



Meeting of the HB Civil Defence Emergency Management Group

Date: Monday 21 August 2017
Time: 1.30pm
Venue: Council Chamber
 Hawke's Bay Regional Council
 159 Dalton Street
 NAPIER

Agenda

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
1.	Welcome/Notices/Apologies	
2.	Conflict of Interest Declarations	
3.	Confirmation of Minutes of the HB Civil Defence Emergency Management Group held on 19 May 2017	
4.	Call for General Business	
Decision Items		
5.	Review of Hawke's Bay CDEM Funding Model	3
Information or Performance Monitoring		
6.	Hazard Research and Risk Reduction Update	21
7.	Submission to Ministerial Review: Better Responses to Natural Disasters and other Emergencies in New Zealand	23
8.	Group Manager's Update	43
9.	General Business	51

HB CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP

Monday 21 August 2017

Item 5

Subject: REVIEW OF HAWKE'S BAY CDEM FUNDING MODEL

Reason for Report

1. The reason for this report is to endorse a proposed new funding model for civil defence emergency management (CDEM) across the Hawke's Bay region and seek approval from the Committee to recommend to individual councils that this be included in their draft 2018 Long Term Plans (LTP).
2. A process as to how a new model could be included in Group members' LTPs is also discussed and feedback is requested.
3. It is intended that should the Joint Committee endorse the recommended model, that papers would be put to the five Councils to include a regional CDEM funding model into their LTP for consultation.
4. The LTP project managers for each of the five councils have been advised of this possibility.

Background

5. In 2011 the Hawke's Bay CDEM Group (a Joint Committee of the four Territorial Authorities and the Regional Council) decided to increase the resourcing of the Group and change the structure of the Group office. This was a result of a monitoring and evaluation report completed by the ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management in 2010 which identified a number of deficiencies.
6. At the time this was seen as stage one of a process that would see a more region wide shared service approach being taken on CDEM.
7. In late 2011 the Group appointed a full time Group Manager/Controller. In early 2015 a review of the Group office structure was completed and a number of additional appointments specialising in training and capability development, provision of emergency welfare, developing community resilience and response readiness were made.
8. The majority of local emergency management officers (EMOs) however, continued to be employed and funded by local councils. As the Group office worked with the Coordinating Executives Group (CEG) and the Joint Committee to put in place a coordinated work programme to address the issues raised in the monitoring and evaluation report, it became increasingly evident that the implementation of this programme required better alignment of all the Hawke's Bay CDEM staff under the Group office.
9. At the same time the Government completed its review of the rural and urban fire services and decided to amalgamate the two. This has removed local government's involvement in rural fire. Some of the local EMOs had a rural fire component to their jobs.
10. These two issues were the catalyst for a review in 2016 of the reporting lines of the local EMOs and it was decided that all dedicated Hawke's Bay CDEM staff would be employed by the Group office while retaining the geographical locations of EMOs in each TLA.
11. This review was based on an agreed definition of civil defence roles and responsibilities; and the services to be provided, between individual local authorities and the CDEM Group. The guiding matrix is **Attachment 1** to this report.
12. This process was completed on 1 January 2017 when the employment of three local EMOs was transferred to the Hawke's Bay Regional Council (HBRC) as the CDEM Group administrating authority and employer of the other Group office staff.

13. At the time of the review both the CEG and the Joint Committee agreed that the existing funding model for CDEM also needed to be reviewed. The current situation is that the CDEM Group office activities as they existed prior to 1 January 2017 are funded by a per property targeted UAC rated by the HBRC. The TLAs currently fund local CDEM activities through their general rates.
14. As at 1 January 2017 the Group took on the extra responsibilities as defined in **Attachment 1**. For some councils this meant the Group taking over responsibility for activities they carried out, for others this would result in an increased level of service.
15. In principle, it was agreed by the CEG and the Joint Committee, that the logical funding model would result in only one rate being charged via the existing targeted UAC. As this was a significant change, this should be proposed as part of the 2018 LTP.

Funding Issues

16. Since 1 January 2017 the majority of the expenditure on CDEM for the Group is managed by the Group office and is aligned by an approved work programme and annual business plan. Some minor expenditure such as individual TLA staff time, coordination centre (EOC) facilities and the asset management of siren systems remains with individual local councils (albeit generally managed by Group staff).
17. At the moment each council is still rating for CDEM based on their 2017/18 Annual Plan and since 1 January 2017 the majority of this is invoiced on a quarterly basis by the Group to pay for CDEM activities across the Hawke's Bay. This system is complex and does not allow for the total expenditure on CDEM across Hawke's Bay to be utilised more effectively. Working across five different budgets and related financial systems is also inefficient.
18. An analysis of the current expenditure by the Group member councils indicated that there is also a variation on what individual ratepayers pay, for what is essentially the same level of service. This variance is based in location and population. Previous individual council policies on CDEM expenditure has also impacted on the variation of amount paid across ratepayers between councils.
19. **Attachment 2** to this report summarises the current funding situation. This table breaks down each council's budget based on the agreed CDEM activities being managed by the CDEM Group since 1 January 2017. The only CDEM expenditure still managed by the local TLAs (and not included in **Attachment 2**) is with regards to external training expenses for their staff, individual council coordination centre facilities expenditure and the capital and maintenance of mass public alerting systems (such as fixed sirens and Stingers).
20. This table shows that the current total annual cost of CDEM per rateable property varies from \$21.09 to \$38.27 between TLAs. This is despite the fact that due to the collective nature of the CDEM Group work and associated resourcing, each property effectively receives the same level of service.
21. In summary, the existing funding model is not fit for purpose given the fact that the CDEM structure has changed to a more "shared service" type arrangement.

Options Identification and Assessment

22. Two realistic options have been identified, being remaining with the current model, or moving to a single target rate across the area of the four TLAs.

Current Model

23. The current model would require the levels of funding for each TLA to remain the same and for the Group to invoice them on this basis.
24. The disadvantages of this approach have already been traversed above.
25. Furthermore this model is not fully transparent in that a considerable part of CDEM funding is part of council general rates. The current model would also continue the existing inequities between the ratepayers of individual TLAs.

Single Regional Target Rate Model

26. The second option involves setting an increased regional targeted rate while at the same time reducing individual local council general rating for CDEM.
27. In theory the total expenditure on CDEM across Hawke's Bay should remain the same and TLA general rates should subsequently reduce. However it is recognised that individual councils may decide to keep their general rate at the same level. This should be a conscious decision signalled in the draft LTP.
28. Another benefit of the shared service approach to CDEM services and funding are cost savings. Draft budgets have been developed which show savings can be made in operational costs.
29. It is recommended that some of these savings be reinvested into increased capability in PIM and public education. This was an action point identified as part of the review of the Group's response to the Kaikoura Earthquake and has been discussed with the Committee and CEG previously.
30. A business case is currently being developed for the next CEG and Joint Committee meetings in November 2017.
31. While the structure of the Group Office is not the subject of this report and any changes will need to go through a separate process, the regional target rate and single budget provide opportunities to reinvest some savings made into improving capability.
32. An outline of the new budget is shown in **Attachment 2**. The proposed 2018/19 budget shows increased personnel while operational expenditure is reduced. The savings in operational expenditure comes mainly from reduced duplication and efficiencies in expenditure, and a restructuring of overheads.
33. **Attachment 2** shows how this proposed budget will impact on the existing regional CDEM rate. The existing regional rate of \$15.03 (2017/18) will increase to \$28.15 per rateable property. This is an increase of \$13.12 per property. However the total existing expenditure for most ratepayers will decrease.
34. In summary, this option allows for increased capability and level of service (particularly in PIM and public education), while providing for an approximately \$200k saving to the regions ratepayers overall.

Strategic Fit

35. The proposed change to the funding model is consistent with the Hawke's Bay CDEM Group Plan. Specifically the funding of Group office activities is identified as being under a regional target rate.
36. The relevant key Group plan outcomes to this proposed include:
 - *Community and response organisations with the capability to deal with unexpected events.*
 - *A rapid, well coordinated and effective response to an emergency.*
 - *A responsive, well coordinated and efficient recovery from an emergency.*
37. Relevant objectives would include:
 - *REA2: Ensure CDEM Group members have the capability to respond to emergencies in their area and promote the need for capability within emergency services and other partners.*
 - *REA3: Continue to improve coordinated and integrated emergency management between local authorities and with other CDEM partners.*
 - *REA4: Enhance the capability and interoperability of the Hawke's Bay CDEM Group through well planned, needs-based professional development.*
 - *RES6: The Hawke's Bay CDEM Group will provide coordinated support to the response of individual members during a local emergency.*

38. An assessment of these outcomes and objectives show that the current work programme and structure is continuing to move the Group toward a more cooperative and coordinated method of operating. In particular this is increasing interoperability and improving capability. The current funding model presents a challenge to this and it is felt that the option of a Single Regional Target Rate would more effectively support this work while building on what has already been done.

Considerations of Tangata Whenua

39. Staff have not been able to identify any negative impacts specifically on Tangata Whenua beyond that which will occur on any other member of the public.

Decision Making Process

40. Committee is required to make every decision in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act). Staff have assessed the requirements in relation to this item and have concluded:
 - 40.1. The decision does not significantly alter the actual service provision or affect a strategic asset.
 - 40.2. The use of the special consultative procedure for this decision is not prescribed by legislation. However should the recommendations of this report be accepted, the LTP process itself is subject to a consultative process.
 - 40.3. The decision does not fall within the definition of Adminstrating Authority's policy on significance.
 - 40.4. The persons affected by this decision are likely to be the ratepayers in the Group area and should the recommendations proceed, the council LTPs are subject to a consultative process.
 - 40.5. The decision is not inconsistent with an existing policy or plan.
 - 40.6. Given the nature and significance of the issue to be considered and decided, and also the persons likely to be affected by, or have an interest in the decisions made, the Committee can exercise its discretion and make a decision without consulting directly with the community or others having an interest in the decision.

Conclusions and Recommendations

41. It is therefore recommended that the Committee endorse the inclusion of a Single Regional Target Rate Model for CDEM funding in the draft 2018 LTPs of Group members.
42. If the Committee agrees to this recommendation the following process is proposed.
 - 42.1. Common proposed wording to be included in draft LTPs will be developed.
 - 42.2. The Joint Committee recommends to individual councils that they include this proposal in their LTP.
 - 42.3. Each council will need to agree to this occurring as part of approving their draft LTP.
 - 42.4. Draft LTPs are notified and submissions received.
 - 42.5. Each Council will need to independently hear and decide on any public submission on the proposed funding changes.

Recommendation

1. The Joint Committee agrees that the decisions to be made are not significant under the criteria contained in the Adminstrating Authority's adopted Significance and Engagement Policy, and that the Committee can exercise its discretion under Sections 79(1)(a) and 82(3) of the Local Government Act 2002 and make decisions on this issue without conferring directly with the community and persons likely to be affected by or to have an interest in the decision.
2. That the Hawke's Bay CDEM Joint Committee receives the "Review of Hawke's Bay CDEM Funding Model" report.
3. As outlined in this report, the Hawke's Bay CDEM Joint Committee endorses the inclusion of a Single Regional Target Rate Model and proposed budget for CDEM funding in the draft 2018 LTPs of Group members.

Authored and Approved by:**Ian Macdonald****GROUP MANAGER/CONTROLLER****Attachment/s**

- [↓1](#) Responsibilities Matrix
- [↓2](#) Current Funding Situation

Hawke’s Bay CDEM Group Members: Roles and Responsibilities

The purpose of the table below is to assist in clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the members of the Hawke’s Bay CDEM Group (HBCDEMG) and participating Local Authorities¹ (LA) as part of a process that proposes a change to the reporting lines of local EMOS in each council.

Key Principles:

In the following key principles underpin the drafting this matrix:

- 1. That the existing CDEM levels of service to communities should not be reduced and should be enhanced.
- 2. That the Group is collectively responsible for CDEM across the entire Group area.
- 3. That any changes to CDEM roles and responsibilities will support the increased resilience of Hawke’s Bay individuals and communities as required under the Group Plan.
- 4. The ability of the CDEM Group to respond to an event in a timely and effective manner needs to be retained and enhanced.

Notes:

- 1. For the purposes of this table the Hawke’s Bay CDEM Group staffing would include all current members of the Group Office and Local EMOs.
- 2. Local EMOs will reside in the Council they are assigned to.

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
READINESS	Coordination Centre ² facilities					
	Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide and maintain a Group coordination centre (GCC) (Main and Alternative) facility.• Provide guidance and monitor the functionality and safety of all facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide and maintain local coordination centre facilities for operational response.• Formalise arrangements for alternative sites (including MoUs with building owners where necessary).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The GCC Hastings facility would continue to be leased as used by the Group office (including the HDC EMO) and GCC.• Any changes in the building use split will require an amendment to the existing lease agreement• Capital Improvements to the GCC will be the responsibility of the Group in consultation with HDC.• Any facility nominated to become a coordination centre should be of an appropriate standard in structure and resilience (BIL 4)	Where they fall	Where they fall

¹ Local Authorities includes the HBRC.
² A facility to support a Controller in coordinating a response, or part of it. Coordination centres may be activated to support incident, local, or regional level responses. They include Incident Control Points (ICPs), Emergency Operations Centres (EOCs), and Emergency Coordination Centres (ECCs).

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
Equipment		<u>Response Equipment Local Coordination Centres</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain and replace all CDEM response equipment including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local communications networks including repeater networks and external communications equipment (eg. radios in CDCs and vehicles) Audio visual equipment Satellite communications Provide guidance and set policy on functionality of response equipment across the region (e.g. radios). Should additional response equipment be required HBCDEMG will consult with the relevant LA. Maintain and operate equipment funded by LAs. Response equipment inventory management, testing schedules and maintenance programme. Regional systems where subscription is required (e.g. D4H). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other than response equipment, fit out and provide associated IT equipment and infrastructure for local coordination centres. LAs provide the facilities/ power/ batteries to operate response equipment along with the supporting computers to run the DORT program Transfer ownership of any response equipment to the HBCDEM Transfer any depreciation collected for response equipment. Fund and maintain shared equipment (e.g. PowerPoint projectors in Council Chambers). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any additional equipment required as a result of existing local public alerting processes will be the responsibility of the LA. Response equipment does not include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Furniture Misc supplies (e.g. stationery) All IT equipment (e.g. computers) and support network/internet infrastructure Telephones and telephone conferencing equipment. There is a need to review the Group radio communications network in light of the proposed changes to Rural Fire. 	100% Purchase, replacement, maintenance and testing costs of response equipment	100% costs of equipment other than response equipment and operating costs (power etc)
		<u>Public Alerting Systems</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve all new public alerting systems Purchase and maintain Group wide public alerting systems and signage. Manage the maintenance of local public alerting systems. Test and activate local and Group wide public alerting systems and signage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support HBCDMG in promoting public alerting systems. Fund maintenance and replacement of existing local public alerting systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local public alerting systems may include, but not limited to, text alerting, email alerting and siren systems. New systems expected to be available over the next 2 years may require a complete review of public alerting systems. 	100% Purchase/ Maintenance of regional public alerting systems 100% Testing and managing maintenance costs	100% Maintenance and replacement costs of existing local public alerting systems
	Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and maintain process on how coordination centres should work allowing for local requirements where appropriate. (SOPs) Develop and maintain process on the activation of public alerting systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide local input into processes for operational requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination centres at all levels must use HBCDEMG processes and Standard Operating Procedures to carry out their functions during an emergency. 	Where they fall	Where they fall
Staffing and Training for the Response						

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
Staffing		<u>Coordination Centre Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop the competency, capability and capacity criteria for all coordination centre staff at all levels. Coordinate and provide CDEM training for all coordination centre staff. Identify staffing (from all LAs) for the Group coordination centre Consult with LAs on staff they will provide to the GCC. Make recommendations on the appointment of key staff to LA CDEM roles. Provide EMOs to support Group and LA coordination centres. Consult with primary local Controllers on the above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LAs to make appropriate staff available for training and to provide emergency response as approved by CEG. Provide staff to the GCC as agreed by CEG. LAs to consult with HBCDEMG on key appointments to their local coordination centre. Provide at least one appropriate staff member as a Group Controller. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate staffing levels for the Group and LA coordination centres will be decided by the CEG. Key appointments would include incident controllers and function heads. 	Where they fall	Where they fall
		<u>Local Emergency Management Officers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide at least one local EMO in location at each LA. Provide each local EMO with an appropriate response vehicle. Provide each Local EMO with appropriate ITC equipment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a suitable desk space including furniture at LA offices. Provide internet connection including Wi-Fi at LA offices Where appropriate provide local EMOs accesses to the LA network and IT services. Transfer the ownership of all existing EMO vehicles and portable ITC equipment to the Group administering authority Transfer any depreciation collected for the replacement of transferred capital items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transfer of depreciation for existing vehicles and ITC equipment allows for the asset to be replaced at the appropriate time. Once any asset is transferred the operating costs become the responsibility of the Group. 	Where they fall	Where they fall
	Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set training standards, develop packages and deliver training (including maintaining training records) in accordance with a training strategy and programme as agreed by CEG. Provide assistance with the development of training budgets (non-Group Office staff and volunteers). Fund all Group Controller training. Make recommendations on specific training and/or professional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make all identified coordination centre staff available for training in accordance with the agreed training programme. Fund training for local coordination centre staff and volunteers where this is not budgeted/provided by the Group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For coordination centres to function effectively regular training is required. It is essential that appropriate staff are released to participate in this training. The training strategy and programme is approved by the CEG on the basis that individual agency staff will be released to attend the training approved. 	100% Costs associated with development and delivery of training	100% Council staff time costs & associated costs (travel & accommodation)

Attachment 1

Item 5

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
		development opportunities for LA staff.				
	Exercises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and exercise programme for the approval of CEG. Develop, run and assess exercises to practice coordination centre operations. Implement corrective action plan for coordination centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make appropriate staff available for exercises on the exercise programme as agreed by the CEG Fund any operating costs for LA coordination centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For EOCs/ECC to function effectively regular exercising is required. It is essential that appropriate council staff are released to participate in exercising. Exercise operating costs would include catering, stationery, contractors etc. 	100% Costs associated with development and delivery of exercises	100% Council staff time costs 100% operating costs for LA Coordination Centres
	Welfare Activities					
	Civil Defence Centre (CDC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and maintain processes on how a CDC should work regionally allowing for local requirements. Undertake audit of and provide guidance on CDC functionality, location, "fit for purpose" and equipment. Maintain inventory of equipment. Maintain kits and communications systems in CDC's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide agreed staff when required to deliver community welfare during emergencies Provide support to CDCs if required. Supply kits and communications systems in CDCs where agreed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HBCDEMG develops Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for delivering Welfare in the community. Volunteers staff CDCs with council support as required by the community. 	100% Costs associated with development of CDC processes	100% CDCs operational costs.
	Welfare Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a Group Welfare Manager and the coordination of the welfare functions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide Local Welfare Managers to deliver and coordinate local community support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The broad principle of the arrangement is to pre-identify, facilitate appropriate networking and advance coordination of welfare resources and agencies so when required they are ready and capable of meeting local, dispersed and/or regional welfare demand needs. It is noted that there is a current review of the delivery of Welfare across the Group. 	100% Welfare staff costs	100% Local welfare staff costs
	Community Resilience					
	Community Resilience Plan ¹ Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and manage a Group wide Community Resilience Planning strategy including priorities to be approved by CEG. Be the lead facilitator in community engagement and support the planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support HBCDEMG and the local community in the effective identification of community and engagement of vulnerable community groups and the development of Community Resilience Plans. Provide opportunities for HBCDEMG to become involved in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Resilience Plans are local and specific in nature, they must be owned, driven and fully developed by the local groups/communities to suit their own particular context. HBCDEMG support and provide advice as part of this process. 	Where they fall	Where they fall

¹ A plan that is created by a community that identifies that community's hazards and impacts, how they can reduce these impacts before they happen, where they would meet to coordinate a community-led emergency response, what resources they have available, and what would be important to them in the recovery phase of an emergency. The process of creating the plan with the community increases the communities resilience, as it strengthens the networks between individuals and groups in the community.

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
			LA community development initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HBCDEMG staff will coordinate with LA, community development team and other staff. 		
	Community Resilience Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead Community Resilience Projects as approved by CEG. Support LA Community Resilience Projects where HBCDEM is not the lead. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide support to HBCDEMG led community resilience projects through staff time and access to facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HBCDEMG led projects to be supported by councils and LA led projects are to be supported by HBCDEMG. 	Where they Fall	Where they Fall
	Volunteer Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit, manage and recognise CDEM volunteers. Set training standards, develop packages and deliver training (including maintaining training records) in accordance with a training strategy and programme as agreed by CEG. Identify the functions to be performed by volunteers and the required volunteer numbers to sustain an effective response to emergencies. Fund all volunteers PPE and equipment as required by the HBCDEMG. Maintain and test volunteer equipment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the HBCDEMG in the development, and promotion of volunteers. Where appropriate provide facilities for volunteers to train and store equipment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Resilience is enhanced by recruiting and training local volunteers for both readiness and response functions to use locally and deploy regionally as required. It is recognised that this capability is often delivered after hours. 	100% Programme and PEE/minor equipment costs	100% Council staff time
Public Education and Information Management Activities						
	Public Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop HBCDEMG Communications Strategy for the approval of CEG that supports key messages and public information in readiness. Provide consistent messaging for Public Education across the region and deliver Public Education. Develop and promote education for business in the importance and development of BCP. Integrate messaging into respective Council communications media/methods. Consult on significant public education programs with InterCom¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide support by using consistent messaging when delivering other Public Education Where appropriate provide staff support and access to facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National standard messages and resources are available for Group to use. Every opportunity should be taken to provide public education across communities and business 	100% Staff and materials and publication costs	100% Council staff and support costs

¹InterCom is a special interest group chaired by the Group PIM and consists of all council PIMS and Communications staff from key partner agencies and Lifelines.

Attachment 1

Item 5

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
	Website management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and maintain a regional CDEMG website that links to other websites as appropriate. www.hbemergency.govt.nz 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide information to HBCDEMG for use on websites. Link LA websites to the HBCDEMG website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HBCDEMG website will be linked with the MCDEM Website. It is essential to keep the website up to date. Local Authority websites will be linked to CDEMG website. 	100% staff costs and website development costs	100% Council staff costs
	Social Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain hbemergency.govt.nz Facebook page and Twitter account. Provide the initial social media updates during a response and transition to the PIM team for an extended activation as well as to promote community and preparedness during day-to-day operations. Train LA PIM staff on the use of social media CDEMG consistent with our brand and objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the agreed number of PIM staff to receive training and assist with the dissemination of public information via social media as required. Provide staff to support the Group PIM in managing social media during a response. 		100% staff and development costs	100% Council staff costs
	Media engagement and Public Information Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide consistent messages and SOPs across the region and provide coordination and advice for PIMs. Administer and Maintain the InterCom special interest group. Support local PIMs (if established) during the response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide communications/media staff as members of InterCom. Provide Public Information Managers Provide communications/media staff to support the Group PIM function during reduction, readiness, response and recovery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Messages/SOPs will be developed by HBCDEMG and InterCom. In order to effectively manage PIM during the response the HBCDEMG operates a centralised PIM model. The extent of this centralisation will depend on the location/nature of the event. 	100% staff costs	100% Council staff costs
RESPONSE	Response Planning and Management Activities					
	Pre-event Initial Response Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate the development, approval and implementation of Group wide initial response plans for major hazards. Local EMOs based in LA offices to provide for a balanced engagement of staff across all councils. Ensure local EMOs have a significant presence in LA offices to ensure connectedness with LA Staff, procedures and organisational culture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the development and sign off initial response plans for local areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-event Initial Response Plans detail how the Group and partner agencies will respond early in an event in a coordinated manner. This often will occur before full situational awareness is available and before control centres are fully activated and have control of the response. 	100% staff costs	100% Council staff time
	Activation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In agreement with the primary local incident controller develop activation processes and assist with the decision making around whether to activate a local coordination centre. Develop in consultation with the relevant local incident controller processes and tools for the activation local coordination centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure the HBCDEMG is advised of any local unfolding event and/or CDEM actions taken. Decision to activate is made by the relevant CDEM Controller. Ensure each council has a duty incident controller or manager. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current 24/7 duty capability for the HBCDEMG is supplied through the HBRC Duty Officer It is noted that the current EOC/ECC review may require amendments to this section of the matrix. 	100% duty officer costs and HBCDEMG staff costs while activated	100% of costs while activated

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide 24/7 Duty Officer capability to provide for warnings and alerts to TLA incident controller or manager. Through local EMOs assist the relevant TLA to activate their IMT¹ and coordination centre. Provide co-ordination with and advice to Local Authority IMT's in pre-activation phase on the impacts of predicted weather events. Provide direct support to an LA where an event does not require a HBCDEMG response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain contacts and alerting systems for local coordination centre staff. 			
	Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist LAs in developing response expense reimbursement claims to MCDEM. Review LA processes and advise on changes to meet MCDEM process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Councils are responsible for any activation costs and must make a claim directly to MCDEM for reimbursement. 		100% staff costs	100% staff costs
	Oil Spill Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the HBRC in the delivery of this function by providing selected Group Office staff as responders. During an oil spill response provide support to the Regional On-site Commander as requested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During a significant oil spill response provide selected personnel to support the Regional On-site Commander as requested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some Group Staff are qualified oil spill responders. Training for and supporting an oil spill response also provides valuable response experience. The cost of responding to an oil spill event is carried by the HBRC who claim costs from Maritime NZ. 	100% HBRC	100% HBRC
	Rural Fire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support LAs in the delivery of this function by providing selected Group Office staff as responders. During a rural fire response provide support to the Principle Rural Fire Officer as requested. Provide CDEM training for Rural Fire Volunteers as appropriate. <p><u>HDC Only</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supply a suitable Rural Fire Duty Officer one week in three. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During a significant rural fire response provide selected personnel to support the Principle Rural Fire Officer as requested. <p><u>HDC Only</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide cover for the HDC based EMO. Provide admin support to the HDC based EMO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural fire is a stand-alone function carried out by CHBDC and WDC. HDC have a combined CDEM/Rural Fire team. For sustained support to a Rural Fire event opportunities may exist to recover actual staff costs. 	<p>Staffing costs where they fall</p> <p>Other Costs relevant Rural Fire Authority</p> <p>Admin support to Hastings EMO</p>	<p>Staffing costs where they fall</p> <p>Other Costs relevant Rural Fire Authority</p> <p>HDC – costs of providing duty cover</p>
	Council Business Continuance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide advice and guidance in both readiness and response. When requested provide Group Office staff in support of a LA responding to a service outage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Own their Business Continuity Planning so they are able to perform their functions following a crisis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the CDEM Act – A local authority is a Lifeline operator and must ensure that it is able to function to the fullest possible extent, even though this may be at a reduced level, during and after an emergency. 	Where they fall	Where they fall

¹ Incident Management Team - the group of incident management personnel that supports the Controller

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
RECOVERY	Recovery Activities					
	Recovery Management staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide Group Recovery ManagersWhere requested and available provide a Recovery Manager to a local authority for a local eventProvide advisors to LA recovery management teams as required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Councils to make appropriate staff available (agreed quantities) to manage recovery.Councils to provide and fund (including training) Local Recovery Managers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">HBCDEMG provides Group Recovery Managers.Currently Group Recovery managers are employed as contractorsTA's provide Local Recovery Managers	Where they fall	Where they fall
	Recovery Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Coordinate Group Recovery Plan development through the Group Recovery Manager.Provide advice to Local Recovery Managers in developing their plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Coordinate Local Recovery Plan development through the Local Recovery Manager.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Local Recovery Plans are an adjunct to the Group Recovery Plan that sets the direction and strategy for recovery in the region. Recovery is council owned and managed with Group coordination.	Where they fall	Where they fall
	Recovery Activities in Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide advisors to the Group and Local Recovery Managers.Assist recovery managers during recovery phase.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Activate Group and Local Recovery Managers as required leading the planning for recovery and transition from response to recovery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recovery Managers should be activated at the start of any significant emergency event which may require a coordinated recovery effort post response.Where a Group or other local recovery manager is deployed to support a LA, the LA is responsible for the costs involved.	100% staff costs	100% cost including Other Recovery Mangers where deployed
REDUCTION	Risk Reduction Activities					
	Lifelines Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide administrative support and CDEM advice to the Lifelines GroupTrain and activate Lifelines Utility Coordinators (LUC) at the Group Coordination Centre.Provide for LUCs to attend Lifelines Meetings and provide input into Lifelines projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Support the Lifelines Group through active participation of LA key lifelines managers.Pay Lifelines Group levies at agreed levels to facilitate joint projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Group LUCs are currently external providers under contract	100% LUC and staff costs	100% staff and asset costs
	Hazard/Risk management	<u>Hazard Research</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Fund and Manage Hazard Research consistent with the 10 Year Hazard Research Programme.Maintain Hazards Web Portal for Hawke's Bay. <u>Risk Reduction Public Education</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide public communications and information when new research is released.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide staff input into the HB 10 Year Hazard Research ProgrammeProvide funding supplementation for local project specific hazard research where agreed and appropriate. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Where appropriate provide staff support and access to facilities		100% staff/research costs	100% staff costs
					Where they fall	Where they fall

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educate and advocate for hazard risk management and provide expert support as required. 				
MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE	Management and Governance Activities					
	CDEM Group Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manages the development and implementation of the CDEM Group Plan for the approval of the Joint Committee using approved processes. Supports monitoring by Joint Committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support and contribute to the development of the Group Plan. Support the HBCDEMG in implementing the Group Plan through its work programme. Implement the CDEM Group Plan objectives as they relate to LAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDEM Group Plan is a 5 year strategic document as to how the HB community will become more resilient to emergencies and disasters. 	Where they fall	Where they fall
	CDEM Group Work Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manage the development and implementation of the CDEM Group Work Programme for the approval of CEG. Supports monitoring by CEG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the development and implementation of the CDEM Group Work Programme. Provide staff as appropriate to support the implementation of the Group Work Programme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDEM Group Work Programme provides a three year plan of work and projects that will include all LAs. Councils must ensure ownership of those agreed activities allocated to LAs as part of the Group Work Programme. 	Where they fall	Where they fall
	Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide agreed reporting to Joint Committee and CEG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide data/input into reporting as requested by the HBCDEMG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting to be aligned to the Joint Committee and CEG reporting deadlines. 	Where they fall	Where they fall
	Joint Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the Joint Committee in carrying out its obligations. Provides administrative support to the Joint Committee. Provide CDEM advice to the Joint Committee. Provide information and advice to the Joint Committee leading into an event and during the response. Provide CDEM induction training to councillors post triennial elections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participates at the agreed level and supports the Joint Committee in carrying out its obligations. Advocates councillors attend CDEM induction training. Joint committee members champions CDEM with their elected officials. 		Where they fall	Where they fall
	Coordinating Executive Group (CEG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the CEG in carrying out its directions from the Joint Committee and its obligations. Provides administrative support to the CEG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participates at the agreed level and supports the CEG in carrying out its directions from the Joint Committee and its obligations. 		Where they fall	Where they fall
	CDEM Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop CDEM budgets for the endorsement of the CEG and Joint Committee Submit CDEM Budgets for the approval of the HBRC as part of LTP and Annual Plan processes. Manage and administer budget. Request approval from Councils for any costs associated with EOC/ECC equipment they are responsible for and other costs to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where appropriate manage and administer local authority CDEM budgets. Provide funding as agreed. 		Where they fall	Where they fall

Attachment 1

	Function	Hawke's Bay CDEM Group	Local Authority	Comments	Costs	
					HBCDEMG	LA
		be covered by the Councils – where they are facilitated and implemented by HBCDEMG staff. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Supply forecasted budget requirements for items/ responsibilities/ projects requiring LA expenditure for inclusion and approval in their annual budgets.				

Item 5

Total CDEM Expenditure Across Region

Expenditure	Hastings DC	Napier CC	CHBDC	Wairoa DC	TLA Sub-Total	HBRC	TOTAL Existing	Proposed 2018/19 Budget
Personnel	\$ 147,150	\$ 85,929	\$ 36,462	\$ 45,314	\$ 314,855	\$ 594,054	\$ 908,909	\$ 1,038,909
Operational	\$ 353,337	\$ 373,197	\$ 1,890	\$ 73,538	\$ 801,962	\$ 654,005	\$ 1,455,966	\$ 1,117,637
External Income	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-\$ 165,821	-\$ 165,821	-\$ 165,821
Total Expenditure	\$ 500,487	\$ 459,126	\$ 38,352	\$ 118,852	\$ 1,116,817	\$ 1,082,238	\$ 2,199,054	\$ 1,990,725
Rateable Properties	32464	26801	6329	5114		70708		
Current Total Cost/Property	\$ 30.45	\$ 32.16	\$ 21.09	\$ 38.27				

Total Across Hawke’s Bay Region

Existing 2017/18 HBRC Targeted Rate	Targeted Rate Based on Total Existing Expenditure of all Councils	Proposed 2018/19 Budget Targeted Rate	Difference Existing/ Proposed Targeted Rate
\$ 15.03	\$ 31.10	\$ 28.15	\$ 13.12

HB CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP

Monday 21 August 2017

Item 6

Subject: HAZARD RESEARCH AND RISK REDUCTION UPDATE

Reason for Report

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Joint Committee an update on hazard research work under the reduction portfolio, along with work associated East Coast LAB and current subduction zone boundary research.
2. Improving our understanding of hazards in Hawke's Bay and the associated risks and consequences underpins much of our CDEM work especially in the area of risk reduction.

Background

3. The Group commission's hazard research projects in accordance with the approved 10 Year Hazard Research Plan dated June 2015. Current initiatives include:
 - 3.1. GNS has completed the fault-line mapping in Wairoa and copies of the report were sent to WDC, and report data has been made available on the HB Hazard Portal.
 - 3.2. GNS & NIWA were commissioned to assist with an initial assessment of Riskscape capability for initial response plans, but costs were found to be prohibitive.
 - 3.3. The completion of the review of HB liquefaction risk assessments - the draft report under peer review has been delayed by the response to the Kaikoura earthquake, and earthquake repairs in Wellington.
4. The HB Hazard Portal Steering Group meet on 7 March 2017, and considered:
 - 4.1. New portal layers such as Landslide risk using Erosion Risk (Landcare Research Woody Layer), and including TLA historical ponding/flooding layers. Hastings District has since uploaded this layer to the Hazard Portal.
 - 4.2. Legal advice on LIMS and Portal Property Reports.
 - 4.3. Adoption of an Application/Data Maintenance & Change Request Manual.
5. East Coast LAB (Life at the Boundary) was formally launched at the National Aquarium on 22 September 2016, with an education room and website to promote awareness of the subduction zone risks of tsunami, earthquake, volcanic ash and coastal hazards.
 - 5.1. Education materials have been produced, including the "Life at the Boundary" education programme, which is now being run by the National Aquarium education team, and over 400 students have already attended.
 - 5.2. A number of research programmes have commenced on the subduction boundary in partnership with the 26-national International Ocean Discovery Program (IODP). The aim is to significantly boost the understanding of the mechanics of subduction zone faults and the earthquakes/tsunami that occur on them. One of the project's main aims was to improve the understanding of slow-slip or silent earthquakes, which are a feature of the subduction zone east of the North Island.
6. The CDEM Group recently ran a Hazards 101 workshop for Hastings District Councillors and could do the same for other Councils if requested.
7. A presentation will be given at the meeting on these research activities and any feedback can be given.

Recommendation

That the HBCDEM Joint Committee receives the "Hazard Risk Reduction Risk Reduction Update" report.

Authored by:

**Lisa Pearce
GROUP EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
ADVISOR (HAZARD REDUCTION)**

Approved by:

**Ian Macdonald
GROUP MANAGER/CONTROLLER**

Attachment/s

There are no attachments for this report.

HB CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP

Monday 21 August 2017

**Subject: SUBMISSION TO MINISTERIAL REVIEW: BETTER RESPONSES TO
NATURAL DISASTERS AND OTHER EMERGENCIES IN NEW
ZEALAND**

Item 7

Reason for Report

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Joint Committee of the submission is made on behalf of the Hawke's Bay CDEM Group on the *Ministerial Review: Better Responses to Natural Disasters and Other Emergencies in New Zealand*.

Background

2. **Attachment 1** is the Terms of Reference set by the Government for a review of response to CDEM events.
3. Due to the short timeframes a submission was drafted by staff for the review of the Chair of the Coordinating Executives Group and subsequent approval by the Chairperson of the Committee, Mayor Dalton.
4. The completed submission is **Attachment 2**.

Recommendation

That the HBCDEM Joint Committee receives the "Submission to Ministerial Review: Better Responses to Natural Disasters and other Emergencies in New Zealand" report.

Authored and Approved by:

Ian Macdonald
GROUP MANAGER/CONTROLLER

Attachment/s

- [1](#) Ministerial Review: Terms of Reference
- [2](#) Submission to Ministerial Review

1 June 2017

Ministerial Review: Terms of Reference

Item 7

Attachment 1

Ministerial Review Terms of Reference

Better responses to natural disasters and other emergencies in New Zealand

1. Purpose

This review will provide advice to the Minister of Civil Defence on the most appropriate operational and legislative mechanisms to support effective responses to natural disasters and other emergencies in New Zealand.

The purpose is to ensure that New Zealand's emergency response framework is world leading, and well placed to meet future challenges. In light of recent events it is appropriate to see how we can further enhance and strengthen the current system.

2. Context

A series of recent hazard events and emergencies in New Zealand have resulted in wide spread reflection on whether the current operational and legislative settings for responding to natural disasters and other emergencies are fit for purpose.

Responsibility for the management of these events lay with three different agencies¹. The civil defence emergency management sector was however involved in all three responses as either lead or support agency. In all three cases the effectiveness of the civil defence emergency management sector was called into question resulting in a loss of stakeholder, public and Ministerial confidence in the response system.

The National Security System, of which civil defence emergency management is a part, has a range of lead agencies that operate under different legislative mandates, depending on the hazard type. The complexity of the system is well understood by those agencies that operate within its framework, but are not widely publicised or understood by the public².

Many lessons from the Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 and other events have been successfully embedded into the operation of the current civil defence emergency management system. However there has been no significant review of the organisational structures, roles and decision-making powers, within which responses are orchestrated. It is timely to take a wide look at how the sum of those parts work together. In particular, to consider whether any changes to settings could optimise the civil defence emergency management system's performance in the response phase.

¹ August 2016 Hawkes Bay gastroenteritis outbreak (lead agency Health); 2 September 2016 East Cape earthquake and tsunami (lead agency Civil Defence Emergency Management); 14 November 2016 Kaikoura earthquake and tsunami (lead agency Civil Defence Emergency Management); and 13 February 2017 Port Hills fire (lead agency Selwyn Rural Fire Authority).

² November 2016, Controller and Auditor General report Governance of the National Security System.

1 June 2017

Ministerial Review: Terms of Reference

3. Project Definition

The problem The purpose of the review is to ensure that New Zealand's emergency response framework is world leading, fit-for-purpose, and well placed to meet future challenges.

The current organisational structures, roles and decision-making powers in the civil defence emergency management response system need to align with the expectations for system performance.

Recent events tested New Zealand's response framework, and its effectiveness in supporting decision making, information sharing and operational capability. In particular it has been noted that:

- The underlying principle of "act locally, coordinate regionally, support nationally" may not be suitable in all circumstances.
- Decisions are not necessarily made by adequately skilled and experienced people, mandated at the appropriate level of government, and supported by the best information possible in the circumstances.
- Volunteers may not be adequately supported by a professional emergency management force.
- Information is not always readily available to decision makers on the scale, complexity and evolving nature of the emergency, to determine the capacity and capabilities required for the response effort.
- There is a need for timely, consistent and accurate communication to the public.
- Response capabilities are not necessarily deployed as promptly and seamlessly as possible, taking advantage of economies of scale and the experience of senior responders.

In summary, the operational and legislative settings within the system may not be performing optimally to meet current and future needs, and the role that New Zealanders need it to play.

Scope The work will examine:

- The current devolved decision-making model from central to local government, and framework of lead and support agencies to manage response to emergencies arising from specific hazards.
- Decision making and chain of command, including:
 - who has the power to declare a State of Emergency, and
 - whether there is a need for an interim mechanism to manage a localised event with significant consequences or that could evolve into a state of local emergency or a state of national emergency.
- Response capability and capacity.

1 June 2017

Ministerial Review: Terms of Reference

Item 7

Attachment 1

- Whether legislative changes are required to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 (and other legislation related to emergency response).

Outcome 1: The emergency response system is fit for purpose and aligns with stakeholder expectations, taking account of the need to prioritise preventing death, injury, and property damage, and the fast-moving nature and uncertainty of emergencies.

Outcome 2: New Zealand has the appropriate response capability and capacity for civil defence emergency management responses.

- The system capacity supports the availability of appropriately skilled and responsive resourcing, regardless of the location and scale of the emergency.
- Appropriate protocols exist to enable supporting agencies to swing promptly into action.
- Agencies with specialist capabilities (such as logistics, aerial surveillance and interpretation) are knitted into the fabric of a response.
- Business continuity across the whole of government supports an effective response and prompt recovery.

Outcome 3: Clearer definition of who determines the need for and declares a state of emergency and at what point the Director Civil Defence Emergency Management can step in to declare a state of emergency.

- A single lead role across any geographical area affected by natural disaster
- The purpose and consequences of declarations of states of emergency are clear
- Appropriate interventions and escalations are available.

Outcome 4: The chain of command and control, coordination, and decision making during an emergency is effective and appropriate.

- There is a clear operating model and chain of command and control and coordination during response, including the recognition of lead and support agencies.
- The system enables decisions to be made quickly, by appropriately skilled and experienced people, mandated at the right level, within the most appropriate agency and incorporating the best available information.
- All participants in the system understand the operating picture and their respective roles and responsibilities, including how these might change over the course of the response or as the event unfolds.

1 June 2017

Ministerial Review: Terms of Reference

Outcome 5: Information flows into, across, and out of the emergency response system effectively, allowing timely and accurate communication to Ministers; agencies; officials; stakeholders with particular interests; and to the public during emergencies.

- Recognition of the modern news cycle – immediacy of social media and power of factual decisive information delivered as speedily as possible
- Stakeholder needs are understood (what information is required; where and how to gather the information, providing it at the right time and in the right format).
- Official information maintains pace with media dialogue and social media activity.

The work will not examine the current legislative framework for hazard risk assessment and management set out in other legislation, for example the Resource Management Act 1991, but may make reference to any further work or consideration that may be necessary to better fit other Acts to enable resilience and preparedness.

**Consultation
and
Engagement**

The chair of the Technical Advisory Group is expected to agree with the Minister of Civil Defence the overall process, including matters of consultation and engagement. There is significant benefit in direct engagement with key stakeholders, as their contribution will add value to the Technical Advisory Group's advice. This should include providing for engagement with local government, emergency services, relevant government departments, and iwi and Māori. The means of consultation and engagement will need to reflect the time available and it is recognised that engagement will commonly be through the chair and the secretariat.

**Key
Deliverable**

A review document examining the current operational and legislative settings for responding to emergencies and the recommended options for change.

The document will be provided to the Minister of Civil Defence no later than three months from the date of the agreement to these Terms of Reference.

1 June 2017

Ministerial Review: Terms of Reference

4. Governance

Sponsor

Minister of Civil Defence

**Technical
Advisory Group**

A Technical Advisory Group made up of:

- Roger Sowry, as Chair;
- Benesia Smith MNZM, independent consultant;
- Malcolm Alexander, Chief Executive, Local Government New Zealand;
- Assistant Commissioner Mike Rusbatch, New Zealand Police;
- Deputy National Commander Kerry Gregory, New Zealand Fire Service;
- Major General Tim Gall, New Zealand Defence Force;
- Sarah Stuart-Black, Director, Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management.

**Project Team and
Secretariat**

The project team and secretariat is headed by Jeremy Corban.

Item 7

Attachment 1



4 July 2017

By email to:

bettercdresponses@dpmc.govt.nz

SUBMISSION TO MINISTERIAL REVIEW: BETTER RESPONSES TO NATURAL DISASTERS AND OTHER EMERGENCIES IN NEW ZEALAND

This submission is made on behalf of the Hawke's Bay CDEM Group on the *Ministerial Review: Better Responses to Natural Disasters and Other Emergencies in New Zealand*.

This submission is made in the context of the Terms of Reference (TOR) for this review.

While the Group fully supports the review and believes it is timely, as a preliminary matter we wish to point out that the context of the review needs to be based on the facts of any specifically cited response, not unsubstantiated opinions.

For example in the TOR for this Review mention is made of criticism of the effectiveness of the civil defence emergency management sector in the response to the August 2016 Hawkes Bay gastroenteritis outbreak. In fact the Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 1 states:

Ultimately the welfare support provided to the Havelock North community appears to have been helpful and generally well executed but it effectively started only on Tuesday 16 August 2016 when it could have been identified as necessary on Friday 12 August 2016, and certainly should have been by the morning of Saturday 13 August 2016.¹

While the Inquiry criticised the District Health Board and Hastings District Council (in its role as a drinking water supplier) on the timeliness of identifying the issue and possible welfare needs, it did not criticise the CDEM welfare response itself.

There was some minor criticism of the decision not to declare a state of emergency under the CDEM Act 2002 (the Act) for this event. This was a conscious decision made at the time in consultation with the Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management (MCDEM). Considering the fact that Health were the lead agency and there was no indication that the responding agencies could not cope, the definition of an emergency under the Act was not fulfilled. This was confirmed in part by the Government Inquiry as follows:

The Inquiry has, however, considered whether a drinking-water emergency should have been declared under s 69ZZA of the Health Act. While the Inquiry has identified above aspects of HDC's and the DHB's

¹ Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water (2017), p. 135 [568]

contingency planning and response that were deficient, it does not consider that the overall circumstances of the outbreak meant that a drinking-water emergency should have been declared.²

This contrasts the decision to declare a local state of emergency for the Havelock North Fires. Whilst again CDEM was not the lead agency, the Rural Fire Authority advised it could not acquire the resources it needed to fight the fires and the definition of an emergency under the Act was fulfilled.

It is therefore important that this Review obtain the full facts on any emergency response used as an example before using this as a basis for suggesting operational or legislative changes.

This submission will address the following matters:

- The place of response in the context of comprehensive emergency management in New Zealand
- The role of Local Government in emergency management
- CDEM response capability at all levels
- Existing command and control arrangements under the CDEM Act 2002
- CDEM response structures as provided for under the CDEM Act 2002
- Situational awareness in a CDEM emergency

The Place of Response in the Context of Comprehensive Emergency Management in New Zealand

The New Zealand doctrine for emergency management is based on what is termed comprehensive emergency management which is represented by the 4Rs being Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery. While this Review is focused on response, it is important that any changes to legislation, structures or responsibilities consider the flow on effect across Reduction, Readiness and Recovery.

In the CDEM context, comprehensive emergency management is essentially delivered locally by the CDEM Groups which in themselves are made up of a coalition local authorities. This is logical as functionally individual local authorities are also primarily responsible for reduction, readiness and recovery across a wide range of other activities at a local level.

Reduction, readiness (community resilience) and recovery are delivered across a range of local government activities as normal business. Most CDEM Groups would have strong linkages into (or may take the lead on) the local government functions that contribute to comprehensive emergency management.

Response however, is primarily delivered by the CDEM Group in coordination with the emergency services and other government and non-government agencies.

Response is actually a very small, yet publically facing, part of comprehensive emergency management.

Key Points:

1. The concept of comprehensive emergency management should be maintained as the basis of how New Zealand deals with CDEM emergencies.

² Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water (2017), p. 145 [603]

2. If this is accepted then any separation of response from CDEM is likely to weaken the delivery of comprehensive emergency management.

The role of Local Government in Emergency Management

This section focuses on the role of local government in CDEM, especially beyond the CDEM Group.

Section 17 of the Act outlines the functions of the CDEM Group. These logically compliment a number of the roles and functions of local government under the Local Government Act 2002. Furthermore section 17 also outlines a number of pieces of legislation supporting the CDEM Act which are also primarily administered by local government (e.g. Resource Management and Building Acts)

Beyond CDEM, local government is largely responsible for a range of functions such as:

- natural hazard research, risk analysis and reduction (Reduction);
- local economic and community development/resilience (Readiness/Recovery); and
- individual resilience (Readiness/Response/Recovery).

It is therefore understandable, that under the Act, CDEM outcomes are seen as largely being delivered by local government (often through the CDEM Group). The only significant exceptions to this are the obligations placed on Lifelines operators (of which all councils are also members) and the emergency services during the response.

Other requirements generally only fall on central government agencies during readiness and in support of the response. Central government welfare agencies would be an example of this.

MCDEM is one obvious exception to this, however the Ministry's role is more in the policy development and setting guidelines in readiness, supporting any local response and coordinating a national response.

The main issue for local government is not so much in reduction, readiness and recovery activities, but capability in the response. We believe that rather than making significant changes by removing responsibility for the response away from CDEM, clarity of those responsibilities and enhanced capability is needed to improve the overall response. This will be discussed more fully in the next sections of this submission.

Key Points:

1. Local government is a vital partner for central government in building individual and community resilience in making New Zealand as a whole more resilient to disasters.
2. The roles and responsibilities given to local authorities across a range of legislation (other than the CDEM Act) means local authorities are well placed to deliver CDEM outcomes to local communities.
3. Response capability is a weakness in local government, however that weakness is variable between CDEM Groups depending on resourcing and capability.

CDEM Response Capability at all Levels

We would agree that the response capabilities of New Zealand Emergency Services within their defined areas of responsibility are generally good. Therefore the purpose of this section is to make comment specifically on the CDEM sector being MCDEM, CDEM Groups and individual local authorities.

Our view is that this discussion would be helped by using the review of the response to the Canterbury Earthquakes as context. We would encourage the TAG to particularly read the response structures and capability comments in the *Review of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Response to the 22 February Christchurch Earthquake* (p190-195). It would appear to us that the comments made on recent responses and the resulting TOR of this review, are very similar to those issues raised as a result of the Canterbury Earthquake response review.

One of the key recommendations of that review relevant to response capability was:

1. *Enhance professionalism in emergency management: a 'cadre' of highly trained emergency managers from organisations across the country should be established to lead and control emergency responses.*

The Cabinet decided this should be investigated further, however we are not aware of any significant progress in this regard.

MCDEM

MCDEM has had relatively very little resource increase since the Canterbury Earthquakes until very recently. An analysis of the Ministry's Annual Plans shows that at the time of the Canterbury Earthquakes MCDEM had a staff of 39 full time equivalents (FTEs) and an operating budget of \$10.7M. By comparison in 2016 MCDEM had about 40 FTEs and an operating budget of \$11.7M.

Our view is the Ministry is under resourced particularly for a response related activities including developing increased response capability across the sector. As mentioned, until the 2016 Budget announcement MCDEM budgets were at best standing still. In the last 6 years however the requirement for policy development and change has increased greatly. Our view is that this has effectively meant that MCDEM has become more focused on developing policy and the response capability has not kept pace with wider changes in the sector.

This should not be taken as criticism of MCDEM staff who are committed, work hard and have very good relationships with the CDEM Groups.

However most national CDEM response roles are tacked on to an existing role which by nature leads to difficulties in prioritising work. Furthermore the structure of the Act makes it hard for MCDEM to take a stronger role in requiring consistency in response readiness across the CDEM Groups.

Our view is that MCDEM needs additional resourcing to develop a more effective national response structure including providing support to CDEM Groups during a response. To compliment this we also believe that MCDEMs role needs to be strengthened in the Act. This will be discussed more fully in the next two sections of this submission.

CDEM Groups

As a general observation, since the Canterbury Earthquakes the CDEM Groups have put a significant investment into their overall capability. For example, in less than 5 years the Bay of Plenty Group office has gone from 3 FTEs to 12³. The Waikato Group have increased their FTEs from 1.3 to 9. In the case of the Hawke's Bay Group, staff have increased from 1.5 to 6.5 FTEs. There has also been a corresponding increase in operational expenditure. In the case of the Hawke's Bay CDEM Group increasing from \$1M in 2010 to \$2.1M in 2016.

By contrast there has generally been very little increased investment by individual territorial local authorities. This points to the fact that most individual councils believe that a cooperative approach along shared service type arrangements produces the best CDEM outcomes for their communities. This has definitely been the experience from the Hawke's Bay perspective.

A number of CDEM Groups now employ full-time professional Group Controllers who are often the CDEM Group Manager as well. This approach is not uniform however and some smaller Groups do not have significant resourcing or capability to do this.

In Hawke's Bay the additional resourcing available since 2010 has focused on:

- Hazard research and reduction
- Increasing community and individual resilience planning
- Professionalization of key response roles such as Group Controller, Group Welfare Manager and response managers
- Training and exercising of council staff who operate coordination centres
- Welfare planning and response
- Coordination centre technology and processes

The key realisation in regard to capability is that the bar is consistently rising. While the Hawke's Bay Group has developed its response capability significantly, we would still struggle to effectively respond to a sustained large-scale event. For that reason we would support the development of national teams that could be deployed to support or even manage significant events.

As mentioned previously this was a significant recommendation of the Christchurch Earthquake Response Review and Cabinet agreed this should be investigated. We would recommend this now be given some priority and resourcing. National response teams could be multiagency (including selected CDEM Group staff) and should contain experts across the full range of CIMS functions. These teams may be deployed to take control of an major emergency but more importantly they could also be deployed across the full range of events to provide advice and expertise to a Group or local coordination centre.

We note this is not a new concept with Maritime NZ and Rural Fire having a similar tiered response capability.

³ Comparisons between 2010 and 2016 and does not include local EMO numbers.

Key Points:

1. The funding and resourcing of MCDEM has not kept pace with the investment by many of the CDEM Groups and the increasing expectation of a response. This needs to be addressed.
2. That multiagency National response teams should be developed to respond or support the response to significant civil defence emergencies.
3. Significant increases in resourcing has occurred at the CDEM Group level, however these could be better utilised and aligned through strengthening the role of MCDEM beyond a mainly policy/advisory role.

Existing command and control arrangements under the CDEM Act 2002

The current Act is structured to deal with two levels of response namely national and local. In a national response the lines of command and control are relatively straight forward, however the national controller only has powers to direct the response down to a local level when a national declaration occurs. The February 2011 Christchurch Earthquake is the only time a national emergency has been declared.

In contrast the Group Controller has the ability to give direction to a local controller in any emergency whether a declaration has occurred or not. In line with our recommendation that MCDEM be better resourced to support the response to civil defence emergencies, we also recommend that the national controller also be given powers to direct group controllers in an emergency whether a national declaration has occurred or not.

Command and Control Definitions

During a state of national emergency the Act and the National Plan Group require the Director and/or national controller to *direct and control* the overall response⁴. However in section 9(2)(a) the powers are changed to *coordinating* resources.

In comparison during a declared local emergency group controllers are generally given powers to *direct and coordinate* the response. In our view use of the word coordinate lacks clarity and confuses the command and control arrangements in the response.

While individual emergency services and other government departments must retain command of their organisation, if a controller has responsibility and accountability for the overall response then they need to have very clear control arrangements over the supporting agencies.

The NZDF clearly identify command and control relationships which are words that are seen as having two very different meanings. Command is seen as being the direct authority to allocate people/resources to a specific task. Control is seen as the authority to delegate and prioritise tasks. For example in a CDEM context the police area commander will retain full command over their organisation however the operational control to delegate and prioritise the police CDEM response tasks may be given to the controller.

⁴ Section 8(2)(h) of the Act

In our view this type of approach is clearer than “coordinating” resources, which leaves room for ambiguity during a response.

We believe that CDEM response command and control needs to be very clearly defined in the Act and in particular the National Plan.

Declarations

The Act provides for local elected officials to declare a state of emergency for their area. The Hawke’s Bay CDEM group has clear delegations for who and where a declaration can be made. At the beginning of each triennium CDEM induction/familiarisation is conducted for councillors where the delegations, roles and responsibilities for elected officials is explained.

We are of the view that the existing provisions for declaring a state of emergency are fit for purpose. However there is often tension between the desire to have more control over an emergency response and having to place this responsibility in the hands of a single controller.

We are of the view that this clear separation between governance and management in the response needs to remain. This separation exists at central government levels where ministers do not interfere with operational matters.

The Joint Committee has the power to replace a controller during an emergency if they are not satisfied, and this is the appropriate mechanism for political input into the operational aspects of the response.

We also note that if the Minister has concerns over the handling of a local emergency, they have the power under the Act to either make a local declaration themselves or remove the relevant CDEM group from control of the response.

Key Points:

1. The power of a controller to direct a response in an emergency should apply whether a state of emergency has been declared or not.
2. That the national controller should be given the power to direct a group controller during an emergency.
3. That the command and control arrangements during an emergency need to be reviewed and clarified. In particular there needs to be clear definitions for these arrangements and those responsible for the response should have an appropriate level of control over supporting agencies.
4. That local government elected officials are the appropriate level for declaring a local state of emergency, however beyond the strategic input of the Joint Committee, a trained controller should retain overall management of the response.

CDEM Response Structures as Provided for Under the CDEM Act 2002

CDEM response structures under the Act envisage three levels being national, group and local. The Group must appoint a Group Controller, however it may appoint local controllers. This structure and how

associated coordination centres work together in response was reviewed as part of the Christchurch Earthquake Review.

The key recommendation from that Review was:

The emergency management response: territorial authorities should no longer have power to control the response to emergencies, but that they still retain the power to declare them.

The Cabinet rejected this recommendation stating:

Rather than diminishing the role of territorial authorities, MCDEM with work with regional CDEM Groups that need strengthening.

Our view is that this Cabinet decision was a fundamental misunderstanding of how Groups should work and therefore missed an opportunity to streamline and clarify the roles of the different levels of government in CDEM. As stated in the Review:

The Review found that the inherent duplication of control between the regional CDEM Group and CCC (Christchurch City Council) hampered the Response to the earthquake. The division between these two entities persisted in the CRC (Canterbury Response Centre) after it was formed. It is clear that the potential for duplication across the country needs to be reduced. This would concentrate resources, training and expertise on a smaller number of incident management teams and EOCs while still ensuring that emergency management is decentralised. (p190)

.....

This recommendation arises directly from an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the several EOCs that operated during the Response:

- *Initially both CCC and the Group operated separate EOCs in the same city, initially some few hundred metres apart. This involved duplication, confusion as to roles and uncertainty with supporting agencies as to with whom they should be dealing.*
- *After the declaration of National Emergency the two EOCs were merged but within the new CRC the two groups never melded into a cohesive organisation. This was despite the efforts by individuals on both sides to make the new structure work.*
- *It is quite clear the CCC EOC on its own could never have handled an emergency of this severity satisfactorily nor would the Group ECC have been able to cope, especially without the active support of the CCC.*

These conclusions are reinforced by the experience after the September event when three TLAs each declared a state of local emergency and appointed their own EOC. The emergency was thus managed in three separate parts, despite considerable commonality in issues faced and resources required. With that event, partner agencies like the Police, MSD, the DHB and NGOs needed to appoint representatives in three EOCs rather than in one. (p191)

Our view is that the above situation still exists across the country today and it is reinforced by the often conflicting roles and responsibilities between the national response, CDEM Groups and individual local authorities.

As an observation it would appear criticism of the response to recent events has occurred where there has been a lack of cooperation and at times strained relationships between members of the CDEM Group.

Our view is that individual members of the CDEM Group must abide by the majority decisions of the collective. There are examples around the country where individual councils have taken an “opt out” approach to CDEM Group decisions. This should be clarified in the legislation with powers to remove the ability of a local council to control a CDEM response given to the Minister and/or the Joint Committee.

We are of the view that you cannot allow differences or personalities to interfere with a coordinated Group response in a CDEM emergency.

While at times there has been conflict between individual Hawke’s Bay councils on matters other than CDEM, both the Joint Committee and the CEG work to the common good and relationships in this area are strong. This has allowed the Group to take a comprehensive look at its capability, response structures and resourcing across the 4Rs but in particular for the response.

In 2015 the Group commenced an internal review of its response structures and method of operations. The review found:

1. Individual local councils lacked the staff and resources to manage anything other than a small emergency.
2. There was a lack of inter-operability between the coordination centre staff of different councils.
3. There was variability between equipment and processes in different coordination centres.
4. There was duplication of effort between the GECC and local EOCs.
5. The emergency services and other government agencies could not provide liaison and support five separate coordination centres across the region.
6. The public’s expectation of a CDEM response had increased and this combined with the rise of digital media had increased the demand for instantaneous information and focus on the needs of the individual rather than communities.

It is likely that the above conclusions would be common across most Groups.

The Group decided that a rationalisation of Hawke’s Bay response structures was needed to ensure that significant staff trained to an appropriate level were available to staff coordination centres during both a local and regional emergency.

The Hawke’s Bay CDEM Group also rationalised its controller pool from 25 to 13 and appointing local controllers to the entire Hawke’s Bay Group area so they can deploy in support of different councils. This has allowed us to focus limited resources on the developing a smaller pool, to a higher level.

The new mode of operational response adopted by the Hawke’s Bay CDEM Group to address the above issues is outlined as follows:

1. The Group ECC will always activate in support a local council. The level of activation will depend upon the scale of the emergency however this helps to ensure that local councils have immediate access to the expertise held at the Group office.
2. Where possible the Group Controller will take the lead in the initial response to any event. This ensures that the expertise of the full time controller is used to establish situational awareness,

liaison with the emergency services, set the initial response objectives and develop the first action plan before a shift handover.

3. The GECC is staffed by three shifts made up of the staff of Hastings, Napier and the Regional Councils. This enables local knowledge to be retained in the GECC.
4. Individual councils are only responsible for managing their lifeline activities and this response is integrated into the Group Operations function.
5. All other CIMS functions are managed and fulfilled centrally.
6. The structure allows for Wairoa and Central Hawke's Bay to run scaled down EOCs given their relative geographical isolation.

As a result the number of coordination facilities across Hawke's Bay has effectively reduced from 5 to 3.

This structure has only recently been implemented. However a number of benefits are already accruing with common training and standardisation of roles and processes across different council staff. Recent gastro outbreak and rural fire events in Hastings District have been support by coordination centre staff from Napier City and Hawke's Bay Regional Councils.

We acknowledge the Hawke's Bay approach may not suit all Groups. In particular smaller groups who do not have the ability to provide a full-time CDEM controller resource, or those with large or remote areas. There could be an argument for the Government to establish a fund for Groups that lack the ability to fund appropriate response structures for their region.

Consideration should also be given to a more the most effective and equitable way to fund CDEM in to the future to ensure, regardless of where you live, you can expect a consistent level of service in readiness, response and recovery.

Currently there are a number of variables that determine how well funded CDEM is in each region. Some of the variability is around individual council decision-making and priorities, some is simply due to the size of the rating base. Within the Groups themselves, varying rating bases across individual local authorities often result in larger TLAs effectively subsidise smaller TLAs.

Hawke's Bay CDEM Group is moving towards a single regional targeted rate based at the property level. This will simplify the funding process, ensure budget allocation is done in the best interests of the Group and that there is equity between ratepayers who are effectively receiving the same level of service.

A consistent funding model across New Zealand would lead to a more equitable and consistent level of capability.

The funding model for CDEM is different to that of the other Emergency Services which are centrally funded and often use population to determine the capability to be provided. The funding model alone won't improve capability but a centralised funding model, alongside commitment from TLAs to provide staff and share resources with a centralised agency, could improve capability.

Key Points:

1. In general individual territorial authorities lack the expertise and resources to manage a significant CDEM response.

2. At a local government level the majority of CDEM expertise and experience now lies at the Group level.
3. We are of the view that at the local authority level there is no need for two layers of response as this leads to duplication and confusion.
4. While territorial authorities still need to respond in their role as Lifeline providers and support specific response functions, there is little need for them to direct or control a multiagency coordinated response at a local level.
5. The role and functions of regional CDEM Groups should be strengthened to ensure individual local authorities must actively participate and abide by the decisions of the Group.
6. A review of CDEM funding should be conducted to help ensure equitable service and capability across New Zealand.

Situational Awareness in a CDEM Emergency

This is an area which is constantly evolving as technology and expectations develop. From our perspective there appears to be three issues.

Firstly the ability for senior politicians and executives to access immediate information through news blogs and social media has increased significantly over the last 5 years. The issue is that much of this information lacks the checks and balances that official information must go through. There is no easy solution to this issue, however if the right technology was available and was used across all agencies and Groups, the flow of information and therefore situational awareness would improve.

Secondly, in terms of technology there is a wide range of off the shelf products which can be easily implemented to provide for quick impact and needs analysis.

There has been some work nationally to develop an impact analysis tool which can be used on the ground by all emergency services and CDEM volunteers. These systems automatically collate the information centrally at a coordination centre. However this appears to have stalled as different agencies have tried to cater for their specific needs.

This has also occurred in the welfare needs analysis space. The Hawke's Bay CDEM Group has developed a very simple tool based on free software used by NGOs. This enables individuals to be registered and their welfare needs identified. This information is collated at the GECC and cases allocated to the appropriate agency. An overall picture of the welfare situation can be easily attained.

We have yet to use this software in an event, however a recent welfare exercise had encouraging results and significantly increased our welfare capability.

All of these systems are portable and simple to use. They can use mobile or satellite data, or the data can be uploaded upon return to a civil defence facility.

The third issue is around the selection and governance of these types of systems. There needs to be a focused process for selecting systems and all agencies should be required to adopt the solution.

It would appear to us that technological solutions are available but identifying and implementing a common platform across all agencies involved in a CDEM response becomes bogged down in individual agency preferences and bias.

This needs to be addressed at a central level and individual agencies (including CDEM Groups) need to be held accountable if they do not adopt a common emergency management platform.

A good example of this is the decision by some CDEM Groups to not fully adopt EMIS. If all Groups used EMIS in the way it was intended the ability for the NCMC and other Groups to get situational awareness at a regional level would be greatly enhanced. Our view is that Groups should be required to use EMIS through the National Plan or other regulation.

Key Points:

1. Situational awareness is the key to making appropriate response decisions in a timely manner.
2. Decisions on what platforms record and deliver impact and needs information should be made at a national level by a single agency after consultation rather than agreement.
3. All agencies and CDEM Groups should be required to adopt these platforms and EMIS rather than allowing an “opt out” approach.

Conclusions

Despite recent commentary on responses to CDEM emergencies, the coordinated response to a civil defence emergency in New Zealand has improved over the last 5 years.

However improvements can always be made and this Review is an opportunity to reinforce and address a number of reoccurring issues identified in responses since the Canterbury Earthquakes.

It also needs to be remembered that a civil defence response is not just the responsibility of MCDEM, the CDEM Groups or individual councils. In responding to a civil defence emergency all agencies and even communities become part of Civil Defence. Any change that is just focused on one sector of the system will not make a significant difference.

Any change will need to be resourced otherwise it is likely to fail and we will be having the same conversations in another 5 years.

The Hawke’s Bay CDEM Group would like the opportunity to be heard and questioned on this submission.

Point of contact: Ian Macdonald (ian.macdonald@hbemergency.govt.nz)

Signed on Original

Bill Dalton
Chairperson
Hawke’s Bay Civil Defence Emergency Management Group

HB CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP

Monday 21 August 2017

Item 8

Subject: GROUP MANAGER'S UPDATE

Reason for Report

1. To inform or update the Joint Committee on a number of matters not specifically addressed in other items on this agenda and to give the Joint Committee an opportunity to ask questions and give feedback if desired.
2. This report was also given to the Coordinating Executives Group (CEG) on 7 August 2017.
3. The matters covered in this report include:
 - 3.1. Training and exercising
 - 3.2. New method of operations implementation
 - 3.3. Hawke's Bay Emergency Response Team
 - 3.4. Community Resilience Plans
 - 3.5. Business resilience work
 - 3.6. Public Education
 - 3.7. Welfare
 - 3.8. Hastings emergency management facility alterations
 - 3.9. Cell Phone Broadcasting Implementation
 - 3.10. Group Initial Response Planning

Discussion

Training and Exercising

4. Two Coordinated Incident Management System (CIMS) 4 Courses were run in July, with 45 staff from across councils and other agencies attending. Feedback from staff has been excellent and the courses are seen to be of great value.
5. Exercise Cyclone Donald was run in May at the Group Emergency Coordination Centre and involved a number of staff from across HBRC, NCC and HDC. The exercise focussed on the role of the Incident Management Team and reviewing the new processes for action planning and tasking that have been put in place to deliver response under the new structure. Attendance at the group exercise was around 60%, with a number of staff from Hastings unable to attend due to the Havelock North water inquiry.
6. Incident Management Team activities were run at the all local councils in June and July. These exercises also focussed on testing and reviewing the changes that have been made to the processes for action planning and tasking.
7. In addition to the above, the Group also held a 1 day welfare needs assessment exercise for welfare managers, agency staff and volunteers. Prior to this training, all attendees completed a 1 hour online training module to ensure that everyone attending understood the process for needs assessment.
8. The exercise itself comprised of two sessions; a practical needs assessment exercise in the morning and a needs analysis and planning session in the afternoon. The exercise tested the recently developed Kobo Needs Assessment form, which has since been used for real to register people stuck on the Napier-Taupo Road in the recent snow event. The exercise was attended by 35 people and was well received.
9. The **HB CDEM Group Training and Exercise Plan** has recently been reviewed and updated and the training programme monitored to see how successfully it was

delivered. Whilst there have been a number of emergency events over the past year that have affected the delivery of training and exercising, the Group has still managed to delivered the following training and exercises to staff:

- 9.1. *Online CDEM Induction* – Piloted at HBRC to approximately 30 staff – due for full release in August 2017.
- 9.2. *Introduction to Emergency Management Information Systems (EMIS)* – Delivered to staff across all authorities.
- 9.3. *EMIS Super user* – two sessions to approximately 30 staff.
- 9.4. *Integrated Training Framework (ITF) Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) Foundation Course* – Delivered across all authorities to approximately 80 staff.
- 9.5. *Public Information Managers' Seminar* – delivered in Napier to 25 staff from across Hawke's Bay, Manawatu and Bay of Plenty.
- 9.6. *CIMS 4* – four courses held for approximately 100 staff from across the authorities and partner agencies.
- 9.7. *Red Cross Psychosocial First Aid Course* – Delivered to 25 staff from across Hawke's Bay.
- 9.8. *Welfare Needs Assessment* – Delivered to Hastings volunteers (Approximately 45 over 2 days) and through an online module prior to Exercise Cyclone Donald (To approximately 35 people).
- 9.9. *Exercise Tangaroa* – Held in September last year and involved staff from across the Group.
- 9.10. *Exercise Cyclone Donald* – Held in May/June and involved staff from all authorities.
10. A number of training sessions in the current programme for last year were part of the National ITF training package, but were unable to be delivered due to the packages not being completed and made available for delivery.
11. The **2017 – 2021 HB CDEM Group Training and Exercising Plan** will focus on embedding the new mode of operations through a series of regionally developed short courses for each of the core EOC functions. These courses will focus on developing the basic skills of staff in each role and the use of EMIS.
12. It is hoped that a number of the ITF packages will be available for delivery over the coming year.

New Method of Operation Implementation

13. The method of operations work is moving along with four of the five Councils given training on some of the new processes recently as part of Exercise Cyclone Donald. This saw Incident Management Teams (IMT's) working through a scenario and focussing on maintaining their lifeline/core business and assets, and in some cases supporting the wider regional response.
14. This was a useful exercise from both a process and testing stand point; as a result of the exercises several changes have been made to the forms staff used, and also to the processes we are implementing to manage response operations.
15. Work has also started on review of the Group Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) and warning/notifications system with several tests being run (and in some cases the new lists being utilised for events) across other agencies. The Group now has a robust email and etext system which sits independent of all Councils making it redundant in the case of Council server loss.
16. The EMIS portal work has now been completed with four of the five Councils given basic training on access and use of the site. Amendments are being made to SOP 5 (Declarations) to include new information and forms relating to Recovery Management powers, and SOP 1 (Warnings & Notifications) is being updated to include changes to the system. Both should be available for release to the wider Group shortly.

17. Given the importance of an effective and operative Group Emergency Coordination Centre, there has been significant progress towards upgrading the technology and assets to ensure all agencies can work within the facility during response operations. Part of this work has been looking for ways in which the facility and devices can be mobile and adaptive, and this has been achieved with input from Hastings, Napier, and HBRC ICT teams. New devices now being built for response now include software to run remote access into all three Council systems, with the potential to include Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) in the future (via Citrix).
18. Lastly, the new method was used during the recent snow event on the Napier-Taupo in conjunction with testing of the Road Closure Sub-Plan. A full debrief will be held on 2 August with involved agencies to look for areas of improvement and review the plan (making any required amendments). While the latest snow event only had some minor impacts, initial feedback from response agencies has been positive and reflects the efforts of everyone involved to work collaboratively on the sub-plan.

Hawke's Bay Emergency Response Team

19. The Hawke's Bay Emergency Response Team has been meeting regularly since its formation in January this year. The team now has 26 registered members. Initial focus has been on ensuring that the team has the right leadership, equipment and resources to train and develop their core functions, whilst building the capability of members according to the required standards.
20. The team has recently been supplied new overalls and personal protective equipment and the response trailers and equipment has been refurbished. They have also attended formal training sessions to gain the required unit standards to enable them to perform a light urban search and rescue (USAR) function.
21. The team has also recently been in discussions with the newly formed FENZ regarding how they will be trained and deployed under this organisation for Light USAR response and other FENZ activities.
22. Due to the changes to the New Zealand Fire Service, the process to register as a new Zealand Response Team is currently under review to reflect the new relationship between Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management (MCDEM) and FENZ. Whilst the changes are not likely to have a significant effect on the current development of the team, it may result in accreditation of the team as a New Zealand Response Team not occurring until mid-2018.

Community Resilience Plans (CRP)

23. Following the completion of the Tangitū Community Resilience Plan (Bayview, Eskdale, Whirinaki and Tangoio), the plan has been put on the CDEM website and hard copies are located at key locations in the community. Brochures were delivered by the community to all residents summarising the CRP, as well as extra information for properties in the tsunami zone. GNS are yet to evaluate the impact of the project (delayed due to Kaikoura earthquake), but an internal evaluation has been completed.
24. A community resilience plan for Taiwanaga (on Portland Island) is nearly complete. Tsunami information boards are being planned with this community, and a bilingual version is being investigated, which is likely to be a New Zealand first.
25. Waikaremoana/Tuai have also asked for a community resilience plan. Community champions are being identified by the Tuhoe Tribal Authority Office (Te Kura Whenua). Planning meetings were to be held in late August and community meetings in November. This is dependent on new Emergency Management Officer for Wairoa, but may be carried by other staff in the interim.
26. The Te Awa community has been identified as the next community to engage with in Napier. A project plan has been completed and community champions identified but not yet approached. Planning meetings to be held in September with community meetings to be held in November.

27. In the Hastings District a “Gap” analysis of the existing plans for Cape Coast is being completed and issues identified will be addressed. Initial planning has also commenced with the Maraekakaho community who are keen to develop their own CRP.

Business Resilience

28. The Group has been supporting a working group of local business representatives and sector groups to finalised templates for business emergency and continuity planning.
29. One of the group members has developed a prototype of an app to create business emergency and continuity plans. Workshops have been held with the tourism sector and a ‘train the trainer’ workshop held with various sector representatives. From this, the tourism and building sectors have asked for input to create a regional initial action plan for their sector, that could be activated in an emergency.
30. This public/private partnership approach is innovative and is resulting in some good outcomes for small to medium Hawke’s Bay businesses. The Group Office will continue to support this initiative.

Public Education

31. A draft Group Public Education Strategy has been written and a plan for delivery of public education, management of education resources and communication of information is being worked on as appendices to the strategy.
32. There have been a number of national campaigns organised by MCDEM (focussing on tsunami and earthquake awareness, young families and millennials). The next campaign will be aimed at new immigrants. The theme for Get Ready Week in October will be ‘stay informed’ and will focus on using radio stations, websites, social media, Emergency Mobile Alerts (Red Cross Hazards App and the new National Cell Broadcasting System) as well neighbours and others in the community to keep up to date in an emergency.
33. The Group office has been working with Red Cross on delivering a CDEM developed programme in schools called “Let’s Get Ready”. It is a half hour interactive programme delivered by their community trainers to primary school students. There are 570 students booked on this programme this term.
34. This programme is a good example of the Group working with other agencies to improve community and individual resilience by combining resources. The material is clearly branded and developed by CDEM but delivered to a standard by the Red Cross using their qualified trainers. This programme is also being looked at by Wellington, Wairarapa, Gisborne and Auckland CDEM Groups.

Welfare

35. **Attachment 1** is a report from the Group Welfare Manager on recent welfare activities.

Hastings Emergency Management Facility Alterations

36. In 2011 the Group and Hastings District Council reached an agreement that the Group ECC and the Group office would be collocated with HDC Emergency Management Staff in the Hastings Emergency Management Facility on Lyndon Rd, Hastings.
37. Consequently as part of the move of the NZ Police East Coast District HQ to the old Hastings Courthouse site (a new build), HDC have reached an agreement to provide for an alternative District Command Centre (DCC) in the existing Hastings Emergency Management Facility.
38. As part of this process an updated structural engineering report was completed using the latest Building Codes. This discovered that parts of the building were not up to the Importance Level 4 requirements.
39. To rectify this situation work is required to the building and HDC decided that a complete internal review of the building would be appropriate at the same time. HDC have allocated \$1m capital expenditure to this project.

40. The Group Manager/Controller is on the project governance group and other Group staff are on the project team.
41. The intention is that the priority for this facility remains as a regional CDEM coordination centre while providing for an alternate DCC. It is also possible that the alternate DCC will also be used by on a day to day basis by HDC CCTV staff.
42. The project objectives seek the following outcomes:
 - 42.1. The ability for the coordination centre to be used in a scalable manner from a HDC local lifeline failure up to a regional CDEM event.
 - 42.2. Provide for an alternative NZ Police DCC should the DCC in the new District HQ be inoperative.
 - 42.3. Provide for the day to day accommodation of Group office staff (now including HDC Emergency Management Officers).
 - 42.4. Provide for the better utilisation of existing space including new function work areas and furniture.
 - 42.5. Upgrade and where appropriate futureproof the facility internet/computers (ITC) and communications equipment.
43. At this stage the project is early in its lifecycle and final layout plans have yet to be developed. It is likely however that a more open plan approach will be taken.
44. This is a significant project and it is likely that staff will need to vacate the building for a period of time and alternative ECC arrangements made. The HDC project manager advises that they intend that the project will be completed by July 2018.

Cell Phone Broadcasting Implementation

45. MCDEM have commenced the implementation project for cell phone broadcasting of mass public alerting messages. They advise that the system should be operational by the end of the year.
46. The role of the CDEM Groups in issuing warnings is being addressed and the Group will be able to send alerts within their area. This ability will not devolve down to individual Councils so procedures will need to be developed to provide for local councils to put out warnings through the Group.
47. The governance and business rules around this new capability are still being developed.

Group Initial Response Planning

48. A draft Initial Response Planning Strategy for the HB CDEM Group has been developed following a meeting in April to determine what plans need to be developed by the group. Although the strategy is still draft, a number of plans are already being developed.
49. This includes the main Initial Response Plan that will form the basis for the development of the hazard specific sub-plans, the Rapid Impact Assessment Plan, Fuel Contingency Plan and the Group Welfare Plan. Work will begin on these plans shortly.

Recommendation

That the HBCDEM Joint Committee receives and notes the ***Group Manager's General Update*** report.

Authored and Approved by:

Ian Macdonald
GROUP MANAGER/CONTROLLER

Item 8

Attachment/s

- [!\[\]\(9063468a59e93f469b71000ac5796bc3_img.jpg\) 1](#) Quarterly Welfare Coordination Group Report

QUARTERLY WELFARE COORDINATION GROUP REPORT

DATE: July 2017

PREPARED BY: Alison Prins - Group Welfare Manager

Item 8

Attachment 1

Welfare Structures

- 2017/18 WCG Work Plan Developed and 4 priorities identified:
 - Group Welfare Plan Completion (2a),
 - Rural Advisory Group establishment (3b),
 - Needs assessment system is robust and reliable (4c) &
 - Welfare staff & volunteers are on training pathway (4b).
- Expanded welfare function response structure and resourcing required in the ECC is better understood and will form the basis of future welfare capability development.

Welfare Planning

- Group Welfare Planning commenced. Social Environment and Roles and Responsibilities sections to be workshopped at the July WCG Meeting.
- Welfare contribution to 'State Highway Closures – Sub Plan'.
- Initial Response Planning continues.

The Capability of the Community to Respond to Emergencies is Recognised and Enhanced




- Community liaison function identified as part of the welfare response structure.
- Rural Advisory Group scheduled to meet in August, online induction circulated and rural@hbemergency email address set up.
- Hui to discuss welfare provision and resilience building in partnership with Maori was held in April – several actions identified to be actioned. Follow up required.

Building and Maintaining Capability

- Edgumbe highlighted the need for increased welfare capability and capacity across NZ. It is likely if faced with a similar event we will need to request welfare personnel from other regions to support us.
- Online induction to Civil Defence has been distributed to WCG members – uptake unknown at this stage.
- Needs Assessment exercise was very successful;
 - 30+ participants from a variety of agencies,
 - positive feedback that it was a valuable experience for participants,
 - provided a high level of confidence about the approach we are taking and the system we are using.
 - identified a number of enhancements, some will be implemented now, others will inform the national project.
- Some informal welfare training is planned for early August focussed on welfare function leadership.
- Contributed to Volunteer Strategy discussions.

General Comments

- Group Welfare Manager deployed to assist with Edgumbe Response (April).
- Contributing to work around welfare response structures and needs assessment at a national level.
- Implementing learnings from the various events of the last few months has impacted on progress on some planned work.
- Group Welfare Manager position increased from 0.4FTE to 0.5FTE.

Key		Little or no progress		Some progress		Good progress towards objective
------------	---	-----------------------	---	---------------	--	---------------------------------

HB CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP

Monday 21 August 2017

Subject: GENERAL BUSINESS

Item 9

Introduction

This document has been prepared to assist the Joint Committee to note any General Business Items to be discussed, as determined earlier in the Agenda.

ITEM	TOPIC	MEMBER/STAFF
1.		
2.		

Authored and Approved by:

Ian Macdonald
GROUP MANAGER/CONTROLLER

Attachment/s

There are no attachments for this report.