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Auckland Emergency Management

Director update
Emergency Mobile Alert

Following the launch of the live test on Sunday 26 November 2017 MCDEM engaged Colmar Brunton to determine:

- The proportion of the New Zealand population who received the test alert
- Prior awareness of the Emergency Mobile Alert system
- Prior knowledge that the nationwide test was going to take place
- The public's perceptions of the Emergency Mobile Alert system
- Whether or not the public believe the system should be optional
Methodology

Random mobile phone interviewing of New Zealand residents aged 15 years and over

Interviewing from 27 November to 6 December 2017

7 ½ minute average interview duration

1,004 interviews completed
Summary of key findings

- 34% of New Zealanders received the nationwide test alert
- 66% of mobile users were aware of the EMA system before the nationwide test took place
- 48% of mobile users were aware the nationwide test was going to take place on Sunday 26 November

Three in four mobile users believe the EMA system will be an effective way of alerting New Zealanders in an emergency (72%)

Most mobile users believe New Zealanders should not be able to opt out of the EMA system (72% feel we should not be able to opt out, 21% feel it should be optional)
Manawatu – Wanganui CDEM Group

Wed 21 Feb – Sat 24 Feb

Boil Water Alert in New Plymouth

FENZ on behalf of West Coast CDEM Group

(Tues 20 Feb)

Declaration of Local State of Emergency in Buller

FENZ

(Sun 18 Feb)

Ammonia Spill in Taranaki

Using the Emergency Mobile Alert
Preparedness survey – latest results

• 85% believe that they have a good understanding of actions to take if a disaster struck their area.

• 61% have access to the necessary emergency items needed to survive a disaster.

• Almost all those surveyed are confident that they know what actions to take in the event of severe weather or power/water outages.

• Those surveyed are less confident about dealing with landslides, tsunamis, tornadoes or volcanoes.
Public Alerting project

Auckland Emergency Management has:

• Received endorsement from all local boards about the new approach to Public Alerting in Auckland.

• Hired external consultants to develop and deliver a five stage procurement strategy to assist with the request for tender for tsunami siren infrastructure.
Public Alerting project

- Collaborated with Healthy Waters on the Safeswim initiative programme
- The Safeswim digital signs at Auckland’s beaches now contains Emergency Management messaging
- This is another channel to communicate our key messages into the community
January Storms
Preparedness & Resilience Monitor
Wave 4: November 2017
Prepared for Auckland Emergency Management (AEM) Team
**Research Approach**

- Online survey of all Aucklanders aged 15+
  - Including mobile devices
- Conducted using the Research Now consumer research panel
- Representative of the Auckland region as per the 2013 Census
  - Minimum sample quotas placed on interviewing 15-29 year olds, Maori, Pacific Island and Asian ethnicities
  - Total sample is post-weighted to match the Auckland population as per the 2013 Census
- Four waves conducted over a 12 month period:
  1. Nov 2016 (benchmark)  n=400 sample size
  2. Mar 2017           n=400
  3. Jun 2017          n=1,200 (maximum margin of error: +/- 2.8%)
  4. Sep 2017          n=400 (maximum margin of error: +/- 4.9%)
    In field from 1st – 8th December

This document supports the findings of Waves 1, 2, 3, 4.
Nearly all Aucklanders believe that they have a good understanding of actions to take if a disaster struck their area (85%, but **down significantly** on wave 3) and have a good understanding of the types of emergencies that could occur in Auckland (85%, stable).

However, there is lower buy-in that they have access to the necessary emergency items needed to survive disaster (61%, **down significantly** on wave 3), and they have conversations with family and friends about actions to take to keep safe before an emergency (45%).

Almost all are at least fairly confident that they know what actions to take in the event of severe weather or power/water outages, but are less confident about dealing with landslides, tsunamis, tornadoes or volcanoes.

Main sources of information in an emergency are AC / AEM and traditional media (two-thirds each) with half who would use social media.

Interaction with people of similar ethnic/cultural backgrounds remains the highest community interaction by far (stable).

The resilience attributes have remained stable at an overall level of agreement. However, there have been **significant declines** in those who strongly agree that *it’s important for initiatives to be co-ordinates by someone who knows the local community and people love where they live and what happens in their neighbourhood is important*.

- Agreement remains lower that people and their local communities *know how to deal with problems together* and feel they can *influence what happens in their local communities*.
(by findings (continued))

More than half of respondents are aware that Auckland Council has overall responsibility for Civil Defence Emergency Management, **up significantly** (54% vs. 43%)

- But 1 in 5 don’t know who has responsibility

Slightly more than one-quarter of Aucklanders (27%) are advocates for AEM and would speak well of them **down significantly** on wave 3 (35%)

- There has been a significant shift from the advocate to neutral segment with the neutral segment up significantly from 38% to 45%

- Some 1 in 4 don’t know

Satisfaction with the overall performance of AEM remains stable with 2 in 4 people who are satisfied

- A high proportion (nearly one-third) don’t know, which is not unexpected

Trust in AEM make the right decisions remains high with 56% who agree. However, there has been a **significant decrease** in those who strongly agree, down 5-points to 17%

This wave has seen declines in perceived levels of preparedness and resilience amongst Aucklanders. Although awareness that Auckland Council is responsible for Auckland Emergency Management is up and satisfaction remains stable; there have been significant declines in advocacy and trust.

It is possible that the Emergency Mobile Alerts that were sent early morning at the beginning of October could have caused a degree of anxiety, particularly as some people questioned why it was compulsory to receive them and felt they were invasive.
LTP KPI Composite Scores

Note:
These have been reassessed to align more closely with Auckland Emergency Management’s goals for 2017/18 and will be used as benchmark readings moving forward
## TP KPIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP KPIs</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP 1: I have a good understanding of the types of emergencies that could occur in Auckland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 2 Composite Score: % of Aucklanders that are prepared for an emergency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a good understanding of what actions to take if a disaster struck my area e.g. 'drop, cover, hold' during an earthquake</td>
<td>0.33333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have conversations with my family and friends about actions we need to take to keep safe before an emergency</td>
<td>0.33333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have or have access to the necessary emergency items needed to survive a disaster such as tinned food, toilet paper, torch, spare batteries and so on</td>
<td>0.33333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 3 Composite Score: % of Aucklanders that feel connected to their local communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discuss problems with the people I trust and work with them to find a solution</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is important that local community activities or initiatives are coordinated by someone who knows our local community</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know we need to work together to overcome obstacles in our local community</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love where I live and what happens to my neighbourhood is important to me</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 4 composite Score: % of Aucklanders that feel empowered to solve their problems together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my local community and I know how to deal with problems together</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel I can influence what happens in my local community</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PT KPIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W3 Jul17</th>
<th>W4 Nov17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP 1: I have a good understanding of the types of emergencies that could occur in Auckland</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 2 Composite Score: % of Aucklanders that are prepared for an emergency</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a good understanding of what actions to take if a disaster struck my area e.g. 'drop, cover, hold' during an earthquake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have conversations with my family and friends about actions we need to take to keep safe before an emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have or have access to the necessary emergency items needed to survive a disaster such as tinned food, toilet paper, torch, spare batteries and so on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 3 Composite Score: % of Aucklanders that feel connected to their local communities</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss problems with the people I trust and work with them to find a solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that local community activities or initiatives are coordinated by someone who knows our local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now we need to work together to overcome obstacles in our local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love where I live and what happens to my neighbourhood is important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP 4 Composite Score: % of Aucklanders that feel empowered to solve their problems together</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My local community and I know how to deal with problems together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel I can influence what happens in my local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparedness and Resilience Attributes
Understanding of actions to take and the types of emergencies remains high. However, one-third don’t have access to survival items (down significantly) and more than half don’t have conversations about actions to keep safe.

### Level of Emergency Preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding of actions to take: I have a good understanding of what actions to take if an emergency struck my area (for example, Drop, Cover, Hold).

Understanding of types of emergencies: I have a good understanding of the types of emergencies that could occur in Auckland.

Access to emergency items: I have or have access to the necessary emergency items needed to survive a emergency, such as tinned food, toilet paper, torch, spare batteries and so on.

Conversations about actions: I have conversations with my family and friends about actions we need to take to keep safe before an emergency.

More likely to have good understanding:
- Those aged 70+, South, Maori/PI, older singles living alone

More likely to have good understanding:
- Those aged 70+, older couples with no kids at home

More likely to have access to items:
- Those aged 70+, North, older couple with no kids at home

Less likely to have conversations:
- Those from household with older kids
Over 9 in 10 are at least fairly confident they know what actions to take for more common emergencies e.g. severe weather and power/water outages. However, people are less confident about dealing with landslides, tsunamis, tornados or volcanic eruptions.

### Confidence in Actions to Take

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Not at all confident</th>
<th>Not very confident</th>
<th>Fairly confident</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
<th>Extremely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe weather (heavy rain, hail, strong winds)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power, water / wastewater outages</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding (surface, river and coastal)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contagious disease</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tornado</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcanic eruption</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More likely to be:**

- **Fairly confident** – those aged 70+ and older couple with no kids at home; **Extremely confident** – those aged 15-29
- **Not at all confident** – West; **Very confident** – those from household with mainly school aged kids; **Extremely confident** – those aged 15-29, rural area
- **Not very confident** – female, Asian; **Very confident** – those aged 50-69, older single living alone; **Extremely confident** – those aged 15-29
- **Fairly confident** – those aged 30-49; **Very confident** – older single living alone; **Extremely confident** – those aged 15-29
- **Not very confident** – Female, group flatting; **Very confident** – Mole
- **Not very confident** – Asian; **Very confident** – Mole
- **Not very confident** – Group flatting; **Fairly confident** – Older couple no kids at home
The most common sources of information are council / AEM and traditional media; followed at some distance by social media.

### Where / Who to go for Information in Emergency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council / Auckland Emergency Management</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional media (for example Radio, TV)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media (for example Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and friends</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours and local community</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based groups (for example churches)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More likely to be:**

- AC/AEM – Those aged 70+, Older couple no kids at home
- Traditional Media – Those aged 50-69, European, Older single living alone, Suburban area
- Social media – Those aged 15-29, Group flatting
- Friends & Family – Those aged 15-29, Māori & Pacific Island
- Neighbours & Local community – Those aged 70+, Older single living alone
Common form of community interaction by far increases across all other interaction types

Frequency of Community Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similar ethnic or cultural background</th>
<th>Rarely or never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbours</th>
<th>Rarely or never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work colleagues (W4: wording changed to 'outside of work hours')</th>
<th>Rarely or never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith-based group</th>
<th>Rarely or never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer organisation</th>
<th>Rarely or never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other clubs</th>
<th>Rarely or never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More likely to interact:
- Often: 70+
- Rarely or never: Asians
- Sometimes: North
- Often: Older single living alone
- All the time: 70+, older couple no kids at home

(Significant drop due to question wording change)
However, significant decreases in strong agreement that it's important for initiatives to be co-ordinates by someone who knows the local community and people love where they live and what happens in their neighbourhood is important.
Perceptions of AEM

Note:
The following questions were added in Wave 3 (July 2017)
more than half know that Auckland Council has overall responsibility for Civil Defence Emergency Management, up significantly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for AEM</th>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
<th>NZ Police</th>
<th>NZ Fire Service</th>
<th>Another organisation</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly more likely to be:
Aged 70+, older couple no kids at home, older single living alone
More than one quarter of respondents are advocates and would speak highly of Auckland Emergency Management – down significantly from Wave 3

There has been a shift from advocates to neutrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 3 Jul17</th>
<th>Wave 4 Nov17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critics</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRITICS are more likely to be:**

Older couple no kids at home

**NEUTRALS are more likely to be:**

Aged 70+
Older, single living alone

**ADVOCATES are more likely to be:**

Aged 15-29
South Asian
Around 2 in 5 people are satisfied with the overall performance of AEM, on par with the previous wave

**Satisfaction with the Overall Performance of AEM**

- **Wave 3 Jul17**
  - 1 (Very dissatisfied): 29.3%
  - 2: 23%
  - 3: 27%
  - 4: 14%
  - 5 (Very satisfied): 31%

- **Wave 4 Nov17**
  - 1: 29.4%
  - 2: 25%
  - 3: 28%
  - 4: 12%
  - 5: 29%

**Those who are satisfied are more likely to be:**
- Aged 15-29
- Maori & Pacific Islander

**Those who don’t know are more likely to be:**
- Aged 50-69
- Older, single living alone
More than half agree that overall they trust Auckland Emergency Management to make the right decisions

Significant fall amongst those who strongly agree

Overall Trust in AEM to Make the Right Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>1 - Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 - Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 Jul17</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 4 Nov17</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAG Review Recommendations

Presentation to Auckland CDEM Group Committee
28 Feb 2018
What is the TAG Review?

**Sector Review**
- In June 2017, a Technical Advisory Group (TAG), sponsored by Minister Civil Defence, was established to carry out a review of the CDEM sector. This review focused on one of the 4 ‘R’s (the response to civil defence emergencies).
- The purpose of the review was to ensure that New Zealand’s emergency response framework is world leading, fit-for-purpose, and well placed to meet future challenges.
Our Civil Defence Ecosystem

Community at the Centre

Emergency Responders
- ALERTS
- Volunteers
- Māori Wardens

Lifelines
- Power
- Fuel
- Water
- Transport
- Auckland Lifelines Group

Public and Social Sector
- NZDF
- Coastguard
- DHBs
- Salvation Army
- Red Cross
- MBIE
- MSW

Private Sector
- Individual Businesses
- Business Associations
- Employers’ Federation

Council
- Police
- FENZ
- St. John

Council assets and infrastructure
- AEM
- Local Boards
- Auckland Transport
- Harbormaster
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Auckland’s Three Foremost Key Challenges

Super Diversity

Growth

Scale

Auckland’s population growth increase is equivalent to adding a Hamilton every 3 years and a Wellington every 5 years.
Outcomes Sought by the Review

The review set out to achieve the following outcomes and culminate its findings in a set of recommendations for change in the CDEM sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>New Zealand has the appropriate response capability and capacity for civil defence emergency management responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4</td>
<td>The chain of command and control, coordination, and decision making during an emergency is effective and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thoughts on TAG Review Conclusions

“ If the TAG Review recommendations were the entrée to a three course meal, they would be great.

However, if they are the full degustation menu, the diner would not be satisfied.”
The Key Challenge

It's not the structure

That leads to success

It's all about the people

He tangata, he tangata, he tangata
TAG Review Recommendation Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The recommendations are still one-size fits all</th>
<th>Recommendation pushes for more command and control, not less</th>
<th>No mention of community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New Zealand is diverse with very different geographical, social, cultural, and built environments</td>
<td>• The proposed structural changes give national authority more command and control in emergencies, not less.</td>
<td>• The review has been silent on community preparedness or resilience in its recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The CDEM Sector needs to accommodate this and use innovation and flexible approaches to cater to the needs of each area.</td>
<td>• This does not allow CDEM Groups to manage events tailored to local conditions</td>
<td>• From experience, we know community engagement before, during, and after an event is the key to resilience. This needs to be reflected in the sector’s future strategic direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We cannot be too prescriptive, there should be less focus on risk minimisation and more on raising standards</td>
<td>• We need to have more of a people-focus over structure in emergency events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Command and control has its place, but not every place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities to improve the 4Rs are still there

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEG Structure still needs strengthening</th>
<th>Capability building is the key to long term success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We need to have minimum standards for consistency, whilst still allowing Groups to innovate rather than subscribe to the ways of the lowest common denominator.</td>
<td>• We need more vision and professionalism in the sector as per other sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no integration of the other ‘R’s into Response.</td>
<td>• We also need diversity and rewarding career paths for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Key Recommendations
Summary of Key Recommendations

1. National Level functions and structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>View of Auckland Emergency Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEMA</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This recommendation is in-line with the significant changes advocated for to both the role and function of MCDEM by Auckland Council.
- That said, we would caution, as stated above, against applying a one-size-fits-all policy across the emergency management sector.
- We would also note that CDEM resources are stretched very thinly across the country. We reiterate Auckland’s support for the REMAs.

Thoughts/Questions?

- Recommendations for significant change in the role and functions of the national emergency management body are to be welcomed.
- Does one-size-fits-all work for the Auckland context?
## Summary of Key Recommendations

### 2. Regional Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>View of Auckland Emergency Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Regional approaches should be consistent with the CDEM Act.</td>
<td>• On resourcing, Auckland Emergency Management is able to leverage extensive shared services support from across the Auckland Council family. This is unlikely to be the case in the majority of councils across the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CDEM Groups would be required to provide adequate funding and resourcing.</td>
<td>• Caution also needs to be applied to establishing national minimum requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National standards/minimum requirements (for example, capability, operating practice).</td>
<td>• National standards should allow for innovation and not result in a one-size-fits-all approach across the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEMA**

**CDEM Groups**

- Minimum requirements
- More consistency

**Thoughts/Questions?**

- These recommendations already reflect Auckland’s existing practice in providing for adequate funding and in applying best practice.

- Minimum requirements may be useful for smaller CDEM Groups but it is important that innovation is allowed as well as standardisation.
### 3. Declarations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>View of Auckland Emergency Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify that elected representatives (the mayors) have primary authority to</td>
<td>• Auckland Council delegations allow for all Governing Body members to declare an emergency subject to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>declare states of local emergency for their respective districts.</td>
<td>availability, in the following order:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide the option of the mayor declaring a ‘major incident’.</td>
<td>• Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chair (Auckland CDEM Group Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deputy Chair (Auckland CDEM Group Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other councillors who are members of the Auckland CDEM Group Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• While the ‘major incident option’ may be a useful tool if applied appropriately clear guidance would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>need to be provided on the rationale and thresholds for this option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thoughts/Questions?

- All members of the Governing Body can, under Auckland’s delegations, declare a local state of emergency.
- The ‘major incident’ option would need to be clarified.
Summary of Key Recommendations

4. Role of Iwi

**Proposed Changes**
- Require the appointment of appropriate iwi representatives to be part of CEG and the Group Joint Committee for all CDEM Groups.

**View of Auckland Emergency Management**
- The elevated role of iwi in emergency management reflects current Auckland Council practice.
- However, thought needs to be given to consider what this would mean for Auckland given the Independent Maori Statutory Board’s statutory role in Auckland and membership of Auckland Council committees.

**Thoughts/Questions?**
- The elevated status of iwi in emergency management is to be welcomed.
- From an Auckland perspective we would need to understand what “appropriate iwi representation” means for our unique arrangements. **Thoughts from the IMSB?**
Summary of Key Recommendations

5. Capability and Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>View of Auckland Emergency Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory National Standards for Controllers</td>
<td>Support in Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create ‘Fly-In’ Teams to be deployed to regions in times of need</td>
<td>• We support the use of national standards, but recommend, in line with New Zealand academic practice, that there be more than one provider for the national Controller’s course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMControllers</td>
<td>• The “Fly-in’ Teams must be able to work with local communities. NEMA, in line with Auckland Council’s submission, is supported to understand the local government operating environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>• Auckland Emergency Management has 3 NZRT teams and they are an invaluable resource. While it is understood FENZ do not wish for further search and rescue resource, for which they are legislatively accountable, and that MCDEM does not provide any further support for RTs going forward as has previously been the case, Auckland will continue to support these essential teams. There is currently a national exercise to determine the role of NZRTs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint FENZ as the lead agency for NZRTs and volunteers to ensure high standards</td>
<td>• Auckland developed the University of Auckland Controllers and Leadership Programme in response to a lack of adequate training for metro controllers. We support change but caution against having one national training provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Auckland supports areas in need across the country during times of crisis. Formalising what can be cumbersome deployment protocols is to be welcomed. Auckland strongly believes that, for example, there needs to be clear health and safety protocols in place for the deployment of staff across the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thoughts/Questions?

- Auckland developed the University of Auckland Controllers and Leadership Programme in response to a lack of adequate training for metro controllers. We support change but caution against having one national training provider.

- Auckland supports areas in need across the country during times of crisis. Formalising what can be cumbersome deployment protocols is to be welcomed. Auckland strongly believes that, for example, there needs to be clear health and safety protocols in place for the deployment of staff across the country.
## Summary of Key Recommendations

### 6. Authority for Command, Control, and Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>View of Auckland Emergency Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enable the Director (NEMA) to direct Group Controller(s) during an emergency under the CDEM Act when there are matters of national interest.</td>
<td>• Seek clarifications on the mechanism for NEMA command and control, as well as what constitutes ‘national interest’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require clear command authority at Group level and clear control authority for Group Controllers.</td>
<td>• Seek clarifications on the mechanism for clear command authority at Group level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require the use of CIMS (2nd edition)</td>
<td>• Support the use of CIMS but note that CIMS needs to be reviewed and enhanced to reflect best practice in project and programme management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thoughts/Questions?

- Command and control is not always appropriate. The importance of community resilience and community engagement needs to be recognised.
- What would constitute an event of ‘national interest’ in Auckland?
What would you see as Auckland’s role in coordinating large-scale events outside of Auckland?

- Auckland has significant resources to support national or otherwise significant emergency events.

Thoughts/Questions?

- Government operating environment understand the specialist skills and language of the local approaches. The ODC needs to be populated with people that understand these processes and approaches while allowing for feedback in line with Auckland’s submission to the TAC Review. Auckland’s feedback may be the potential to be used for this purpose.

- Auckland’s feedback have the potential to be used for this purpose.

- Auckland Emergency Management has significant EOC resource in the primary EOC in Auckland CBD and in the purpose-built facility.

Proposal Changes

2. Intelligence

Summary of Key Recommendations

CRAIG

Item 10

Attachment A
Summary of Key Recommendations

8. Information and Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>View of Auckland Emergency Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confirm local Mayor as primary spokesperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate and deploy well-trained PIM personnel in “Fly-In Teams”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thoughts/Questions?

• The communications ‘landscape’ is quite different in Auckland.
• Our local media is also the national media. As a result, Auckland Emergency Management is often called upon for comment.
• In an event, the media in Auckland also seeks commentary from several different sources, including elected members.

Support in Part

• We are supportive of this recommendation, but it must be noted that in Auckland, primary elected member spokespeople are the Mayor and CDEM Group Committee Chair.
• It is also appropriate for the Auckland Emergency Management Director/Controller to be the spokesman for special situations requiring further details on the response.
Current Reforms → Future Reforms?

The TAG recommendations have been silent on many aspects of the sector, such as:
- Community
- Culture
- The other ‘R’s of emergency management outside of Response (such as capability across the 4Rs)

In order to realise the purpose of the recommendations, which is to ensure New Zealand’s emergency response framework is world leading, fit-for-purpose, and well placed to meet future challenges, future reform is required.

In the future, through a series of phased reforms, New Zealand’s CDEM sector should increasingly reflect global best practice in both strategic direction and operational capability.

Auckland Emergency Management believes the current TAG recommendations should be seen as the first of a phased approach to reforms to ensure that all of the 4 ‘R’s are considered in an integrated fashion.
Next Steps for the TAG Review

- Minister of Civil Defence to review the recommendations of the TAG
- Government’s response to the TAG’s recommendations
- Call for submissions
- Legislative change
- Implementation
Questions?
National Science Challenge

2015-19 Research Program – Resilience to Nature’s Challenges

Toolbox programs
- Economics
- Governance
- Infrastructure
- Culture
- Hazards
- Resilience Trajectories

Underpinning Resilience Disciplines

Priority Partnerships

Maori

Rural

Edge

Urban

Co-creation Labs

Resilient New Zealand

Resilience Pipeline
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Item 15

Delivering Resilience
David Johnston, Nick Craddock-Henry
Science to deliver and track resilience

Recovery
Suzanna Wilkinson, Julia Becker
Science to design effective recovery

Mātauranga Maori
Charlotte Severne
Science to grow Mātauranga in resilience

Multi Hazard/Risk Models
Mark Bebbington, Garry McDonald
Integrated multi- and cascading risk and uncertainty

Weather
Richard Turner
Wind, flood, landslide wildfire
Impact science for High-Impact-Weather scenarios
• Urban engineering (especially Auckland)
• Primary sector
• Warning, + communication technology
• Mātauranga Maori

Earthquake
Brendon Bradley
Andy Nicol
Tsunami, Landslide, Fire
Source and Impact science for earthquake and cascading scenarios
• Building and lifeline network engineering
• Warning
• Mātauranga Maori
• Cultural resilience and psycho-social recovery

Volcanic
Jon Proctor
Tom Wilson
Ash fall, mass flow, gas
Source, impact and adaptation science for long-term volcanic scenarios
• Primary sector and tourism
• Energy, transport and health engineering
• Mātauranga Maori
• Value chains and business continuity

Coastal
Paul Kench
Erosion, flood, storm surge
Source and Impact science for coastal scenarios
• Planning, adaptation and retreat, decision-support tools
• Port and coastal engineering
• Insurance and risk-reduction
• Mātauranga Maori

Aligned: MBIE Endeavour wildfire, NIWA and Scion SSIF, NSC Deep South
Partners: MFE, MCDEM, MPI, MetService, Forestry, Regional Councils, EQC, Lifelines

Aligned: MBIE Endeavour Landslides and Hauraki Rift, QuakeCore, GNS SSIF, NSC Homes
Partners: MBIE, MOT, MED, MCDEM, SI Regional Councils, Cities, EQC, Lifelines

Aligned: MBIE Endeavour Calderas, GNS and NIWA SSIF, NSC Our Land and Water
Partners: MCDEM, MPI, Forestry, DOC, NI Regional Councils, EQC, Lifelines

Aligned: MBIE Endeavour Sea Level Rise, NIWA SSIF, NSC Deep South
Partners: MFE, LGNZ, NZ regional councils, cities, EQC, Lifelines

Contestable Research
Urban Resilience

Resilient Auckland Communities

- RA communities, focus on Pacific Island, Asian, migrant and refugee groups.
- Case study Auckland.

Case studies
Urban Resilience

Resilient Businesses

Developing resilient business practices in Auckland.

RB Tests and promote resilience amongst businesses
Urban Resilience

Resilient Auckland Planning

Simulations run for Auckland
Resilient Auckland Infrastructure

Develop/test resilient indicators for infrastructure networks, transport, water, electricity, telecommunications, evacuation planning.

Urban Resilience
Co-create with businesses, communities solutions to resilience.

Identify vulnerable communities.

Case study projects for researchers and communities to work together.

Investigate realistic scenarios with communities to test long-term recovery, recovery futures and resilience building.