – far too dependent on irregular ‘windfall’ funding. Given this conclusion we must question the doggedness of Council in seeking to maintain the status quo. We note the comments of former Cr Tim Hayes, September 2010, when he called publicly for amalgamation (more accurately his proposal was for a dismemberment of the Shire with portions being incorporated into adjoining municipalities). Unfortunately Cr Hayes’ comments were, literally, swept away by the severe floods a few days later and were not subject to any debate. It is imperative that any debate be as well-informed and unhurried as possible. We understand that viability questions apply to nearly 20 rural municipalities in Victoria and believe that it is far preferable for our community to be having this debate rather than being ‘hit by the proverbial bus’ at some later time – it will put us in a much stronger position to negotiate our respective futures.

We understand that Councillors are bound to operate within the municipal structure to which they were elected. However, the larger over-riding responsibilities of a Councillor are similar to those of company directors who must act in the best interests of the shareholders or, by analogy, in local government the ratepayers and residents. We therefore submit that it is incumbent on Councillors to critically examine the range of services and value for rate monies paid and call for **Council to commit to a process for such a searching review and make the necessary budgetary provision to support this during 2012-13.**

5 Notwithstanding the above call on Council and, without prejudice, the FORUM reiterates its offer to seek **a better working relationship between Trentham and Council.** Our attempt to pursue such a collaborative approach was deflected on the basis that the regular meetings between the CEO and senior managers and the FORUM served many of the objectives sought. Since then the quality and effectiveness of these meetings has deteriorated badly and we have raised with the Interim CEO the need for an independent review of the Council-Trentham situation to which he agreed.

We maintain that if a small resource-strapped municipality like Hepburn is to have any hope of surviving it must have strong, collaborative and respectful relations with all its communities.

The Trentham FORUM has strongly represented and advocated for our community in what we believe has been a professional manner – we are after all seeking redress for structural and other inequity that has been in place ever since amalgamation. That Councillors and Officers over many years have found it convenient to ignore these inequities is unacceptable and must be addressed. It is important that the FORUM’s ‘rate equity’ campaign over the past year is seen in this longer-term context. Various attempts to ignore and deflect our legitimate concerns and an emergent antagonism towards the FORUM for our advocacy is disturbing. Notwithstanding admissions by some senior managers that

“Trentham hasn’t had a fair go for years”, veiled hints of retribution for our representations and attempts to manage, control or resist effective community engagement underline the lack of respect and fairness by some senior members of Council towards the Trentham community.

We believe that the FORUM, as a voluntary coalition of the major committees and initiatives in Trentham offers Council a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate productive local governance – providing we can first establish an equitable facilities and services base.

Notes:

1. The ‘rate equity – a fair go for Trentham’ campaign

The campaign for greater equity grew over recent budgets which consistently failed to list any Trentham projects. In recent years Council has ‘found’ small but significant allocations (\$20,000 for painting the Railway Station and \$50,000 towards the establishment of a static Library) in response to Trentham’s increasingly frustrated representations to the respective budgets. This is not good enough and reflects an underlying out-of-sight-out-of-mind approach to Trentham needs. While Council was aware that the current mobile library service would cease in June 2012, there was no provision for any alternative arrangement in the 2011-12 draft Budget and this was only included in the adopted Budget as a result of a community submission. Implementation of the Library project has been largely driven by community action and provides a very interesting case study for how Council and community can and should work together which should be comprehensively reviewed when the dust settles.

2. ‘Rate equity’ – what we mean

In campaigning for rate equity the FORUM has a basic position that Council has an obligation to provide and maintain an equitable core range of community facilities in each of its main towns and that funding for new capital projects and initiatives should be equitable ‘on a rolling pro-rata average’.

We are not asking for a thin spread of spending in every budget year which is clearly incompatible with any major projects. Various statements that Trentham ‘will get its turn’ are not good enough and take no account of years of neglect – indeed they implicitly endorse our contention, which is the basis for Q2 below regarding major project funding across the Shire over the past 5 years (we would prefer this over 10 years but believe that a 5 year comparison will demonstrate our case).

3. The unwritten but frequently stated policy that Council only spends money on assets it owns or manages.

This has recently been disputed, citing most frequently the allocation of Hepburn’s share of the second tranche of the Economic Stimulus Package funding to the Change Rooms project at the Sportsground. (This project has some interesting dimensions, being previously ‘a 7.30 Report Story’ waiting to happen, in the major role of community involvement in bringing it to a successful outcome: quotes obtained by Council were ~ \$100,000 above the funding available but after some local brokering the project was completed with a contribution of only ~ \$30,000 from Council.) We note also Council’s recent response to another crisis issue: the leaking lake wall at the Quarry St Reserve. However, the scale of inequity as identified through the FORUM’s questions at Council (see Note 3) shows Council spending \$75,000 annually on the maintenance of Halls – but nothing in Trentham! In defending Council’s claim that it will spend on properties other than those it owns or controls, senior management have told us:

- (i) that asset management plans are needed for community facilities in Trentham before Council will allocate funding and that Council currently does not have the resources to develop these; and
- (ii) that Council must give priority to addressing ‘risk’ (e.g. asbestos) in properties for which it is responsible. We do not quibble with this but simply note that it is a major qualification on Council’s claim of its willingness (and capacity) to fund community facilities in all towns in the Shire.

There are other issues related to this core issue in the unfair treatment experienced by Trentham:

- (i) the total imbalance in the range of community facilities maintained by Council across its 4 towns. We were amazed when we told late last year that Council did not have a comprehensive inventory of all of its built assets across the Shire. We have recently been provided with a listing but do not yet have any costs of maintenance except for Halls as noted above. Council must address this imbalance in its provision of community facilities; and

- (ii) the Hire Fee Waiver Policy which we believe is a two-fold (even 3-fold) advantage for those towns which have Council-maintained facilities compared with Trentham, where local committees are responsible for maintaining similar facilities and have no capacity to waive fees for even the most worthy uses. We have been told that Council is reviewing the policy.

4. Questions asked at Council, Oct 2011, Nov 2011 and Feb 2012 – summary and commentary

Q1 Oct: Rate Equity – Council’s initial response was based on composite percentages over several categories of expenditure (for 7.3% of total expenditure) which claimed that Trentham received funding comparable to the percentage of rates paid by Coliban Ward. Following 3 rounds of further questions re detail and actual costs we have calculated that the actual percentage of Council expenditure in Trentham is approximately half of the percentage of rates paid.

Q2 Oct: Project funding – past, current and prospective Trentham projects were noted but no satisfactory five year comparison across the Shire has been made available. Our request for this information stands.

Q3 Oct: Community Facilities and fee waiver policy – taken ‘on notice’ – still no response & see Note 3.

Q4 Oct: Trentham Town Strategy priority – no clear response and see above (Note that a FORUM Planning Group has been formed.)

Q5 Nov: Community Facilities and costs – ‘information to be provided by end Jan 2012’ – see Note 2 above: we were provided with a copy of the HSC Asset List of Buildings 2011 in April but expenditure figures have not been provided.

Q6 Nov: Public space/subdivision levy – current balance attributable to Trentham was provided, but parts (ii) ‘tagging’, and (iii) community input to spending priorities of our question were ignored (see also Q8 below and refer to section 4 of this submission above)

Q7 Feb: Community Facilities – advised inventory & service level agreements will not be available until late 2013 (*at the earliest* – implied by ‘may take several years’) Discussed above.

Q8 Feb: Open Space Levy – follow-up to Q6, response considered unsatisfactory. (Follow-up question re the viability of the Council was taken ‘on notice’, but no advice to date.)

Regarding the Open Space Levy, the FORUM wrote formally to the CEO (17 January 2012) requesting a meeting with Council regarding the use of these funds. In an undated response (ref FOLI/10/3280) the Interim CEO explained Council processes for use of these funds and indicated agreement with the proposed Subsidiarity Principle which he believed should be pursued. Notwithstanding this response the FORUM asked a further question at the February meeting and is keen to pursue this matter with Council.

We would like to acknowledge the assistance of the Interim CEO, in particular for his direction to General Managers to provide the FORUM with answers to questions to which we would be entitled under FOI, and to the General Manager, Corporate Services for his patience and cooperation in responding to our follow-up to Q1 above.

We would like to speak to this submission at the Special Meeting of Council, 29 May 2012.

Ian MacBean,
Secretary, Trentham Community Groups FORUM
c/o PO Box 195,
Trentham,
VIC 3458

21 May 2012