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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities and powers

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee is a statutory committee required under S12(1) of the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002 (CDEM Act) and is responsible for:

- being Auckland’s strategic forum for civil defence and emergency management planning and policy
- establishing an emergency management structure for the Auckland region
- developing, approving, implementing and monitoring the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan
- developing, approving, implementing and monitoring other relevant strategies and policies relevant to the powers and functions of the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group as identified in the CDEM Act
- performing the statutory functions of a civil defence emergency management group
- representing Auckland in the development of national emergency management policy including approving relevant policy and legislative submissions to external bodies
- engaging with Local Boards and local board portfolio holders on civil defence and emergency management issues.

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee will exercise the statutory powers outlined in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 and the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan. The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee is authorised to approve use of the established emergency funding facility provided for emergency management.

Relevant legislation includes but is not limited to:

Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public

All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

• Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
• Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
• Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
• In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting

• The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
• However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
• All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

• Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
• Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff

• All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
• Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members

• Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations

• Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1 **Apologies**

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2 **Declaration of Interest**

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3 **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 28 November 2018 as a true and correct record.

4 **Petitions**

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

5 **Public Input**

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than **one (1) clear working day** prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of **thirty (30) minutes** is allocated to the period for public input with **five (5) minutes** speaking time for each speaker.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public input had been received.

6 **Local Board Input**

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to **five (5) minutes** during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give **one (1) day's notice** of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

At the close of the agenda no requests for local board input had been received.
7 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
Update from Acting Director Auckland Emergency Management

File No.: CP2019/01752

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To give the Acting Director, Auckland Emergency Management the opportunity to update the Committee.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Sarah Sinclair, Acting Director – Auckland Emergency Management will give a presentation to the Committee.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) receive the presentation from the Acting Director, Auckland Emergency Management.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Authoriser | Sarah Sinclair – Acting Director, Auckland Emergency Management |
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To report to the committee, the advice and recommendations from the Coordinating Executive Group meeting on 4 February 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Coordinating Executive Group had its first meeting of 2019 on 4 February.

3. The Coordinating Executive Group received a number of reports on collaboration initiatives, as well as specific reports relating to the approval of documents. Agenda items from that meeting, not separately reported to this committee meeting include:
   • Extraordinary business
   • Proposed changes to CEG membership to reflect Auckland Emergency Management’s Controller-Director role split
   • Proposal for joint exercising across agency partners
   • Discussion on our approach to a joint Evaluation Action Plan
   • Working to build community resilience together

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

  a) note the contents of the report.

Horopaki

Context

4. Under section 20 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, the Coordinating Executive Group:
   • provides advice to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group
   • implements, as appropriate, the decisions of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group
   • oversees the implementation, development, maintenance, monitoring and evaluation of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan 2016-21.

5. In performing these functions, the Coordinating Executive Group meets quarterly and also attends the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee meetings.

6. Coordinating Executive Group agenda items, not separately reported to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee are summarised.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutouhu
Analysis and advice

Extraordinary business

7. There were three items of extraordinary business, one of which is separately reported in c) below:

a) Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management (MCDEM) Proposal for Fly In Teams (AEM)

The Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management’s proposal for Fly-In-Teams was discussed. The proposal was supported in principle subject to queries relating to implications for Auckland. These included implications for different agencies and established models used in defence and medical responses, the selection of fly-in-team members, thresholds for deployment and reporting lines. It was noted that legislation change might be required to operationalise fly-in-teams. It was agreed to prepare draft feedback and hold a joint workshop with the Ministry.

NB – a report on this item is included on the Committee’s agenda.

b) Shared CEG media (AEM)

Support for sharing media across Coordinating Executive Group agencies was discussed prompted by a media enquiry received Auckland Emergency Management. This idea was supported and it was noted that agenda items provided opportunities for more joint work across Coordinating Executive Group agencies. It was agreed to look at shared media in any joint work on readiness and exercises.

c) Building a Robust and Sustainable Volunteer Capability and Capacity for Emergency Management in New Zealand (AEM)

The Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management is seeking feedback on proposed national arrangements for response teams before the end of February 2019. Ownership and tasking of response teams, responsibility for training, and health and safety obligations were discussed. Auckland Emergency Management will circulate the document by 15 February 2019.

Proposed changes to CEG membership to reflect Auckland Emergency Management’s Controller-Director role split (AEM)

8. Previously one role, the functions of Group Controller and Director, Auckland Emergency Management were separated in June 2018.

9. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to:

- the addition of the statutory role of Controller as a voting member of the Coordinating Executive Group to reflect the separation of Director and Controller roles
- to remove the role of Head of Strategy and Planning from membership to reflect the stronger role the Director has in delivering strategy under the separated roles, which helps maintain current membership numbers
- to amend the Coordinating Executive Group’s Terms of Reference to reflect these changes in the Group’s membership.

10. Updated Terms of Reference reflecting the membership change will be reported to the committee in May 2019 for endorsement.

Proposal for joint exercising across agency partners (AEM)

11. Auckland Emergency Management is developing a 2019 exercise calendar to test competencies across the group as outlined in the Auckland CDEM Group Plan (2016-2021). There is an opportunity for agency partners to lead and participate in joint exercises as part of this initiative.
12. A more aligned and collaborative approach to exercising across Coordinating Executive Group agencies was supported. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to:
   • support the establishment of an exercise working group
   • recommend an appropriate candidate from their agency to provide representation on the exercise working group
   • support agency representation at the Auckland Emergency Management’s Incident Management Team monthly meetings and recommend an appropriate candidate from their agency.

Discussion on our approach to a joint Evaluation Action Plan (AEM)

13. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to develop a Joint Evaluation Action Plan and associated protocols. This is intended to inform collaboration across agencies through sharing improvements and lessons learnt after significant events. The Plan would be supported by tools to facilitate reporting and resourcing of any inter-agency recommendations subsequently identified through the plan. These tools would also enable updates to be provided to the Coordinating Executive Group and the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee as required.

14. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to establish a working group to develop the protocols and a reporting template.

Working to build community resilience together (AEM and FENZ)

15. The Coordinating Executive Group previously agreed to developing a coordinated approach to the way that we work together.

16. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to form a community resilience-building working group to explore actions that could be delivered in the areas of shared approaches to resilience building, shared resilience communications and inter agency delivery of actions. The Group also agreed to nominate representatives from each agency for the working.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

17. The matters outlined in this report support fulfilment of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group’s role and contribute to improving emergency management capability in Auckland. There are no direct implications for Auckland Council group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe

Local impacts and local board views

18. The matters outlined in this report support fulfilment of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group’s role and contribute to improving emergency management capability in Auckland. There are no direct local impacts or implications for local boards.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

19. The matters outlined in this report support fulfilment of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group’s role and contribute to improving emergency management capability in Auckland. There are no direct impacts on or implications for Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

20. No financial implications are identified arising out of the matters outlined in this report.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
21. The matters outlined in this report support fulfilment of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group’s role and contribute to improving emergency management capability in Auckland. There are no specific risks identified as arising out of the matters outlined in this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Authorisers | Sarah Sinclair – Acting Director, Auckland Emergency Management |
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To update the list of Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management group controllers as a regular update and to reflect recent staff changes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Removal from, or addition to the list of authorised group controllers, group recovery managers and group welfare managers requires a resolution of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee. In August 2018 the committee agreed to receive a twice-yearly update to the list (CIV/2018/26).

3. It has since proven necessary to inform interim meetings of changes to reflect updates training or appointments, as well as staff changes.

4. A staff member, Craig Glover, former head of Strategy and Planning at Auckland Emergency Management, is no longer available to be an Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management group controller. His name has been removed from the list of alternate group controllers.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) approve the removal of Craig Glover, former Head of Strategy and Planning at Auckland Emergency Management, from the list of Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management group controllers.

Horopaki

Context

5. Under Section 26 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, each group must appoint, either by name or by reference to the holder of an office, “at least one suitably qualified and experienced person to be the person or persons who are to perform the functions and duties and exercise the powers of the group controller.”

6. Under Section 26(3) a group may, at any time remove from office or replace a group controller appointed under subsection (1) or (2).

7. The recording of the committee’s decision in the minutes of the meeting formalise appointments under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 and fulfill the requirements of that Act.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

8. The role of group controller is an important one. In a declared emergency the individual performing has access to statutory powers subject to obligations and processes under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

9. Auckland Emergency Management takes care to ensure a sufficient roster of qualified and authorised persons is available to undertake the role of group controller whenever an emergency occurs.

10. Reporting any additions and removals to the list of group controllers to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee so these can be formally resolved ensures clarity and compliance with Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

11. Craig Glover, former Head of Strategy and Planning has resigned from Auckland Council and is no longer be available to perform the function of an Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management group controller.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

12. Group controllers are responsible for performing and exercising functions, duties and powers under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. While the assets, services and conduct of business by members of the council group may be impacted by an emergency, the appointment or removal of an individual as group controller has no impact.

13. Council group views were not sought on the decision to remove a group controller.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

14. Group controllers are responsible for performing and exercising functions, duties and powers under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Civil defence emergencies can have local impacts and local boards are regularly consulted on the delivery of emergency services in their areas.

15. Local board views have not been sought on the decision to remove a group controller.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

16. There are no impacts on Māori arising from this report.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

17. There are no financial impacts arising from the report.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

18. The Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group is required to appoint suitably qualified and experienced personnel to perform the functions and duties and exercise the powers of the group controller.

19. This report seeks to ensure the list of group controllers remains current, reflecting those qualified and duly authorised by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee may perform this role.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

20. Any future deletions or additions to the list of group controllers, group recovery managers, and group welfare managers will be brought to the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee for resolution, as and when required.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Jennifer Rose - Head of Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Andrew Clark - General Manager Commercial and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Sinclair - Acting Director, Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Submission on Fly In Team Concept

File No.: CP2019/01702

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek retrospective endorsement for the Auckland Group submission to Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management Consultation on the New Zealand Fly In Team Concept Paper, which was returned to meet Ministry deadlines, between meetings of the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Ministry of Civil Defence issued an important consultation document in December 2018, requiring urgent response. This was the New Zealand Fly In Team (NZ-FIT) Concept Document of 12 December 2018.

3. Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group submitted a response to the New Zealand Fly In Team Concept on 5 February 2019, having received an extension of time to discuss the document at the Coordinating Executive Group. The Group submission endorses the concept of New Zealand Fly In teams, with a number of questions about applicability and implementation in Auckland. As an early concept document, it is understood that concept development and adaption is ongoing.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) retrospectively endorse Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group’s submission to New Zealand Fly In Team (NZ-FIT) Concept Document of 12 December 2018.

Horopaki
Context
4. This document proposes a Concept for the establishment of a suitably qualified and experienced pool of New Zealand Fly In Team members for the purpose of rapid deployments in emergency response and recovery situations. This follows government decisions announced on 30 August 2018 on emergency management system reform, in support of the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Group.

5. The Concept document has been clearly defined by the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management as work in progress, and since the submission date further conversations with Ministry officials have identified that further development of the ideas into an operational level of detail is underway.

6. The document addresses the purpose and benefits to emergency management of having Fly In Teams. It suggests the scope, duties and responsibilities of the teams. It proposes how the teams might be selected, and the range of skills that might be sought and developed. Ideas of how the teams may be deployed are also articulated.
7. Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group submitted a response to the concept document on 5 February 2019, having secured an extension of time to allow the document and response ideas to be discussed at the Coordinating Executive Group. This extension of time did not allow time for the submission to be approved by the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee. This report seeks retrospective approval from the committee for the Group submission on the proposed Fly in team concept (Attachment A).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

8. The concept of developing additional capability and capacity in the emergency response sector is strongly supported. The time frames are challenging, and the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management is acknowledged for its rapid development of the concept since announcement on 18 August 2018. The Ministry has made clear its intent to work with the 16 regional Civil Defence and Emergency Management groups to further develop the concept.

9. The submission from Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management group framed a number of questions, relating to implementation of Fly In Teams in the Auckland context. These related specifically to triggers, reporting lines, governance and Auckland specific legislation, involvement of local boards, Auckland scale and diversity, and involvement of staff who are involved part time rather than full time in emergency management. The submission endorsed and commended the intention to build capability in the sector and develop professional competences for emergency management staff and volunteers.

10. Officers from the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management met with Auckland Emergency Management staff, Controllers and Lifelines Utility Coordinators to discuss the feedback, and to brief Auckland on ongoing changes to the concept based on more detailed considerations.

11. The Auckland Coordinating Executive Group has requested a workshop with the ministry once the proposal detail is further established, to work through some of the concepts in relation to a large, potentially declared, event in Auckland.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

12. The submission outlines that there are benefits to councils not identified in the document, and also raises potential impacts to Auckland Council when many of our incident response managers are not Auckland Emergency Management staff.

13. The formulation of the submission was discussed with the Coordinating Executive Group on 5 February 2019. As further detail is developed on the operational approach to fly in teams, this will be discussed across the planned incident management team at Council and the Coordinating Executive Group and escalated where appropriate. Further change is expected.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

14. The submission identifies the need for any Fly In Teams to understand local impacts, local areas and local board arrangements. This has been discussed further with the ministry, and further details will be provided to give context to Fly In Team arrangements, and how that will impact on local board arrangements.
15. Discussions with Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management on selection and training of volunteers has stressed the importance of cultural awareness. Similarly, the submission identifies the importance of local relationships of trust with communities, and the importance of local understanding. Further details will be provided to give context to Fly In Team arrangements, and how that will impact on local board arrangements.

16. Financial implications of training volunteers for Fly In Teams are discussed in the submission appended to this report.

17. The matters outlined in this report support fulfilment of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group’s role and contribute to improving emergency management capability in Auckland. There are no specific risks identified as arising out of the matters outlined in this report.

18. Further documentation on implementation and operational considerations around Fly In Teams is expected to be received from the ministry.

19. Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Coordinating Executive Group has requested a workshop with the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management. Further details are also requested on existing qualifications, and on capabilities and constraints around selection and training of volunteers.

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Auckland CDEM Group Group Submission on NZ-FIT</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signatories**

| Authorisers | Sarah Sinclair - Acting Director, Auckland Emergency Management |
05 February 2019

New Zealand Fly in Team (NZ-FIT) submissions
Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management
PO Box 5010
Wellington 6145
Rachel.walker@dpmc.govt.nz

Dear Rachel,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the New Zealand Fly in Team (NZ-FIT) concept paper 12 December 2018. As the document notes, the TAG review published in August 2018 recommended the establishment of national fly in teams to be comprised of professionals drawn from a variety of agencies to provide support to the local or regional Controller or Recovery Manager. On 30 August 2018 Government decisions about the emergency management system reform were announced, including new investment to establish New Zealand Fly In Teams. We acknowledge the Ministry for its rapid development of the fly in team concept from this stage.

We note that the feedback was due by 28 January 2019. We understand this is an urgent paper, noting that the timeline for response covers the main holiday period for New Zealand. It has therefore not been possible to synchronise our Group Meetings to discuss this paper, or to coordinate discussions with senior MCDEM staff, within the deadline.

The Auckland CDEM Group requested an extension of time to Tuesday 5 February to be able to discuss this important topic at its Coordinating Executive group (CEG) meeting, noting that its CDEM Group Committee discussion with not be held until 25 February 2019. This submission was considered and discussed by the CEG at its meeting on 04 February 2019, and the CEG agreed the following points, which are discussed in more detail below, noting that some of the National Agencies represented at our CEG have also fed back separately to MCDEM on a national basis.

In summary, Auckland CDEM group supports the general principle of FIT teams nationally. We note that the document is a concept proposal and recommend that further concept development incorporates the need for greater understanding of the distinction of the Auckland region specifics and the application of FIT teams within the Auckland context, including how we coordinate emergency management functions in Auckland, our governance arrangements and our super-diversity.
We endorse and commend the intention to build capability in the sector and develop professional competences for emergency management staff and volunteers. Feedback in this submission focuses on the core areas that the proposal touches on being the implications of Fly In Teams to Auckland Emergencies and the availability of Auckland staff for FIT roles, in the context of not being full time emergency management professionals, and having other paid roles outside of emergencies. We welcome further exploration of how these volunteers can contribute to and learn from FIT arrangements.

The FIT team concept was discussed in development at the National Emergency Management Development Group meeting on the 24 October 2018. The feedback raises some of the wider points including in that discussion.

If you require any clarification on any aspect of the submission please contact Sarah Sinclair, Acting Director Auckland Emergency Management, on 021 331 767, or by email at sarah.sinclair@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Sinclair
Acting Director Auckland Emergency Management, Auckland Council
Submission to the

Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management

DRAFT New Zealand Fly In Team (NZ-FIT)

05 February 2019

Private Bag 92300, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142
(09) 301 0101
www.aucklandcivildefence.org.nz
www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the New Zealand Fly In Team (NZ-FIT) concept paper 12 December 2018. As the document notes, the TAG review published in August 2018 recommended the establishment of national fly in teams to be comprised of professionals drawn from a variety of agencies to provide support to the local or regional Controller or Recovery Manager. On 30 August 2018 Government decisions about the emergency management system reform were announced, including new investment to establish New Zealand Fly In Teams. We acknowledge the Ministry for its rapid development of the fly in team concept from this stage.

Summary

Auckland CDEM group supports the general principle of Fly In Teams (FIT) nationally. We note that the document is a concept proposal and recommend that further concept development incorporates the need for greater understanding of the distinction of the Auckland region specifics and the application of FIT teams within the Auckland context, including how we coordinate emergency management functions in Auckland, our governance arrangements and our super-diversity.

We endorse and commend the intention to build capability in the sector and develop professional competences for emergency management staff and volunteers. Feedback in this submission focuses on the core areas that the proposal touches on being the implications of FIT teams to Auckland Emergencies and the availability of Auckland staff for FIT roles, in the context of not being full time emergency management professionals, and having other paid roles outside of emergencies. We welcome further exploration of how these volunteers can contribute to and learn from FIT arrangements.

This document addresses the Auckland context further, before providing detail on each of the submission sections requested. We have identified areas where we may have materials or resources which will assist MCDEM in further development of the FIT concept. We have also suggested a workshop to explore some of the implications of FIT in Auckland.

Auckland Considerations around Implementation of FIT concept

It is understood that the purpose of the FIT is to support the CDEM Groups in the event of a large-scale local or regional emergency in the response and recovery phases. The document expressly refers to support being available to “assist the Local Group Controller/Recovery Manager in establishing an effective response and recovery when there are difficulties in doing this”, as well as advising on resourcing, giving others reassurance about the response being effective, and providing resource for large scale or enduring emergencies.
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It is not clear who would make the decision around the need for support from FIT, and whether it would be requested or imposed. It is suggested that clear guidelines for requesting FIT team support are developed to support both Controllers and Recovery Managers in activation or declarations.

The scale and complexity of the Auckland Region is also worthy of consideration in the further development of a FIT team concept. This has been raised in discussion with MCDEM, noting the peculiarities of Auckland has both advantages and disadvantages. In a large-scale event, particularly a long duration event, it is clear that the Auckland region will need additional support, notwithstanding that some of these events may also impact elsewhere.

Auckland is fortunate in that by virtue of its size and unitary authority status, and associated resources, that we have access to a large number of trained staff who can fulfil emergency roles. These people acting in a voluntary role for CDEM, particularly Controllers and Coordinated Incident Management System (CIMS) function leads, often have “day jobs” where their individual accountability, funding and resources are greater than some of the whole of district councils in New Zealand. These managers are known to and trusted by our local and regional politicians and have strong relationships across Auckland Council family and our supply chain and suppliers. Our high levels of capital and operational expenditure across regeneration as well as renewal projects and events mean we have partnerships across our vertical and horizontal supply chains that reach widely, including internationally. We also have substantial departments of Council providing advice on communications, legal, procurement, health and safety and governance. Previous discussions with MCDEM have indicated that Auckland would have a much higher threshold than the rest of the country when it comes to declaring an emergency to be at a national level, however that has not been codified or explored in detail since the Council’s formation.

The Auckland Region comprises just under one third of New Zealand’s population producing just under half of NZ’s GDP. We are aware that a significant impact on Auckland would be a significant impact in New Zealand, with associated political interest. At present, we do not have the shared learnings of the amalgamated Auckland Region experiencing the scale of emergency that would lead to a local declaration, or a national emergency being declared. Therefore, the decision of when a FIT team would be required without there being a national scale emergency is not clear to us. This is further complicated by having the FIT team model reporting to the National Controller, which implies that for Auckland this would be similar to a national emergency at present.

It is suggested that a shared understanding of how a significant declared event would play out in Auckland be developed in theory. The Auckland CEG and Auckland Emergency Management would appreciate a workshop with the MCDEM FIT development team to explore how this could work in reality. This could explore areas which are unclear in the concept stage such as how decisions around when a significant event would move to a National Emergency versus a Regional Emergency with FIT support. We are also seeking
clarity of how an Emergency Coordination Centre (ECC) would function under the FIT model, for example, with a full FIT team deployed, and how advice from the FIT team would be delivered. We suggest that workshopping this would help clarify when members of the FIT would be flown in to Auckland, how the decision would be made and how this would influence the Regional Controller’s decision-making prior to a National Declaration.

The Auckland Region also has some local arrangements which are not addressed by the current FIT concept such as our Auckland Region Lifelines Coordination Function similar to the Welfare Function, which performs specialist advice and coordination roles, and reports directly to the Controller. This role has evolved because of the importance of lifeline utilities to Auckland as New Zealand’s largest city. Of recent significant events, power, water supply, and wastewater disposal, have been demonstrated to be significant enough to be managed within this formal structure. Discussions with MCDEM have indicated that new training is silent on the structure of the CIMS model in relation to lifelines. However, for a FIT responder, we do not think that is appropriate for the Auckland model of lifelines to be unacknowledged or unfamiliar to a FIT team. A workshop would also be an opportunity to clarify the roles of the National Lifeline Utility Coordinator and National Welfare Coordinator in an Auckland-scale event. It would also be useful to clarify the interfaces with various subgroups such as the electricity providers group, the transport group etc.

In the Auckland governance model – as established under the Local Government Auckland Amendment Act 2010 - local boards and Auckland specific governance structure are unlike any other in New Zealand. The concept of FIT teams is silent on the concept of local governance and responsibilities and obligations of local authorities under the LGA, RMA and any other legislation. However, we are aware that local engagement and local understanding is critically important for both response and recovery. We also note that Auckland is super diverse, unlike much of the rest of New Zealand, which poses different opportunities and challenges for consideration in a FIT capability and deployment model. This could be addressed through induction processes to support deployments and ensure understanding and cultural sensitivity with diverse communities and should be included in the workshop. We have been working with MCDEM on outreach to diverse media and are very happy to contribute our experiences and lessons learnt to the FIT induction and training programmes.

The Auckland CDEM, like Wellington, have separated the roles of Director and Controller. The Director role, whilst outside the CIMS structure, is involved in media and governance updates and wellbeing of staff. This should also be included in any workshop or induction.

**Benefits of NZ-FIT participation**

The benefits to a CDEM group of developing professional capacity within its full-time staff are well articulated and we can see an alignment with the FIT team proposal. Auckland CDEM Group is strongly supportive of developing and increasing sectoral capability and endorses the FIT concept benefits generally.
Auckland Council has a team of 31 people working in emergency management, both in developing readiness and capability for our own response, and in developing resilience in our communities. Many of our incident response team leaders (i.e., CIMS function leads) are volunteers, rather than Emergency Management professionals, who bring skills like crisis management, developing action plans etc., into emergencies. Whilst we applaud the motivation to increase the number of highly competent professionals in the sector, we suggest this could also reflect that many of them may not be in the sector full-time. For that reason, we suggest that the ‘benefits section’ might also include specific benefits to councils and ratepayers wider than those listed, as the skills developed will be widely useful.

The home agency’s commitment might already be to release them from their day job to participate in emergency management exercises, responses, workshops and projects, for personal growth and to support the wider Council needs. Therefore, we suggest that benefits to home agency and members also consider benefits associated with people who are not full time emergency management professionals.

Measurement of success should include the additional cost of implementing this measure, to confirm the expected return on investment, therefore it will be important to understand where the investment is being made through home agencies as well as government. We suggest that costs to home agencies are documented and collated centrally as part of the NZ-FIT, as this will contribute to a shared understanding of the cost of emergency management to CDEM Agencies and groups.

Scope of NZ-FIT

Generally, what is ‘in scope’ and ‘out of scope’ as described in the proposal is easily understood and makes sense. We note that the scope does not include welfare or lifelines, both of which are important coordination functions – especially for the Controller and Recovery Manager roles, as discussed above. At a detail level, it would be good to understand the types of emergencies that NZFIT is intended to support, to ensure the scope is appropriate, possibly by exploring some scenarios around deployment.

At present, Controllers and Recovery Managers are appointed by each local Group. We request that you consider in more detail whether the local Group would be required to endorse any nationally appointed FIT team Controllers and Recovery Managers and what jurisdiction or decision-making powers the local Group would have in relation to FIT members being deployed in their region.

Other non-scope Feedback

We note the intention to change the CDEM legislation around Controllers, if needed. If the CDEM legislation is changing, we recommend the opportunity is taken to address some other gaps in the current legislation – such as the existence of unitary authorities as in the case of Auckland. Based on recent Auckland experiences, it would also be useful to change the lifeline utilities descriptors to include retailers, community facility operations (e.g., parks,
libraries, waste collection), and include some private utility operators that will be bound by this legislation. This may also be an opportunity to update the Act to reflect the FENZ legislation, and overlaps, with Emergency Management and help clarify within the wider context.

**Duties and Responsibilities**

Whilst we support the potential duties and responsibilities listed, we are keen to understand how the FIT will take account of local SOPs and local arrangements. Auckland Council and its CEG members have well developed SOPs which are currently being updated to reflect inter-Agency activations. Each of our Group CIMS function leads have been involved in workshopping and exercising to understand their roles and the overlaps, and to clarify these. We suggest the concept is developed to include location and event-specific training and integration at the start of deployment, plus confirmation that FIT will work to local arrangements rather than seek to impose a standardised central approach.

It is noted that when a FIT team is deployed, this may be at a time of peak activity of the ECC, hence we reiterate the need for a good in-depth understanding of the local arrangements. At present, the workshopping and exercising noted above is involving the Auckland Regional Emergency Management Advisor (REMA), to facilitate cross-MCDEM understanding. For concept development, it would be useful to explore the REMA role in a FIT activation or induction.

**Composition and selection**

We support the use of a variety of selection tools including those listed in the concept document. Understanding that the FIT ethos is focused on utilising emergency management staff, we would add the comment that Auckland has recently done some work to understand the core competencies associated with each of the specific CIMS roles within the Auckland region. For example, the planning manager needs to have good project planning capability, and an understanding of implementation and resourcing, to be able to develop good action plans. We are happy to offer our work, in addition to the CIMS specific competencies listed, to assist in selection or development of these functions in the FIT model.

We note that the Lifelines function is missing from the list of skills which may be needed in a FIT. Whilst Auckland might be the only region large enough to trigger a significant emergency with a lifeline outage (such as fuel or electricity), we note that the establishment of a FIT for the Auckland fuel disruption would be heavily lifeline oriented.

We also note that CIMS does not capture the need for engagement with communities, and this is a particular issue for Auckland’s governance structure and super diversity. Community engagement was also a particular learning from the Christchurch Earthquake experience and we support the involvement of communication specialists, however note that the link with diverse communities and local boards (for Auckland) is critical for successful engagement.
As noted above, we are happy to share our own learnings and experiences around this, and we anticipate that other CDEM groups will also have specific local concerns and arrangements. Development of the FIT inductions will be a good opportunity to share these learnings and experiences amongst the regions and broaden our understanding of our sector.

**Capability and Training**

Generally, we note the importance of the roles is reflected in the training commitment. For many councils, the prospect of time commitment of senior staff is challenging, hence the note on requesting discussion on wider benefits above.

At present, the majority of Auckland’s Controllers have been trained using the University of Auckland and Auckland Council co-designed programme. This included specific insight into our local governance arrangements and Auckland specific legislation, and the importance of lifelines in Auckland, alongside national obligations and responsibilities under the MCDEM Act. It was also developed within the context of Auckland being a multi-cultural and diverse city with over 200 languages being spoken, and an equivalent or higher number of distinct cultures, some of whom are relatively self-contained.

We understand that all FIT Controllers will be required to undertake the new Controller training, which we have not seen the scope of to date. We suggest that Auckland can share some of the training materials that we have developed to ensure that any FIT teams coming to Auckland have training on our local arrangements, and the implications of the super diversity of Auckland. We would also seek to ensure that FIT teams are specifically trained in community engagement and understand cultural diversity challenges, as these have affected some of our communities in recent events.

The Controller training that was run in Auckland necessitated a high time commitment for staff. We understand that the FIT Controllers, who are advising other Controllers and assisting on priorities will not deployed until they have undertaken the new Controller training. None of the CDEM groups have seen the content of this training yet, and we have no indication of what it includes and how different it is from our Controller training. We also have no indication of whether our existing training will be “grandfathered”. There is, we believe, potential for the training of FIT Controllers to be perceived by outsiders as ‘better’ which raises unfortunate implications for our own Controllers. We would like to discuss this area more with MCDEM.

As other Controllers around the country will have also completed other training courses and the required qualifications to be current as Controllers this requirement could have wider implications than just Auckland. Consideration could be given to refresher or add-on training module for those that already have had significant training, prioritised to ensure that there were no perceived gaps in capability around the regions.
Relationships are important - not just the relationship amongst the FIT team, but relationships and trust throughout the wider response team and the elected members. We do not support the concept that training individual FIT teams together will build a high trust high relationship unit, as we believe this will create a clear and marked difference between the FIT teams and the rest of the Incident Management Team (IMT). Rather, we endorse the current proposal that each FIT member is trained with the wider group and focusses on building relationships with the whole local or regional IMT at location - once deployed.

We support good record keeping, especially for decision making and suggest that any templates or centralised data management systems are circulated widely for use across groups.

Activation and Deployment

As noted above, for our senior volunteers, time availability is a challenge as is the cost to councils. We suggest that the system needs to be as flexible as it can be to maximise the likelihood of individual staff versus team availability.

We commend MCDEM for supporting the cost of training the FIT teams. We understand from discussion that the training itself would be funded, and that time would not be funded. It would be good to get confirmation on whether travel and accommodation for training would be funded in the current proposal.

We note that the deployment would not be funded by MCDEM. Whilst this is not unreasonable for a one off 14-day deployment, we suggest that consideration is given to funding longer term deployments – as the impact on council’s budgets and delivery responsibilities could be significant.

Health and safety of our staff is a particular concern, and we seek more clarity about the overlap between home employer responsibilities and the responsibilities of MCDEM and the receiving agency for FIT volunteers safety and wellbeing during deployment. This would need to be resolved and confirmed within the July 2019 Terms of Reference, and sufficient consultation time allowed for Council safety and legal teams to review.

We would anticipate that any psychosocial debriefings of a personal nature would result in any important issues being conveyed to their business as usual functional managers, as appropriate. We suggest the mechanism for this is worked through, taking into account health and safety considerations, in July 2019. We are currently exploring a post event welfare survey format, which is anonymous, which we are happy to also discuss with MCDEM.
Conclusions

We endorse the NZ-FIT initiative as a national initiative which will improve the capability of response in New Zealand and we suggest that the wider benefits of the initiative are articulated. We applaud MCDEM for developing the concept quickly, and we understand that there are continuing short timeframes to implement this - we have noted some aspects which we believe should be included in the next stage of development.

Auckland CDEM is keen to further workshop the detail with MCDEM for how NZ-FIT concepts would work in Auckland, and we have articulated some specific differences that we are keen to explore, outside of the consultation questions. We support the ongoing development of the NZ-FIT approach to include more regional concepts and detail around deployment and implementation. We are also happy to share materials or resources that we have developed, to support the NZ-FIT initiative.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve the Auckland Coordinating Executive Group's submission to the New Zealand Response Team Steering Group's options paper for 'Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capacity for emergency management in New Zealand.'

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Response teams have been part of the Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) structure in New Zealand for over 30 years. Their role in response increased following the strengthening of responsibilities at the local government level under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

3. Recent changes to how volunteers in the sector are managed has led to confusion about which tasks Response Teams can undertake, who will task them, and associated health and safety management implications. A New Zealand Response Team Steering Group has been established to clarify Response Team arrangements and improve local, regional and national relationships with the intent of ongoing utilisation of Response Teams in emergency events. This Steering Group was tasked with, among other things, considering governance options for Response Teams.

4. The Steering Group has asked for feedback on an options paper 'Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capacity for emergency management in New Zealand' which outlines governance arrangements for Response Teams and what should be achieved through any arrangements. It presents a recommended option before describing the process for gaining a mandate to progress with the recommended option and next steps.

5. Auckland’s submission was coordinated by Auckland Emergency Management based on expert advice from the team, feedback from the Coordinating Executive Group, and Auckland Council's Senior Health and Safety Advisor, Infrastructure and Environmental Services. Comment on the draft response was also sought from the two Response Teams in Auckland.

6. Auckland’s submission supports the utilisation of Response Teams across New Zealand, and the benefits of establishing national governance arrangements, however it does not support the Steering Group’s recommended option.

7. The proposed governance arrangements separate ownership and governance of the Response Teams, leaving health and safety accountability with the owners, which Auckland considers a fundamental part of governance. In addition, the proposed option lacks clarity as to who would task response teams and the mechanism for how Response Teams would be tasked. It is suggested that this needs to be more clearly defined, prior to establishing a governance structure.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) approve the Auckland Coordinating Executive Group submission to the New Zealand Response Team Steering Group’s options paper for ‘Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capacity for emergency management in New Zealand.’

Horopaki
Context

8. Response Teams have been part of the Civil Defence Emergency Management structure in New Zealand for over 30 years. Their role in response increased following the strengthening of responsibilities at the local government level under the Civil Defence and Emergency Act 2002.

9. Response teams consist of community volunteers supported by, and accountable to, a specific local authority or other parent organisation. They can provide specific capability and capacity to support emergency services or the civil defence and emergency management sector during a local emergency.

10. Recent changes to how volunteers in the sector are managed has led to confusion about which tasks Response Teams can undertake, who will task them, and associated health and safety implications. The Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management held two workshops in April and July 2018, to explore options for building a robust, organised and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management.

11. An action resulting from the July 2018 workshop was the establishment of a New Zealand Response Team Steering Group, to explore options for governance of Response Teams in New Zealand. This was intended to be followed by a working group, if necessary, to establish roles, responsibilities and tasking arrangements.


13. The options paper outlines governance arrangements for Response Teams and what should be achieved through any arrangements. It presents a recommended option before describing the process for gaining a mandate to progress with the recommended option and next steps.

14. The recommended option is to leave ownership of teams where it is currently, but to split the governance arrangements for Response Teams into two parts: key agency governance and team governance. This option recommends the establishment of:

i) Key agency governance – A national group/board of stakeholders that consists of senior officials/representatives from key tasking agencies, Civil Defence and Emergency Management Groups and Response Team owners.
ii) **Team governance** – A non-government charitable organisation that represents response teams and provides governance and support when needed. Any team, regardless of their ownership model, could be a member of the organisation, with team owners holding voting rights. The Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management (the Ministry) would also be a member of the organisation. Members of the organisation will decide on who will represent them in the national group/board of stakeholders. Ownership of teams will remain as is (in other words, teams could be owned by local authorities, businesses, trusts etc) with health and safety responsibilities and liabilities remaining with the owner. The organisation could have the ability to support teams when necessary, by either advocating or supporting them or, if necessary, owning them.

iii) A Ministry-based secretariat to support the national group/board of stakeholders and the non-government charitable organisation. The secretariat would also develop, implement and administer a national accreditation framework and develop national policy.

15. The paper also provides a background and the current state of Response Teams, before describing all the governance arrangements options that were explored. Feedback on the options paper was initially requested by 15 February 2019, however the Ministry has extended the deadline until 5:00pm, 1 March 2019.

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

**Analysis and advice**

16. The Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017, which amalgamated the New Zealand Fire Service (urban fire services) and the National Rural Fire Authority (rural fire services) into one organisation impacted the ownership and management of Response Teams. Prior to the unification of urban and rural fire services in New Zealand, rural fire was the responsibility of local authorities under the Forrest and Rural Fires Act 1977.

17. In Auckland like many councils, one of the responsibilities of council Rural Fire teams was the governance and management of both the Volunteer Rural Fire Forces, and local Response Teams. However, since the amalgamation of urban and rural fire services into Fire and Emergency New Zealand, the role and governance of Response Teams across New Zealand including Auckland were not transitioned into the unified fire organisation. This led to a lack of clarity whether these teams of highly trained individuals would be tasked by any of the first response agencies, which raised questions about their ongoing viability.

18. As Auckland Council is not a first response agency the organisation does not have first responder safety protocols in place, including ongoing training and development. However, in parallel with the government response, the Auckland Coordinating Executive Group agreed to explore tasking and capability using Auckland Council health and safety systems.

19. The options paper was sent to Coordinating Executive Group members on 8 January 2019 and was discussed briefly at a Response Team workshop held with Coordinating Executive Group members on 21 January 2019.

20. On 4 February 2019 the Coordinating Executive Group met, and the governance of Response Teams was discussed again under Extraordinary Business.

21. Auckland Emergency Management circulated a draft submission based on expert advice from within the team, as well as feedback received from Coordinating Executive Group members. The draft submission was distributed to Coordinating Executive Group members, as well as Auckland Council’s Senior Health and Safety Advisor, Infrastructure and Environmental Services, for any further feedback.
22. Although Auckland’s submission (Attachment B) supports the utilisation of Response Teams across New Zealand, and the benefits of establishing national governance arrangements, it does not support the Steering Group’s recommended option to establish two distinct parts of governance arrangements: key agency governance and team governance.

23. The proposed governance arrangements separate ownership and governance of the Response Teams, leaving health and safety accountability with the owners, which Auckland considers a fundamental part of governance. In addition, the proposed option lacks clarity at the local level as to who would task response teams and the mechanism for how Response Teams would be tasked. It is suggested that this needs to be discussed further and more clearly defined, prior to establishing a governance structure.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

24. The formulation of Auckland’s submission was coordinated by Auckland Emergency Management based on feedback from the Coordinating Executive Group, as well as expert advice from within the team. Both Auckland Council and Auckland Transport are members of the Coordinating Executive Group.

25. Of note, the options paper refers to all Response Teams. Auckland Transport has a volunteer Maritime Response Team and a Harbourmaster Response Team, and it is suggested that more clarity is needed on how other Response Teams would be managed under the recommended governance option.

26. All feedback received from members of the group has been included in the submission.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

27. No specific local views have been considered in the drafting of this report, and the recommendations contained in this report have no specific local impacts.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

28. The option paper outlining the proposed governance of Response Teams in New Zealand does not have any specific implications for Māori outcomes in Tāmaki Makaurau.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

29. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

30. Our submissions seek to balance the risk of not being able to utilise response teams against the risk of unclear responsibilities for health and safety, volunteer capability and tasking.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

31. To progress and develop the recommended option to a more detailed level, the Steering Group need:
   i) Two thirds of Response Team Owners (who respond) to support the recommended option.
   ii) Key agencies to support the recommended option.

32. The options paper states that if there is a mandate to progress the recommended option (that is, the above threshold is met) the Steering Group will develop the recommended option in more detail, which includes seeking advice on the structure of the recommended option. A more detailed final option will then be circulated.

33. If the threshold to progress is not met, the Steering Group will review the responses and the reasons for a lack of support, and then discuss a way forward.
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Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management in New Zealand

Options for establishing governance arrangements

1. Introduction
This paper seeks a mandate to progress, in more detail, a recommended option for establishing governance arrangements for response teams\(^1\) in New Zealand.

The paper outlines the benefits of establishing governance arrangements and what should be achieved through any arrangements. It then describes the two parts needed in the governance arrangements and presents a recommended option, before describing the process for gaining a mandate to progress with the recommended option and next steps. The paper also provides a background and the current state of response teams before describing all the governance arrangements options that were explored.

1.1. Benefits of establishing governance arrangements
The key benefits of establishing robust and sustainable governance arrangements for volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management include:

- Strengthened buy-in and support from all stakeholders
- Stronger engagement and relationships across the emergency management system including between response teams (existing and future), tasking agencies, CDEM Groups and relevant national agencies.
- Assurance for tasking agencies in relation to their Health and Safety at Work Act obligations
- Ability to provide direction and guidance to response teams, improving national consistency and strengthening the capability of teams through the development of an accreditation framework that meets the needs of stakeholders.
- Better recognition and support of the capability and capacity response teams provide.

1.2. What we are trying to achieve
Developing and implementing governance arrangements will ensure a robust, organised and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management. When exploring options for governance arrangements, the Steering Group considered the following factors:

- **Representation** from all key stakeholders including response teams, response team owners, CDEM Groups, NZ Police, Fire and Emergency NZ, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management (MCDEM).
- Gain and maintain **buy-in** from all interested parties including response teams, response team owners, CDEM Groups, and other tasking agencies including NZ Police, Fire and Emergency NZ, Ministry of Health and MCDEM.

\(^1\) The term ‘response teams’ is used throughout this document to refer to both existing New Zealand Response Teams (registered under the retired MCDEM-led registration system), and other teams that identify as response teams in that they intend to or are interested in, registering/being accredited under a future accreditation framework.
Enable **consistency** across the country while ensuring capability and capacity is fit for **local needs**

- Maintain **local identity** of teams - some teams are well known/recognised and valued in their communities.

- Ensure all relevant **legal requirements** such as health and safety and liability are met

- Provide an ability, through governance arrangements, to set **national policy** (both strategic and operational) and regulate it

- Provide strategic national direction

- Ensure governance arrangements allow for the oversight of a **national accreditation framework** (to be developed)

- Increase **understanding of capability and capacity** of teams.

### 2. Two parts of governance

In exploring the options for governance arrangements, it became clear that two distinct parts of governance arrangements were needed. For teams to be able to interact and build relationships with key agencies at a national level, they need to have some form of body that represents them and can speak on behalf of them. For this body to then be able to interact at the national level there is a need to have a ‘key agency’ governance level, where stakeholder representatives can work together.

In exploring options for governance arrangements, the Steering Group split options into these two parts; team governance and ‘key agency’ governance (as illustrated in the diagram below).
3. Recommended option

The Steering Group recommend the following option for establishing governance arrangements for response teams:

National Group/Board of Stakeholders

Plus

Non-government charitable organisation providing governance and support when needed

Plus

MCDEM based secretariat

The recommended option is to establish:

- A national group/board of stakeholders that consists of senior officials/representatives from key tasking agencies, CDEM Groups and Response team owners.
- A non-government charitable organisation that represent response teams and provide governance and support when needed. Any team, regardless of their ownership model could be a member of the organisation, with team owners holding voting rights. MCDEM would also be a member of the organisation. Members of the organisation will decide on who will represent them in the national group/board of stakeholders. Ownership of teams will remain as is (in other words, teams could be owned by local authorities, businesses, trusts etc) with health and safety responsibilities and liabilities remaining with the owner. The organisation could have the ability to support teams when necessary by either advocating or supporting them or if necessary, owning them.
- A MCDEM-based secretariat to support the national group/board of stakeholders and the non-government charitable organisation. The secretariat would also develop, implement and administer a national accreditation framework and develop national policy.

Further work is needed to understand and provide detail on:

- Responsibilities of, and working relationships between, the three governance components including, responsibility for developing and administering a national accreditation framework
- Form of the national group/board of stakeholders including whether it is a group, board, committee or other.
- Legal structure of the non-government charitable organisation, i.e. whether it is a charitable trust, or trust-based or society-based incorporated society
- How the non-government charitable organisation will be represented on the national group/board of stakeholders, i.e. number of response team owners that are part of the group, how they are elected etc.
- Structure of MCDEM-based secretariat
- Possible funding partnerships
- Incentives to strengthen relationships locally, regionally and nationally through governance arrangements, and the role of the Coordinating Executive Group to incentivise relationships between teams and tasking agencies and, capacity and capacity meeting local hazards and risks.

3.1. Funding partnerships

The recommended option would benefit from seeking funding partnerships with private organisations or businesses to fund specific areas, for example, national uniforms, particular
training or nationally consistent equipment. This should be considered when further developing and implementing the recommended option.

4. Gaining mandate
To gain this mandate to progress the recommended option for establishing governance arrangements in more detail the Steering Group have agreed to:

- Send the paper to:
  - Response team owners
  - Response team managers
  - Response team leaders
  - Chief Executives of team owners
  - Group Managers
  - Coordinating Executive Group Chairs
  - MCDEM
  - Fire and Emergency New Zealand
  - New Zealand Police
  - Ministry of Health
  - New Zealand Search and Rescue
  - Workshop attendees
- Encourage response team owners to discuss the recommended option with their Chief Executive, response team manager and team leaders.
- Ask response team owners to respond stating:
  - Whether they support or do not support the recommended option and particularly the response team governance element
  - If they do not support the option, they must state the reasons why and may provide an alternative option.
- Ask agencies to respond stating:
  - Whether they support or do not support the recommended option and particularly the key agency governance element
  - If they do not support the option, they must state the reasons why and may provide an alternative option.
- Ask Group Managers and Coordinating Executive Group Chairs to respond stating whether they support or do not support the recommended option. This could be a combined response if appropriate.
  - If they do not support the option, they must state the reasons why and may provide an alternative option.
- Team Managers and team leaders may respond stating whether they support or do not support the recommended option.

4.1. Threshold to progress with recommended option
To progress and develop the recommended option to a more detailed level, the Steering Group need:

- Two thirds of response team owners (who respond) to support the recommended option, and in particular, response team governance option.
- Key agencies to support the recommended option, and in particular, the key agency governance option.
5. Next steps
If there is a mandate to progress the recommended option (i.e. the threshold is met), the Steering Group will develop the recommended option in more detail including seeking advice on the structure of the charitable organisation, discussing the detail of the national group/board of stakeholders with agencies, and the MCDEM-based secretariat with MCDEM. A more detailed final option will then be circulated.

If the threshold to progress is not met, the Steering Group will review the responses and the reasons for a lack of support, and then discuss a way forward.

6. Background of response teams
Response teams have been part of the Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) structure in New Zealand for over 30 years. Their role in response increased following the strengthening of responsibilities at the local government level under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

Response teams consist of community volunteers supported by, and accountable to, a specific local authority or parent organisation. They can provide specific capability and capacity to support emergency services or the CDEM sector during a local emergency.

Over time, the variability in the way Response Teams have been established, operated and the capability they provide has increased. For example, some existing teams are owned by local authorities while others are charitable trusts. Similarly, functions, capability, activation arrangements and agreements with tasking agencies vary considerably around the country.

Recognising this variability along with a need to clarify response team arrangements and improve local, regional and national relationships, the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management (MCDEM) held two workshops in April and July 2018 to explore options for building a robust, organised and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management. These workshops also recognised the changes in the CDEM system over recent years including:

• the introduction of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017, which added performing rescues, including high angle line rescues, rescues from collapsed buildings, rescues from confined spaces, swift water rescues, and animal rescues as a function Fire and Emergency New Zealand could assist in to the extent that they have the capability and capacity to do so,

• changes to the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, which introduced the requirement for person conducting a business or undertaking, a PCBU, to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health and safety of workers, and that other persons are not put at risk by its work, and

• an increasing requirement on tasking agencies to do due diligence to ensure the safety of groups they task (under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015).

Actions resulting from the July 2018 workshop included:

• Issuing a Joint Agency Intent Statement demonstrating key agencies support of the capacity volunteers provide to tasking agencies, emergency services, CDEM Groups and communities, as well as their commitment to building a national framework for a robust
and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management in New Zealand. This statement was issued on 20 September 2018.

- Establishing a steering group to explore options for governance arrangements. This group was established in September 2018.
- Implementing governance arrangements
- Developing and implementing a national accreditation framework.

Given the considerable amount of work needed to explore and implement governance arrangements and develop and implement a national accreditation framework, it was decided to focus on establishing governance arrangements first as the agencies and groups involved in the governance will need to collectively develop the accreditation framework. Therefore the current focus, and that of this paper, is exploring and recommending options for robust and sustainable governance arrangements. Work on developing a national accreditation framework will begin once governance arrangements are in place.

7. Current state of Response Teams

The Steering Group conducted a survey of response teams in September 2018 to better understand the current state of response teams. Below is an overview of the results.

Registration status
- 16 teams are registered NZRT teams (registered under the retired MCDEM-led registration system)
- 13 teams identify as response teams but are not registered

Owning authority
- Two teams are owned by regional councils
- 15 are owned by territorial authorities (City or District Councils)
- Five teams are owned by charitable trusts or societies
- One team is owned by a business

Written service agreements
- One team has a written memorandum of understanding with private business for provision of services
- Three teams have written memorandums of understanding or service level agreements with local councils.

Membership
The number of team members ranges from 11 to 69 with an average of 39 members per team. The majority of teams differentiate between operational and non-operational members with an average of 19 operational and 4 non-operational members per team. Operational status is largely based on achievement of training courses/unit standards/qualifications. The process for joining a team commonly consists of Police vetting, competency and cultural fit interviews, skills and fitness assessment and a probationary period.

Funding
Teams are either funded through the territorial authority that owns them, seek money from charities, or fundraise through events such as providing first aid or logistical services. Estimated operating budgets for teams vary between $7,000 and $60,000 per year.
Activation
Teams are activated by a variety of people including CDEM Group Controller, CDEM Group Manager, CDEM Group duty officer, territorial authority duty emergency management officer. Some teams are also tasked by Fire and Emergency New Zealand and New Zealand Police. Few teams have memorandums of understanding, service level agreements or formal agreements with tasking agencies, although a number are working towards these.

Training
The majority of teams train on a weekly basis for between two and six hours. Formal training courses including unit standards are delivered through formal training providers.

Capabilities
Capabilities vary across the country but are largely based on NZQA unit standards. Capabilities include:
- Storm response: for the majority of teams, capability is largely focused around storm response (23694) and height safety (17600) unit standards including temporary building repair, with a small number of teams trained in chainsaw operations.
- Flood response: focused largely around flood protection such as barriers and sandbagging, pump operations, and clean-up through NZQA unit standards
- USAR/Light rescue: the majority of teams have qualifications for locating and recovering surface and lightly trapped casualties from structural collapse, USAR awareness, general rescue, and the retired USAR Orange card – Responder level.
- Rope rescue: five teams have specialist rope rescue capability, three have no rope rescue capability, and the remainder have limited capability largely focused on accessing a patient or team member.
- Swiftwater rescue: four teams hold advanced swiftwater rescue capabilities.
- Mass casualty: many teams hold NZQA unit standard ‘Manage mass casualty triage in a civil defence and emergency management emergency’.
- Medical: all teams have first aid training as a core skill for members and most teams have Pre-hospital Emergency Care trained members.
- Incident management: majority of teams have CIMS 2 and 4 qualifications with some able to support Emergency Operations Centres.
- Field support: some teams have capability to support field operations with advanced communication support, people movement and cordon management, and all are able to support agencies in the field by providing people power.
- Welfare: most teams have basic capabilities in welfare such as setting up and supporting welfare centres, welfare checks and needs assessment.
- Other capabilities: some teams are capable of supporting at rural fire incidents including pumping, and aerial operations, urban and rural based LandSAR operations, EOC supplementary staff and limited animal rescue.

8. The name
The name New Zealand Response Team was introduced through the original registration process. It reflected the purpose of teams at the time which was to provide an emergency response capability, to support emergency services or CDEM Groups. As the capabilities of emergency services and CDEM Groups have changed over time along with the primary
capabilities of teams, the Steering Group believe there is a need to consider the name of teams in the future to ensure it reflects the ongoing direction and capability of teams, both existing and new.

9. Governance arrangements options explored
The following options were explored for building robust, organised and sustainable governance arrangements.

9.1. Key agency governance
One option was explored for key agency governance.

9.1.1. National Group/Board of Stakeholders
This option is to establish a national group/board of stakeholders. The group will be chaired by the Director CDEM and consist of senior officials/representatives from key tasking agencies, CDEM Groups and the response team governance body.

Membership
Members of the group will consist of senior officials/representatives of:
- Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management
- Fire & Emergency New Zealand
- New Zealand Police
- Ministry of Health
- New Zealand Search and Rescue
- CDEM Group Managers
- Response Team Governance

Members from the first five agencies will be elected by their agency. A representative of CDEM Group Managers will be nominated by the National Emergency Management Development Group, and the ‘Response Team Governance’ will elect representative response team owner/s to be a member of the group. Members will be appointed for their interest and expertise in emergency management, and search and rescue. They will represent their respective agency or group (i.e. CDEM Group Managers or Response Team Governance), and need to be self-funded for meetings and follow up work.

Responsibilities
The national group/board of stakeholders will be responsible for:
- Developing a clear national vision and strategy with Response Team Governance
- Providing direction and advice to Response Team Governance including in relation to operational policy (i.e. turning policy into practice) developed by Response Team Governance
- Providing direction, and where appropriate, develop elements of a national accreditation framework
- Setting national policy (through the appropriate agency), especially in relation to an accreditation framework
- Oversight of the performance and activities of teams
- Oversight of any committees or sub-groups the Group may set up
The national group/board of stakeholders may set up any committees or sub-groups to address particular issues. These committees or sub-groups may operate continuously and in conjunction with the Group, or be set up on an ad-hoc basis to address specific issues such as capability standards, and health and safety policy. Committees and sub-groups will allow issues to be explored in detail and decisions to be reached.

**Decision-making**

Members of the national group/board of stakeholders will be able (have the mandate) to make decisions on behalf of the agency or group they represent. The national group/board of stakeholders will consider the national picture when making decisions.

**Implementation**

The following will be needed to implement this option:

- Development and approval of a Terms of Reference detailing the national group/board of stakeholders role and responsibilities and how they will operate
- Formal commitment from stakeholders of ongoing involvement and support of the national group/board of stakeholders
- Identification, and appointment of members
- Clarity of immediate and future work programme of the national group/board of stakeholders, including establishment of any sub-committees and what agency/group will be responsible for the work (see risks below)
- Inaugural meeting of the national group/board of stakeholders

**Benefits**

Benefits of this option include:

- The national group/board of stakeholders will provide a national strategic view, promoting team and national consistency, as well as strengthening relationships with tasking agencies.
- The national group/board of stakeholders will be responsible to a wide range of stakeholders and will allow team and framework performance to be monitored and evaluated.
- Increased buy-in and engagement from stakeholders and tasking agencies.
- Stronger relationships and easier, open communication between stakeholders.
- As well as providing a strategic governance role, the national group/board of stakeholders will advise on operational policy (i.e. how policy is implemented on the ground), improving national consistency.
- The national group/board of stakeholders will develop and oversee the national accreditation framework (once developed)

**Risks**

Risks of this option include:

- The national group/board of stakeholders itself will have no legal mandate to set, regulate or enforce policy. The national group/board of stakeholders will need to work through the member agencies and groups to set regulation, policy, and standards.
- The national group/board of stakeholders will not be a ‘working’ group. Any work identified as necessary will need to be done within the member agencies and groups or through committees or sub-groups set up by the national group/board of stakeholders. Agencies could provide staff to be part of these.
Overall assessment
This option will enable representatives from key stakeholders to provide national strategic direction and guidance to ensure national consistency, as well as strengthening relationships between tasking agencies and response teams.

9.2. Team Governance Options
A range of options were explored for team governance including status quo, a company, a support office, non-government organisation and MCDEM-based secretariat.

9.2.1. Status quo
Maintain the status quo, relying on collaboration and relationships and establish a volunteer-based steering group to represent response teams.

Overall assessment
This option was disregarded because it relies on collaboration, relationships and good will of volunteers to maintain and does not provide a formal structure to represent response teams.

9.2.2. A company
A company or business is a separate legal entity with one or more owners. A company normally keeps control and decision-making in the hands of just a few people and provides those people with limited personal liability. A company can do many of the same things as an actual person — hold property in its own name, enter contracts, sue and be sued.

Five company types were explored:
- limited liability companies
- cooperative companies
- unlimited companies
- sole trader
- partnership

Overall assessment
All company types were disregarded because:
- the Response Team Governance will not exist to make an income
- Teams could not be shareholders of a company — shareholders would have to be individuals from teams exposing them to liabilities and legal responsibilities.

9.2.3. Support office - NZSAR Secretariat-type model
A ‘support office’ of paid full-time staff, similar to the NZSAR Secretariat, could assist and support response teams through considering policy, and providing assurance to the Key Agency Governance. The support office would be funded by a club-funding model from response team owners. The required funds to operate the office would be determined and split among response team owners.
Current response team ownership would be retained (e.g. territorial authorities or charitable trusts) however teams would be required to comply with national policies and rules set by the support office.

**Overall assessment**

This option was disregarded because the costs of implementing and operating this model would be very costly for owners and funding could vary and be unsustainable with teams establishing and disestablishing.

9.2.4. **Non-Government Organisation – Governance only**

A non-government charitable organisation (either an incorporated society or a charitable trust) would provide governance and represent response teams. Response team ownership would be retained and owners would pay a subscription to be part of the society or trust.

A Management Committee, Trust Board or Trustees would focus on strategic governance of the society or trust, and a leadership team, or regional leadership teams (e.g. northern, central and southern) could be tasked with delivering on the national vision and strategy as well as any other areas of work required from the Management Committee, Trust Board or Trustees.

**Implementation**

Implementation differs slightly depending on if an incorporated society (Incorporated Societies Act 1908) or a charitable trust (Charitable Trusts Act 1957) is established.

For an incorporated society:

- **Draft a set of organisation rules which is then taken to the first meeting.**
- **Call a meeting of at least 15 people willing to be the founding members. At this meeting the group needs to:**
  - approve the rules
  - complete the application for incorporation documents
  - appoint a chairperson, secretary, treasurer and management committee
  - set a membership fee (or agree not to have one).
- **Complete documentation and send to the Companies Office.**

For a charitable trust:

- **Decide whether it will be society-based or trust-based.**
- **Decide who will be the trustees or board members and how the trust or society will operate.**
- **Draft a trust deed (trust-based) or constitution (society-based) that includes the aims, powers and rules of the trust or board.**
- **Call a meeting of the trustees or trust board to:**
  - approve the trust deed (trust-based) or rules (society-based)
  - approve the application for incorporation documents, including the registered office and statutory declaration
  - elect a secretary, treasurer and management committee (for a society).

**Benefits**

Benefits of this option include:
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- One national body providing the governance and direction for all teams allowing better cohesion between teams and promoting work together, skills transfer and sharing of lessons learnt.
- A democratic, membership-based governance structure.
- Charitable status will allow the charitable organisation to benefit from income tax exemptions and provide access to a range of grants, donations, contracts, and loans and an ability to leveraging off supply agreements that provide discounts.
- A subscription fee from member teams would contribute to funding administration of the charitable organisation.
- The charitable organisation would represent response teams in the key agency governance level and could advocate for teams where appropriate.
- The charitable organisation would be able to set its own internal policy and policy that teams need to adhere too to be a member.

Risks
Risks of this option include:
- The charitable organisation could work in isolation from tasking agencies, and pursue misaligned visions, which could reduce buy-in and support from tasking agencies.
- It could be difficult to maintain the 15 members required in an incorporated society when relying on volunteers.
- Governance of the charitable organisation could change annually through an annual general meeting process, which could lead to short-term decision-making and limited succession planning.
- Governance and control of the charitable organisation would sit with the trustees/committee which could lead to:
  - a lack of accountability to the wider membership base
  - the organisation becoming controlled and governed ‘by a few’ dominating or vocal people and smaller or quieter teams could feel isolated.
- Teams would not be supported financially by the charitable organisation.
- The charitable organisation will have no legal mandate to set, regulate, or enforce national policy, regulation, or standards.
- Any work identified as necessary will need to be done by volunteers (either as part of a leadership team or other groups set up). This could slow progress towards achieving a national vision.

Overall assessment
This option provides a national body that can represent response teams at the key agency governance level. It would require either significant funding to employ staff to progress a work programme or be considered in combination with another option.

9.2.5. Non-Government Organisation – Owning authority
A non-government charitable organisation (either an incorporated society or a charitable trust) would own response teams.

Implementation
Refer to Non-Government Organisation - Governance only
Benefits of this option include:

- One national body providing the governance and direction for all teams allowing better cohesion between teams and promoting work together, skills transfer and sharing of lessons learnt.
- A democratic, membership-based governance structure.
- Charitable status will allow the charitable organisation to benefit from income tax exemptions and provide access to a range of grants, donations, contracts, and loans and an ability to leveraging off supply agreements that provide discounts.
- A subscription fee from member teams would contribute to funding administration of the charitable organisation.
- The charitable organisation would own teams taking the financial responsibility and day-to-day administration off existing owners.

Risks of this option include:

- Teams will no longer be self-governing or governed locally.
- Owning all teams would be a significant burden on the charitable organisation and expose it to significant legal responsibilities and risks.
- The charitable organisation would not be able to own all response teams, for example, teams owned by businesses or other national charitable organisations.

Overall assessment

This option was disregarded because of the significant legal responsibilities and risks the charitable organisation would be exposed to as well as the costs involved in operating the organisation.

9.2.6. Non-Government Organisation – Governance plus support when needed

A non-government charitable organisation (either an incorporated society or a charitable trust) provide governance and represents response teams but also have the ability to support teams when necessary through advocacy, support or ownership. Response team ownership would be retained and owners would pay a subscription to be part of the charitable organisation.

Implementation

Refer to Non-Government Organisation - Governance only

Benefits of this option include:

- One national body providing the governance and direction for all teams allowing better cohesion between teams and promoting work together, skills transfer and sharing of lessons learnt.
- A democratic, membership-based governance structure.
- Charitable status will allow the charitable organisation to benefit from income tax exemptions and provide access to a range of grants, donations, contracts, and loans and an ability to leveraging off supply agreements that provide discounts.
A subscription fee from member teams would contribute to funding administration of the charitable organisation.

The charitable organisation would represent response teams in the key agency governance level and could advocate for teams where appropriate.

The charitable organisation would be able to set its own internal policy and policy that teams need to adhere too to be a member.

The charitable organisation would have the ability to support teams when necessary by either advocating or supporting them or if necessary, own them. Ownership would be a last resort where there is an agreed need for a team but one cannot be owned by another organisation or it is financial unsustainable.

**Risks**

Risks of this option include:

- The charitable organisation could working in isolation from tasking agencies, and pursue misaligned visions, which could reduce buy-in and support from tasking agencies.
- It could be difficult to maintain the 15 members required in an incorporated society when relying on volunteers.
- Governance of the charitable organisation could change annually through an annual general meeting process, which could lead to short-term decision-making and limited succession planning.
- Governance and control of the charitable organisation would sit with the trustees/committee which could lead to:
  - a lack of accountability to the wider membership base
  - the organisation becoming controlled and governed ‘by a few’ dominating or vocal people and smaller or quieter teams could feel isolated.
- The charitable organisation will have no legal mandate to set, regulate, or enforce national policy, regulation, or standards.
- Any work identified as necessary will need to be done by volunteers (either as part of a leadership team or other groups set up). This could slow progress towards achieving a national vision.

**Overall assessment**

This option provides a national body that can represent response teams at the key agency governance level with an ability to support teams when necessary through advocacy, support or ownership. It would require either significant funding to employ staff to progress a work programme or be considered in combination with another option.

9.2.7. **MCDEM-based secretariat**

A secretariat sitting in MCDEM to support a response team governance body, a national group/board of stakeholders and administer the national framework. The current ownership model would be retained with stronger ties and consistency between teams, owners, CDEM Groups, and tasking agencies.

The secretariat would be responsible for:

- Tracking progress towards achieving the national vision and strategy
- Supporting national policy development, especially in relation to health and safety standards and an accreditation framework
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- Developing, implementing and administering a national accreditation framework including
  an audit function (if this is agreed through the development of the framework)
- Oversight of the performance and activities of teams
- Administration of the national group/board of stakeholders
- Oversight of any committees the secretariat may set up

Implementation
Implementation of this option is connected to the Emergency Management System Reform
process. The reform provides an opportunity to explore establishing a secretariat in MCDEM.
The following will be needed to implement for this option:
- Advice into decisions related to strengthen the national leadership of the emergency
  management system in the Emergency Management System Reform process
- Establishment of a new team in MCDEM including recruitment
- Clarity of immediate and future work programme of the secretariat.

Benefits
Benefits of this option include:
- The secretariat would have legislative mandate (through Director CDEM powers) and an
  ability to develop national policy and regulate to achieve national consistency, and
  ensure capability and capacity is based on local hazards.
- Clear national reporting framework allowing teams, framework performance, and
  progress towards the national vision to be monitored, evaluated and reported.
- The secretariat would be integrated into the established CDEM system, with strong ties
  to CDEM Groups and tasking agencies.
- A dedicated secretariat focused on a work programme, allowing work and the national
  vision to be progressed.
- Potential to leverage existing purchasing contracts (through MCDEM).
- Ability of all tasking agencies and teams to inform the work of the secretariat.

Risks
Risks of this option include:
- This option is tied to the Emergency Management System Reform (EMSR) and decisions
  related to strengthen the national leadership of the emergency management system.
  Decisions on staffing levels would be a part of the EMSR decisions. An interim solution
  may need to be used until decisions are made regarding a new National Emergency
  Management Agency.
- Changes to government priorities could affect sustainability of the secretariat. This is a
  very low risk.

Overall assessment
This option provides a dedicated resource to support a both key agency governance level and
response team governance level, as well as administer the national framework. It would best
work if considered in combination with another option.
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ATTN: Clare Robertson
Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet
Level 4, Bowen House
Parliament Buildings
WELLINGTON 6145

Dear Clare

Auckland Coordinating Executive Group feedback on the paper:

*Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management in New Zealand*

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the paper that outlines the options for establishing governance arrangements for New Zealand Response Teams of 12 December.

We note that the feedback was due on 15 February 2019, which has now been extended to 1 March 2019. We understand this is an urgent paper, noting that the timeline for response covers the main holiday period for New Zealand. We have, however, captured feedback across members of Auckland’s Coordinating Executive Group (CEG), noting that some of the agencies represented may also have provided feedback independently, to meet the first deadline, and subsequently sought the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee for endorsement.

The paper ‘Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management in New Zealand’ offers seven options for the Response Team (RT) governance arrangements, with one recommended option: a national group/board of stakeholders (tasking agencies, CDEM Groups and the Response Team (RT) Governance Body), chaired by the Director CDEM, plus a Non-Government Charitable Organisation providing governance and support when needed, and MCDEM-based secretariat.

Amongst others, the paper has been sent to Auckland Council’s Emergency Management team and the council’s Chief Executive as the RT owner, and as the CEG Chair, Auckland Council Acting Emergency Management Director (as Group Manager), and via them to other members of the Auckland CEG who have received this separately. These are: Fire and Emergency New Zealand, New Zealand Police, and the Chair of the Auckland Health CEG. The document was also sent to Ministry for Social Development and New Zealand Defence Force CEG representatives.

Auckland CDEM Group supports the utilisation of RTs, and we agree with the articulated benefits of establishing governance arrangements at a national level. However, we do not support the concept of separating ownership and governance of the teams, and leaving health and safety accountability with the owners, because health and safety management is a fundamental part of governance. We also suggest there needs to be some national standards
in health and safety for RTs, to enable them to work across tasking agencies. How this would be implemented across the proposed ownership and governance structure is not clear, because of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 focus on Officer accountability for decision-making.

We support the concept of a national group of stakeholders, however we do not think that there is clarity yet, at least at a local level, about who would be tasking agencies. We therefore suggest that more clarity is needed on this, prior to establishing a governance group comprising tasking agencies.

Therefore, at the present time, we do not support the recommended option. The attached document contains more detail of the aspects considered in this response, and we would like to discuss this in more detail with you, should the chance arise.

If you require any clarification on any aspect of the submission please contact Sarah Sinclair, Acting Director Auckland Emergency Management, on 021 331 767, or by email at sarah.sinclair@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Stephen Town
Chief Executive, Auckland Council
Chair, Coordinating Executive Group

Encl.
Submission to the

Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management

Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management in New Zealand

Options for establishing governance arrangements

19 February 2019

Auckland Coordinating Executive Group submission to the
Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management
Summary
This submission is approved by the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management (CDEM) Coordinating Executive Group (CEG), and by Auckland Council as team owner for the Auckland Response Teams (RT).

Auckland CEG supports the utilisation of RTs, and we agree with the articulated benefits of establishing governance arrangements at a national level. However, we do not support the concept of separating ownership and governance of the teams and leaving health and safety accountability with the owners as we consider health and safety management as a fundamental part of governance.

We also suggest there needs to be some national standards in health and safety for RTs, to enable them to work across tasking agencies. How this would be implemented across the proposed ownership and governance structure is not clear, because of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 focus on Officer accountability for decision-making.

We support the concept of a national group of stakeholders, however we do not think that there is clarity yet, at least at a local level, about who would be tasking agencies. We therefore suggest that more clarity is needed on this, prior to establishing a governance group comprising tasking agencies.

The text below explores these considerations in more detail, drawing from work we have done to understand health and safety considerations as part of tasking the Response Teams in Auckland as an interim step, whilst national governance issues are resolved.

Introduction
The paper ‘Building a robust and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management in New Zealand’ offers seven options for the RT governance arrangements, of which one has been recommended:

A National Group/Board of Stakeholders (tasking agencies, CDEM Groups and the RT Governance Body), chaired by the Director CDEM, plus establishing a Non-Government Charitable Organisation providing governance and support when needed, and a Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management (MCDEM)-based secretariat.

Amongst others, the paper has been sent to Auckland Council Auckland Emergency Management and council’s Chief Executive as the RT owner, and as CEG Chair, Auckland Council Acting Emergency Management Director (as Group Manager), and via them to other members of the Auckland CEG who have received this separately. These are: Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ), New Zealand Police, and the Chair of the Auckland Health CEG. The document was also sent to Ministry for Social Development and New Zealand Defence Force CEG representatives.

The intent of the paper is to seek and gain mandate to progress the recommended option. Each correspondent was asked by MCDEM to respond stating whether they support the
recommended option, and particularly the response team governance option. If the recommended option is not preferred, MCDEM has asked that they state the reasons why, and noted that the respondents may suggest an alternative option. MCDEM has also set a threshold to progress with the recommended option, being the support of two thirds of RT owners, the support of key agencies (number unquantified).

Background
The FENZ Act 2017, and the move of Rural Fire from regional councils to FENZ impacted the use of volunteer RTs. We understand that these teams of highly trained individuals were initially advised that they would not be tasked by any of the first response agencies, which raised questions about their ongoing viability.

The Acting Director of Auckland Emergency Management attended a workshop for New Zealand RTs in Wellington on Saturday 28 July 2018. At this meeting, MCDEM confirmed to the RTs that there was no intention to disband the RTs, or to stop using them as part of an initial response.

This was subsequently followed up with a letter from MCDEM and first responders on 20 September 2018, which confirmed:

(i) a commitment to establishing a National Framework to create consistency and interoperability of functions and tasks to support tasking agencies and our communities,
(ii) building a National Framework to ensure a robust and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management, and
(iii) that a working group would be established to resolve issues around tasking of RTs to enable the emergency management sector to be able to access volunteer support from the RTs.

Auckland Emergency Management has requested to be part of that working group subsequently, because of the work Auckland is doing to understand and address the issues around RTs. To date, this request has been declined. This response, therefore, articulates work we have progressed in relation to RTs in the Auckland region, and reiterates formally Auckland’s request to be involved in the further development of a way forward for the NZRTs.

Health and Safety context around governance of the Response Teams
We understand that health and safety management has been a consideration in future tasking of RTs. It is important to clarify tasking of the RTs in the context of who is responsible for their health & safety.

If the RTs, as volunteers, are voluntary workers under the Health and Safety at Work Act (HSWA) 2015, and corresponding regulations, it is not fully clear who they would volunteer to as their ‘employer’ in an activation to support a CDEM Group. Are they volunteering to...
the CDEM Group (or tasking agency member), or to a council? Would the change from a local declaration to a regional or national declaration change the perceived employer of the volunteers? Or will a separate owner become a supplier agency for volunteer staff? We believe this needs to be clarified to manage health and safety governance.

The HSWA separates out armed forces but no other first responders, in terms of risk focus. It is not clear in an activation how much control the Controller, or others, would be expected to have over a 'workplace' in a large-scale emergency. The HSWA also allows there to be more than one person controlling a business or undertaking (Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking (PCBU)), and it is not clear how training or tasking the RT volunteers would affect PCBU obligations of any of the agencies that the RT volunteers might support with their voluntary activities. The clear definition of accountability and responsibility for consultation, cooperation and communication between PCBU's requires stronger focus and establishment.

The RTs are currently trained to national standards in a variety of skills including medical, search and rescue, clean up and repair, and providing aid and relief. However, we understand that not all the standards they have been trained to are considered acceptable standards by other first responders who are the lead agency for that capability. This has led to a lack of confidence by response agencies in the capabilities and methodologies that might be utilised by RTs. In addition, some agencies set different requirements for their own volunteers, including rigorous vetting procedures. It is not clear how standard or blanket vetting requirements might affect the tasks that RTs would perform, from a safety or risk management perspective.

The proposed governance arrangements suggest that ownership of the RTs stays as current. We believe that leaves a lack of clarity among tasking agencies about whether the RTs are considered council volunteers working under council business as usual, or whether they are CDEM volunteers, working under an incident management team to a variety of tasking agencies. We suggest this needs to be clarified urgently at the national level to confirm:

1. who the tasking agencies will be for RTs, and
2. who the RTs are perceived to be volunteering to, whether locally or nationally.

**Auckland’s progress with utilising Response Teams**

At present we are working to an interim approach with RTs, whereby tasks that Auckland Council already has an ability to manage safely, by having existing method statements and capability requirements for that task, may be undertaken by RTs. This requires that they are trained to appropriate capability levels both in terms of the task itself, and the Auckland Council health and safety system. However, this interim step does not cover many of the functions of RTs, for which Auckland Council would not be the lead agency.

A recent Auckland CEG workshop identified that there is unlikely to be the same needs or capabilities for RT volunteers in the urban and rural environments. For Auckland, we have
committed to working through some scenarios with the CEG to identify potential scale of need for RTs in a major disaster. This will include the practicalities and priorities of bringing first responders in from other regions, which also has national implications. It would be helpful to understand how often RTs are expected to be deployed, and whether they are likely to be required to be trained to a range of national capabilities, which may not be intended to be utilised locally.

We are also seeking to develop an understanding of future tasking processes for RTs. Our work to date has identified that if the RTs are to be more widely utilised than our interim first step via council systems, this will be in support of functions in which another agency is the lead agency. Other than councils, all agencies are national agencies, generally first responders. They have national health & safety approaches and methodologies that may not fit with the health & safety risk identification and management systems of a local authority. For councils, our highest risks tend to be construction or consent enforcement related, and our health & safety systems are generally set up to manage staff and physical works rather than dynamic emergency situations.

We therefore question the approach proposed in the paper, of leaving RTs in council ownership, or trust ownership i.e. ‘where it currently lies’. If RTs are to be utilised to their full capability, we suggest that governance and ownership of these volunteers needs to be considered together, to address health & safety considerations, and national vs local deployment considerations.

We further suggest that leaving the ownership with council (in Auckland’s case) but with a more complex governance arrangement will also muddy the waters in terms of health & safety liability. We suggest that governance cannot be decided and settled without resolving the issues relating to tasking and ownership of health & safety responsibility of the volunteers.

Other Response Teams
The paper refers to all Response Teams. We note that Auckland has a Volunteer Maritime Response Team, reporting to, and tasked by Auckland Transport. Auckland Transport is an entity separate to council, under our legislation.

There is not yet any discussion or guidance on how other RT capabilities (such as the Auckland Transport existing Harbormaster Response Team, which is a joint employee and volunteer team) would be factored into this model. The group that met at the Auckland CEG workshop understand that this has not yet been explored and will be considered at a future time.

It is understood that if Auckland Transport wanted to register any existing or future RT capability with MCDEM (once the national accreditation framework is established), that those RTs would come under this governance model. In that case, Auckland Transport would expect to be a member of the RT Governance Body as an ‘RT Owner’, separately to Auckland Council.
We therefore seek more clarity on how other RT volunteers would be managed under the proposed framework.

Conclusion
We support the need for national level governance across tasking agencies, CDEM Groups and RTs and their owners. In relation to the recommended governance structure, we suggest that this could more closely consider the interface between governance and health & safety responsibility articulated in the HSWA 2015.

In conclusion:

1) We suggest that the key agency governance concept should consider and confirm how the RTs will be tasked, and who will be tasking them, prior to establishing membership of the group, and of other governance groups.
2) Whilst we support the concept of a MCDEM-based secretariat, we suggest that further consideration is given to whether health and safety can be addressed well, and RTs utilised effectively across the range of capabilities, with a variety of separate owners holding health and safety accountability, and a separate governance structure.
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery for targeted consultation and engagement.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee has received a series of updates on the development of the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery (Attachment A), under the previous working title: the Resilient Recovery Strategy. The change of name more accurately reflects the purpose and contents of the document.
3. The draft framework satisfies requirements to strategically plan for recovery. It will build momentum on preparations for recovery through implementing actions to enable effective recovery, guided by what is important to communities in Auckland.
4. The draft framework identified actions to build capacity and capacity and remove barriers to effective recovery. Working with our partners, this work includes wider public engagement on recovery, what happens and how people and communities can better prepare themselves.
5. It is proposed that engagement and consultation on the draft framework focus most heavily on organisations and agencies actively engaged in delivering a recovery, supported by soft engagement with the wider public. Engaging Māori communities is a priority and will be structured around Auckland’s marae.
6. Following engagement and consultation from March through June, the final draft framework will be reported to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee for adoption in August 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:
a) approve the draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery for consultation and targeted engagement with identified groups and organisations.
b) note that the committee will receive the final draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery for approval at its meeting in August 2019.

Horopaki
Context
7. The draft Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery was developed under the working title of the Resilient Recovery Strategy. The new title more accurately reflects its purpose and content.
8. Under the former title, work on the draft framework was reported to the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee in November 2017 (CP2017/24590), February 2018 (CP2018/01314) and August 2018 (CP2018/15741).

9. The draft framework meets the requirements of the 2016 amendments to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 and mandatory guidelines to strategically plan for recovery.

10. The draft framework builds momentum on our preparations for recovery, through identified actions directed at what is crucial for effective recovery, guided by what is important to communities in Auckland.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Draft Framework

11. The draft framework follows the process set out in the Ministry for Civil Defence Emergency Management’s Guidelines: Strategic Planning for Recovery (DGL 20/17), as follows:

**Community values and priorities**

12. An initial set of community values and priorities was identified through engagement with Auckland Council’s local boards and demographic advisory panels. Reported feedback on consultation on the Auckland Plan 2050 was also considered.

13. Community values and priorities guide pre-event recovery planning and preparation to ensure their focus on what is relevant and important to communities. They inform the way we will work in a recovery and the work we would do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity, Diversity and Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence, Resilience and Self Reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Connection and Culture, Heritage and Amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Knowledge, Leadership Partnership and Voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Social Connections, Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Local Input, Lifelines and Key Infrastructure, Economic Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health and Personal Wellbeing (including our pets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Personal Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vision for recovery preparedness

14. Consistent with the Directors’ Guidelines for Strategic Planning for Recovery, the draft framework sets a vision to ensure:

‘Auckland’s people, communities, businesses and infrastructure are well-placed to recover from a disaster’

Consequences and opportunities of Auckland’s hazards and risks

15. The value of anticipating what might be required to recover from an emergency event arising from Auckland’s hazards and risks is outlined in the document. Its formulation incorporates the impacts of hazards and risks, their interaction with the circumstances of time and place, themselves informed by a community’s values and priorities. This forms a basis for intentional pre-event recovery planning and preparation. New Zealand and international experience shows undertaking this work has advantages over leaving recovery to chance or orchestrating a recovery without pre-planning.
16. Work to better understand Auckland’s hazards and risks, their impacts and consequences is part of Auckland Emergency Management’s ongoing work programme.

**Building capacity and capability; and addressing barriers to recovery**

17. This element of the draft framework comprises two elements: a partnership approach and five areas of focus to support building capacity and capability. These are described below:

18. **Partnership approach** - The partnership approach provides a framework for how we will work in recovery to respond to the initial set of community values and priorities. This approach seeks a balance between:

   - organic structures, supportive of self-initiated and community action, and
   - highly structured, institutional structures that enable coordination and recovery operations at scale.

The partnership approach is informed by our engagement with local boards and initial community values and priorities. It is also consistent with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee focus on resilience across the Group Plan’s 5 R’s – reduction, readiness, response, recovery and resilience.

19. **Five Areas of Focus** - Five areas of focus ensure pre-event recovery preparations are directed towards actions that are crucial to recovery and/or address challenges to effective recovery in Auckland. The five focus areas emerged through the development of the draft strategy and parallel work streams in recovery. They seek to ensure:

   - capacity and capability is available
   - collaboration is supported
   - recovery is communicated
   - recovery is understood
   - monitoring and evaluation is undertaken.

**Actions to build momentum**

20. A set of short to medium term actions are identified. Initially focused on Auckland Emergency Management, the implementation of these actions will first involve the wider Auckland Council group, then expand outwards to include a wider group of partners before reaching out into the community.

21. Members of the Coordinating Executive Group will be involved to ensure inter-agency operability is maintained, operational needs are assured and to affirm shared understanding.

22. The actions focus on:

   - Auckland’s diversity
   - Building an understanding of recovery in our communities
   - Collaboration planning
   - Economy/Local economy
   - Funding and resources
   - Managing expectations
   - Māori communities
   - Monitoring and evaluation
   - Pre-existing issues
   - Psycho-social recovery
   - Establishing task groups for recovery environments
23. The existing recovery work programme will be refreshed and updated as a prioritised work programme enabling progress to be made on achieving the draft framework’s vision.

24. The draft framework has been developed with significant engagement with local boards and council’s demographic advisory panels. It has also benefited from an internal workshop process and support from the Ministry for Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee.

**Consultation and Engagement**

25. Consultation and engagement on the draft framework will occur from the beginning of March 2019 to the end of June 2019. The final draft framework will be reported to the Coordinating Executive Group in early August, before being reported to the Committee for adoption.

26. The draft framework is more of a technical nature setting out actions to be undertaken to better prepare for a recovery from an event. As described above, implementation will mostly involve business units within the Auckland Council group, our partners and key stakeholders, before reaching out into the community.

27. Consultation and engagement on the draft framework will be targeted to groups and organisations which are anticipated to play an active role in a recovery, supported by soft engagement with the wider public. The basis for this consultation strategy is:

- targeting those anticipated to be more closely involved in executing a recovery. This enables socialisation of the ideas and concepts, helps build relationships, provides the opportunity to make improvements and supports buy-in for the work they will become involved in.

- targeted engagement on the draft framework provides an opportunity to engage with individuals, groups and organisations who may be recruited to task groups for recovery.

- the draft framework identifies specific actions to ensure ‘Recovery is understood’ and ‘Recovery is communicated’ well in the implementation of recovery. It proposes to actively engage the community to supporting their understanding of what recovery is, how it works, how they can help and what they can do to better prepare themselves.

28. Engagement will involve a mixture of email contact, one-on-one meetings and facilitated group workshops. Auckland Council local boards, demographic panels, business units within Auckland Council group, community groups and organisations active in the emergency management sector, NGO’s and specialist organisations will be involved.

29. It is important to note that engaging Auckland’s Māori communities will be a priority, focusing on marae as a centre of Māori communities. This approach was recommended by the Independent Māori Statutory Board and Auckland Emergency Management hui held in November 2018.

30. Attachment B sets out the groups and organisations to be engaged under this proposal.

31. This targeted engagement will be supported by engaging with the senior, Rainbow, disability, cultural and linguistically diverse, Pacific and faith-based communities. Contact will be made through established networks seeking feedback and Auckland Emergency Management will respond to requests for engagement as appropriate.

### Ngā whakaawaewe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

#### Council group impacts and views

32. Limited engagement on the draft framework has been undertaken to date across the Auckland Council group. A degree of pre-work was required to support broader discussion. This pre-work was undertaken in developing the draft framework and it is now appropriate to commence discussion. This context forms a part of our preference for targeted consultation and engagement. Attachment B provides further information on business units within the Auckland Council group to be engaged.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe

Local impacts and local board views

33. Emergency events occur in a location or locations affecting surrounding places and communities. The affected area may be confined to a part of a local board's area or may involve multiple local boards. Civil defence emergency management is of general interest to local boards, and particular interest following an emergency event.

34. While decision making under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 is expressly the function of Auckland Council’s governing body, local boards are a key partner in emergency management in Auckland. Local boards maintain relationships with community organisations and special interest groups in their area and are responsible for identifying community preferences in relation to strategies, policies, plans and bylaws. Local boards play an important role in recovery following a significant event.

35. Local boards have been engaged throughout the development of the draft framework. Workshops, presentations to local board cluster meetings, and the circulation of reports and memos have continued a dialogue about recovery. Local board engagement on the draft framework is an opportunity to continue this conversation.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

36. An emergency event may adversely impact on land, water, sites of significance, waahi tapu flora or fauna affecting mana whenua and Māori wellbeing in general. The recovery from such an event would similarly affect mana whenua and Māori wellbeing.

37. A significant development arising out of the recovery from the Christchurch earthquakes has been the involvement of local iwi at all levels, from delivering services and activities on marae to governance and decision-making through the structures established for the recovery.

38. Auckland’s mana whenua and mataawaka will be engaged and consulted on the draft framework through marae. The engagement is also an opportunity to introduce Auckland Emergency Management recovery activities and lead into the draft framework’s identified actions with Māori communities. Based on wider engagement, these actions are to develop a shared understanding of recovery, identify opportunities to collaborate and cultivate leadership, participation and outcomes for Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

39. There are no financial implications arising from this report. Resources have been provided for in the current budget and no financial risks have been identified.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

40. The draft framework is to build capability and capacity and address barriers currently existing to effective recovery. The draft framework seeks to mitigate the risk of being underprepared to effectively recover from an event.

41. The timing of an event, such as a storm, is beyond control. The main risk would be for such an event to occur before the draft framework’s actions have been able to be implemented. In mitigation, recovery processes under Standard Operating Procedures, have been refined and developed in parallel to work on the draft framework. Subsequent risk is mitigated progressively as progress is made on implementing the draft framework’s actions.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

42. Following consultation and engagement over the period of March-June 2019, the final draft framework will be reported Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee for adoption on 28 August 2019.
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Welfare Coordination in Emergencies: Auckland Emergency Management Group Welfare Plan

File No.: CP2019/01251

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To approve the Auckland Welfare Plan for adoption.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group has co-designed a revised plan for the coordination and delivery of emergency welfare services in Auckland.
3. The revised plan defines the welfare functions in an emergency, the agencies involved, and sets a framework for detailed plans to be developed at sub function level.
4. A discussion document about the Auckland Welfare Plan was presented and endorsed by the Coordinating Executive Group and committee in August 2018. Agreement for further consultation across stakeholders and partners was granted at this meeting.
5. Following wider consultation, the draft Auckland Welfare Plan has been finalised and was brought back to the Coordinating Executive Group on 4th February 2019 for endorsement prior to seeking the approval of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee.
6. This plan will be supported through the development of a tool-kit of resources, standard operating procedures and community focused resources. These combined plans and tools define and guide the way that Auckland Emergency Management, Group Welfare function and the nine sub-functions of welfare will coordinate services in an emergency.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) approve the Auckland Welfare Plan (Attachment A to the agenda report).

Horopaki

Context
7. The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group is made up of partners from emergency services, social and health services and non-government organisations. This group is required under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act (2002) to develop a Group Welfare Plan for Auckland that shows how the group will provide for the relief of distress, including emergency food, clothing and shelter.
8. The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group has worked together to co-design this new collaborative Auckland Welfare Plan for the coordination and delivery of emergency welfare services for Auckland.
9. The objective of the Auckland Welfare Plan is to provide a clear and concise strategic document that can be used to inform and educate anyone on what the group does and why we do it.
Developing a new plan for welfare coordination

10. Traditionally welfare plans are internally focused documents that are not able to be shared widely due to the operational nature of the information contained within them.

11. The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group and the Coordinating Executive Group endorsed a new approach to the development of planning for welfare that would enable community and stakeholders without formal roles within a response, to have a clear understanding of how welfare would be delivered.

12. It was agreed by the Auckland Welfare Coordination Group and the Coordinating Executive Group that the new look welfare planning would deliver on the following requirements:
   - Provide any audience with transparency about what emergency welfare is, what services are provided during and after an emergency and recommend what Aucklanders can do to build their own resilience.
   - Use strong visual elements, to ensure maximum accessibility, enabling it to be used as a simple and concise public document.
   - That the plan could be used by anyone who has a role or interest in how welfare agencies are coordinated to respond to the welfare needs of the people of Auckland.

13. A ‘Welfare coordination in emergencies’ discussion document was presented to the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee and the Coordinating Executive Group in August 2018 outlining the responsibilities, principles, challenges and the interdependencies across agencies. The committee and the executive group provided feedback on this document in August 2018 and endorsement was given for wider consultation to occur to develop the plan.

14. Consultation on the plan was facilitated through discussions with various stakeholders within the welfare coordination group, and with agencies and stakeholders who do not hold a traditional role within the coordination of emergencies but take an active interest in welfare, such as Neighbourhood Support, Age Concern, disability and diversity focused panels and organisations. This plan was also worked with various local boards and advisory panels for their feedback.

15. The stakeholders that are not part of a traditional emergency welfare response welcomed the new approach to talking about welfare in emergencies. They found the new look document to be educational in understanding the way welfare works and the work that we do during an emergency response. This has resulted in organisations such as Neighbourhood Support working with the group to redefine their practice in a response, to further support our approach in developing a shared understanding of how we can leverage our combined efforts for the betterment of individuals and communities.

16. The plan was also shared with various civil defence emergency management groups across New Zealand. We are now working with other groups to give them access to this plan and share our practice and process for developing plans such as these, across their communities and networks.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

17. The welfare plan (Attachment A) sets the strategic context of emergency welfare coordination and delivery in Auckland. It shows the nine key areas of work that are delivered as part of a welfare response, these areas of work make up the nine sub-functions of welfare outlined below.
18. The nine sub functions of welfare coordination are:
   a) Combined sub functions 1 and 2: **Registration** and **Needs Assessment**: The collation of affected people’s details and identification of immediate needs.
   b) Sub function 3: **Inquiry**: A cross-agency process of reconnecting people who are out of contact with family or significant others (beyond usual means of contact).
   c) Sub function 4: **Care and Protection of Children and Young People**: Providing statutory care and protection services to children and young people separated from their parent, legal guardian, or usual caregiver during an emergency.
   d) Sub function 5: **Psycho-social Support**: Providing psychological and social support interventions that support recovery.
   e) Sub function 6: **Household Goods and Services**: Providing essential goods and services when access to these has been disrupted.
   f) Sub function 7: **Shelter and Accommodation**: Providing shelter and accommodation for people who have to leave their homes as a result of an emergency.
   g) Sub function 8: **Financial Assistance**: Providing essential immediate or longer fixed term financial assistance (including tax relief and ACC payments) from the government and non-government agencies and organisations.
   h) Sub function 9: **Animal Welfare**: Providing assistance to animals affected by an emergency, including the temporary shelter and care of companion animals and their reunification with owners.

19. Each Auckland Welfare Coordination Group lead agency is currently working with their supporting agencies to develop nine welfare sub function plans. These plans detail the operational agreements and requirements for delivery of welfare service provision within specific areas of welfare provision and how agencies will work together. The sub function plans cover the key areas of work that the welfare function delivers within an emergency.

**How this plan fits**

**Our welfare framework**

- **Civil Defence Emergency Management Act (2002)**
- **Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan**
- **Auckland Welfare Plan**

This Act outlines the welfare response required by Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups to ‘provide for the relief of distress, including emergency food, clothing and shelter’.

Our strategy is the guiding document for how we work to build a resilient Auckland.

This is a dual purpose, inward and outward facing document that helps to inform and educate on what we do and why we do it.

The plan is informed by:

**Welfare toolkit**

- standard operating processes
- position descriptions, competency framework, training
- operational documents and templates
- guides
- practice tools
20. The Welfare in Emergencies plan is used in conjunction with a supporting Welfare Toolkit. The Welfare Toolkit contains the standard operating procedures (such as activation, triggers and thresholds for welfare response), role descriptions and other operational policy and procedures developed for the welfare agencies.

21. This plan was brought back to the Coordinating Executive Group for endorsement prior to seeking the approval of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee in February 2019.

---

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views**

22. The proposed initiatives contained in this report have no identified impacts on other parts of the council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report’s advice.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe Local impacts and local board views**

23. The recommendations in this report will enable local boards to gain a greater understanding of the welfare in emergencies process.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement**

24. The recommendations made in this report have no identified Māori impacts.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications**

25. There are no identified financial implications arising out of recommendations made in this report.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations**

26. Risk management is a central focus of emergency management. The risk of not proceeding with the recommendations outlined in this report is that Auckland Emergency Management and partner agencies in the Auckland Welfare Coordination Group will not be fulfilling the requirements under the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps**

27. The review and future development of the Welfare Toolkit is a key deliverable in the Auckland Welfare Coordination Group 2019 work programme. The work programme is being developed and will be reported back to the Coordinating Executive Group and Committee in May 2019 to agree subsequent progress reporting.
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Whakataukī:

Ehara tāku toa i te toa takitahi, engari he toa takitini.

My strength is not mine alone, but that of many.
Kupu Whakataki
Foreword

Emergencies, by their nature, take many forms and can affect us in different ways. They can have life-altering impacts on the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of individuals, whānau, and communities. It is important that in these events, those affected have timely access to emergency welfare support and services.

As home to New Zealand’s largest city, more than one third of the national population, approximately 1.7 million people from over 120 different ethnicities, live in the Auckland region. Auckland is as geographically diverse as it is demographically, from people living in low-lying suburbs and coastal communities, to rural communities, to geographically isolated islands, and communities of urban high-rise city dwellers.

Our subtropical climate is dominated by irregular, sometimes severe, atmospheric conditions that can bring ex-tropical cyclones with strong winds and intense rain. These weather phenomena mean we are most susceptible to events such as flooding, and consequences like fires and electricity outages. The additional threat from low-frequency and high-consequence hazards such as volcanic eruption, earthquake and tsunami, make the hazard-scape of the region additionally complex.

Given Auckland’s exposure to hazards, our size, and our level of population growth and diversity, we can draw on the strength of our people and the partnerships with emergency welfare service agencies to provide appropriate support where it is most needed.

The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group, made up of key welfare services agencies, have co-designed the Welfare Coordination in Emergencies Plan to guide and enhance the delivery of emergency welfare services and support.

This plan can be used by anyone who has a role or interest in how this group of agencies are co-ordinated to respond to the welfare needs of the people of Auckland.

We all have a shared responsibility to grow our collective capability for preparing and responding to emergencies and we all have to work together to build a resilient Auckland.

As Chair of Auckland’s Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee it is my privilege to introduce this plan for welfare coordination in emergencies.

Councillor Sharon Stewart,
Chair of Auckland’s Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee
What is welfare
He aha te mahi toko i te ora

What is welfare

The delivery of welfare in emergency management is made up of emergency services, social and health services and non-government organisations. We work together to minimise and address the impacts of an emergency on individuals, whānau and communities.

Te rurukutanga mahi toko i te ora i te mate ohotata

Welfare coordination in an emergency

Auckland Emergency Management (AEM) is responsible for the overall coordination of welfare services in an emergency. This is delivered in partnership through the Auckland Welfare Coordination Group (AWCG).

The AWCG work together to plan for and respond to emergencies through the development of a shared plan of action that can be followed in the event of an emergency.

When an emergency event occurs, it is crucial for AWCG agencies and others to provide a coordinated approach to responding to the impacts on individuals, whānau and communities.

The AWCG is supported by the National Welfare Coordination Group (NWCG). They provide strategic support and guidance of planning, development and coordination.

This document has been developed by AEM and the AWCG to show the way we work and the work we do.
Te Rōpū Ruruku Mahi Toko i te Ora o Tāmaki Makaurau

The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group

The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group is made up of the following partners:

- Adventist Development and Relief Agency
- Air New Zealand
- Auckland Council Animal Management
- Auckland Emergency Management
- Auckland Regional Public Health
- Department of Corrections
- District Health Boards
- Inland Revenue
- Ministry for Primary Industries
- Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment
- Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Social Development
- NZ Companion Animal Council
- NZ Police
- Oranga Tamariki – Ministry of Children
- Red Cross
- Rural Support Trust
- Salvation Army
- SPCA
- St John
- Te Puni Kōkiri
- Victim Support

The AWCG also work with key non-governmental organisations and other agencies during an event.
Ngā mātāpono mō te mahi toko i te ora i te mate ohotata

Welfare in emergency principles

The National Welfare Plan has five principles that guide emergency welfare planning and arrangements to ensure that we keep the community at the heart of everything we do.

The principles for emergency welfare services are to:

- recognise the diverse and dynamic nature of communities
- strengthen self-reliance as the foundation for individual and family and whānau and community resilience
- ensure that emergency welfare services address the specific welfare needs of individuals and families and whānau and communities
- ensure flexibility in the services provided and how they are best delivered
- integrate and align with local arrangements and existing welfare networks.
The Auckland Welfare Coordination Group has adopted an integrated approach across the 4Rs of emergency management (see diagram). We do this maintaining strong interagency relationships and through the development of practices and tools (i.e. standard operating procedures) that we build and test together.
Item 14
Attachment A

Ngā mea hei whakaaro ake

Considerations

- Welfare service considerations across all sub-functions.
- Respect – need to respect and show empathy towards those needing assistance.
- Business continuity planning – welfare services need to have arrangements in place to ensure they can contribute to the delivery of essential services and critical functions.
- Public information – need to use a variety of communication channels.
- Culturally and linguistically diverse communities – need to have access to services.
- Community connectedness and networks – foster, encourage communities to work together.
- Adaptable use of technology and manual systems.
- Respect privacy (information sharing) – all people collecting personal data need to abide by Privacy Act (1993) and Vulnerable Children’s Act (2014).
He kōrero poto mō Tāmaki Makaurau
Auckland at a glance

Population - already at 1.7M people and projected to grow to 2.4M by 2048.

Languages - there are over 175 languages spoken in Auckland.

Housing - Auckland needs approximately 14,000 new homes built per year to keep up with projected population growth.

Visitors - over 2.7M international arrivals per year.

New residents - approximately 740 new residents per week.

Māori - Māori Mana whenua are represented by 19 iwi (tribes) or hapu (sub-tribes) with territorial affiliations to the area.

Size - approximately covers 16,157 km² land and sea.

Ethnicities - home to over 180 ethnicities.

Rural land - approximately 84% rural.

Coastlines - approximately 3,100 km of coastlines.

Urban - 94 per cent live in urban areas.

Age - under 25's make up 34 per cent of the population.
How this plan fits

Our welfare framework


This Act outlines the welfare response required by Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups to ‘provide for the relief of distress, including emergency food, clothing and shelter’.

Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan

Our strategy is the guiding document for how we work to build a resilient Auckland.

Auckland Welfare Plan

This is a dual purpose, inward and outward facing document that helps to inform and educate on what we do and why we do it.

The plan is informed by:

Welfare toolkit

- standard operating processes
- position descriptions, competency framework, training
- operational documents and templates
- guides
- practice tools
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Item 14

How This Plan Fits

- Inquiry
- Household goods and services
- Animal welfare
- Financial assistance
- Psychosocial support
- Needs assessment
- Care and protection services of children and young people
- Shelter and accommodation

Welfare sub-function action plans

These plans are owned by members of the AVCC and will detail the nine welfare sub-functions at an operational level.
Ā mātau mahi
The work we do

Welfare is made up of nine sub-functions. Each has an identified lead agency and agencies that are responsible for the coordination and delivery of services of that sub-function.
Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee

27 February 2019
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Item 14
Te rehitatanga Registration

Registration enables us to identify and document who requires assistance during and after an emergency. The registration process enables welfare agencies to implement their welfare response.

Principles

- Demonstrate a respectful and empathetic approach towards those affected by the emergency.
- Uphold privacy of information.
- Protect the autonomy of affected people by ensuring the process of registration is voluntary.
- Ensure information is gathered and collated in a timely and accurate manner.

Planning actions

- Decide what the mechanisms for registration are, both primary and back-up.
- Make sure all staff have had background checks and are suitably trained.
- Develop a plan for increasing numbers of registrars if the emergency event is large.
- Ensure the registration process covers options for culturally and linguistically diverse communities.
**Response actions**

- Make sure each affected person is registered. This can come from:
  - the person presenting themselves at the registration desk/area, or to a registrar
  - contact being made with a registrar in a community setting (or via self-service in a remote setting).
- Use the EMIS Welfare Registration System to store registrations and inquiries whilst ensuring the privacy and security of personal information about all registrants.

**Challenges**

- Language barriers.
- Capability and capacity of registrars.
- Lack of understanding of the purpose of registration.
- Cultural barriers or fear of the registration process.

**LEAD AGENCY**
Auckland Emergency Management

**SUPPORT AGENCIES**
- Inland Revenue
- NZ Red Cross

**INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS**
- Needs Assessment
- Inquiry
Te arotake i ngā hiahia

Needs assessment

Needs assessment is the process of understanding the changing needs of people who have been affected by an emergency. It includes the system by which needs are identified and how the response to the needs are coordinated through the sub-functions.

Principles

- Promote and respect people's self-reliance and how they can support each other.
- Adopt a flexible and community-centred approach.
- Understand that needs may not be immediately apparent and will differ between people and over time.
- Respect people's privacy.
- Keep the process simple and timely.

Planning actions

- Decide the mechanisms for needs assessment collection, referral and follow-up, both primary and back-up.
- Make sure all needs assessors have had background checks and are suitably trained.
- Develop a plan for increasing numbers of needs assessors if the emergency event is large.
- Build partnerships with existing networks and relevant organisations to enhance communication channels with non-English language speakers.

“ There is no shame in getting assistance from people in such a situation.”
### Response actions

- Work with support agencies for needs assessment.
- Identify what support each person needs before referring them to the appropriate agencies.
- Information collected will be collated by the Welfare function in the Emergency Coordination Centre.

### Challenges

- Language and cultural barriers.
- Changing needs over time.
- Collating large amounts of information.

### LEAD AGENCY
Auckland Emergency Management

### SUPPORT AGENCIES
- District Health Boards
- Ministry of Primary Industries
- Ministry of Social Development
- NZ Police
- NZ Red Cross
- Salvation Army
- St John
- Te Puni Kōkiri
- Victim Support

### INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS
- Needs assessment can occur in conjunction with Registration
- Needs assessment has interdependencies with all welfare sub-function
He aromātai Inquiry

The process of inquiry involves assisting family, whānau, and significant others to make contact, and the subsequent inquiries and investigations to ensure they are reunited.

“When you are involved in something you want your loved ones to know that you are alive and well. Nothing becomes more important to you than knowing that everyone is ok.”

Principles

• Inter-agency cooperation to manage inquiry functions.
• Reconnecting people.
• All agencies will abide by the Privacy Act 1993.

Planning actions

• Encourage people to develop their own emergency plans that identify a means of contacting family members in an emergency, as well as where and how to meet in an emergency.
• Build lead and support agency contingency plans to cope with increased public demand.
• Establish a single non-emergency phone number for use during times of high-call volume.
Response actions

- NZ Police will assist in missing person matters when a member of the public has exhausted their own means.
- When the scale of the emergency is such that the Police cannot manage the volume of calls through their BAU processes, the Red Cross Restoring Family Links should be considered.
- Ensure consistent public messaging around how and when to inquire with NZ Police as well as other alternatives.
- NZ Police will continue to perform duties to ensure preservation of life and property.

Challenges

- Ensuring quality information is provided to the inquiry group.
- Getting people to see the importance of registering on the Red Cross Restoring Family Links.

LEAD AGENCY
- NZ Police

SUPPORT AGENCIES
- Auckland Emergency Management
- District Health Boards
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
- NZ Red Cross
- Primary Health Care
- St John

INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS
- Registration
- Needs Assessment
- Care and Protection of Children and Young People
Ko te tautiaki me te whakahaumaru i ngā tamariki me ngā rangatahi
Care and protection of children and young people

To plan for, deliver, and coordinate care and protection services for children and young people who have been identified (after registration) as being separated from their parents, legal guardians or usual caregivers.

- Children are kept safe and are cared for.
- Reunite children with their parents, legal guardians or usual caregivers as soon as possible and take all reasonable steps to do so before referring to NZ Police.
- Maintain strong relationships with community organisations and develop a clear understanding of the welfare needs of individuals and whānau.
- Recognise the diverse and dynamic nature of emergencies and their consequences on children and young people.

- Make sure all agencies develop and maintain plans that outline how they will collectively ensure that the needs of children and young people are met.
- Ensure that people involved in the provision and care of children and young people in an emergency are vetted according to legislative requirements.
Response actions

- Identify children and young people who are separated from their families.
- Utilise support agencies’ information to identify caregivers and parents as soon as possible.
- The Oranga Tamariki National Contact Centre will be the primary contact point for community members to ensure an accessible and responsive service.

Challenges

- Language and cultural barriers.
- Working with homeless or transient youth.
- Getting back to a normal routine, for example, school.

LEAD AGENCY
Oranga Tamariki – Ministry of Children

SUPPORT AGENCIES
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management
- NZ Police
- NZ Red Cross
- Te Puni Kōkiri

INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS
- Needs Assessment
- Inquiry
- Psychosocial Support

“When you have kids you need to be able to get things back to normal as fast as possible and sometimes something as simple as a pillow makes all the difference.”
Item 14

5.

He tautoko mō ngā āhuatanga papori ā-hinengaro
Psychosocial support

Psychosocial support during an emergency focuses on the interventions that are delivered to individuals and communities to ensure physical, psychological and social difficulties are eased at times of stress and uncertainty.

Principles

- Recognise that individuals and communities need time to recover.
- Reduce further harm.
- Provide wellbeing strategies over intensive forms of psychosocial assistance.
- Use the 'look, listen, link' approach.

Before an emergency

- Identify what communication methods will be used between lead and support agencies.
- Identify specialist support agencies to undertake the NZ Red Cross Psychological First Aid course and to participate in exercises.
- Develop a contingency plan for delivery of services if support agencies are unable to assist.
- Foster and maintain relationships with support agencies to assist with identification of vulnerable groups.
During an emergency:

- Use the psychosocial ‘look, listen and link’ model to support community recovery.
- Provide targeted support through referral to health and other support agencies.
- Continuously review and endeavour to understand the needs of the community, including vulnerable groups.

Challenges:

- Common understanding of what is ‘normal’ in emergencies.
- Culturally appropriate support.
- Changing nature of needs over time.
- Accessing those in need of support.

**LEAD AGENCY**
District Health Boards

**SUPPORT AGENCIES**
- Community-based Networks
- Counselling Services
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Primary Industries
- Ministry of Social Development
- NZ Red Cross
- Primary Health Organisations
- General Practitioners
- Public Health Units
- Pharmacies
- The Salvation Army
- Victim Support

**INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS**
- Needs Assessment
- Inquiry
- Care and Protection of Children and Young People

“Natural disaster events are stressful and we often don’t think clearly during them.”
Ngā rawa me ngā ratonga ā-kāinga
Household goods and services

Basic household goods and services may be provided to support affected people. This is a broad category, including food, water, clothing, bedding, furniture, medication and hygiene requirements. Goods and services are provided until normal systems of supply become available again.

**Principles**

- Basic supplies are provided to support community resilience.
- Work with community based support organisations to supply what is needed through mutual support.
- The provision of household goods and services is only undertaken when the usual means of supply is insufficient or inaccessible.
- Must at all times account for the dignity of those affected and consider culture, family make-up and religion where relevant.

**Planning actions**

- Work with support agencies to develop integrated plans based on agency capability, capacity and existing arrangements.
- Work with Auckland Council Local Boards and regional community organisations to develop mechanisms that enable communities to help themselves.
- Expand the range of supporting agencies to provide a flexible and appropriate response.
Response actions

- The Emergency Coordination Centre Logistics function will work closely with the Group, Auckland Council departments, suppliers and community leaders to access goods and services.
- Work with community networks to support them to coordinate a community response based on targeted needs.

Challenges

- Coordination of multiple suppliers.
- Supporting communities without disrespecting their innate resilience.
- Managing offers of assistance and donated items.

LEAD AGENCY
Auckland Emergency Management

SUPPORT AGENCIES
- Adventist Development and Relief Agency
- Auckland Council Animal Management
- Auckland Regional Public Health Service
- District Health Boards
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Primary Industries
- Ministry of Social Development
- NZ Defence Force
- NZ Red Cross
- Salvation Army

INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS
- Needs Assessment
- Shelter and Accommodation
- Financial Assistance

“Nearly every belonging was covered in flood water, what was untouched was eaten away by mold in the weeks following.”
Ngā wāhi whakamaru me ngā wāhi noho
Shelter and accommodation

The purpose of the shelter and accommodation sub-function is to coordinate the provision of shelter and accommodation for people who have been displaced from their homes as a result of emergency.

**Shelter**
Provided usually in a communal facility (but not necessarily a pre-designated Civil Defence Centre), for a few hours up to a few days only.

**Emergency accommodation**
Provided to displaced people for up to two weeks.

**Temporary accommodation**
Provided to displaced people who cannot return to their homes for a prolonged period (weeks, months or years).

**Principles**
- Encourage people to stay at home or with family and friends (when safe to do so).
- Take into account family and community connections and aim to keep families together and close to essential services.
- People needing shelter and accommodation are likely to need other support services and should be referred accordingly.
- Shelter options should be safe, hygienic and accessible to those who need them.
- Avoid moving displaced people multiple times.

**Planning actions**
- Lead agencies work together to plan the transition between shelter and/or emergency accommodation to temporary accommodation.
- Work with support agencies to develop integrated plans for the shelter and accommodation sub-function including those people who may be able to shelter in place.
- Identify communal accommodation options through the Civil Defence Centre designation programme and other facilities partnerships.
Everyone wants to get back to normal as soon as possible. Having nowhere to call my own was the most destabilising thing of all.

**Response actions**
- Auckland Emergency Management’s welfare and logistics teams will work together to identify the needs of those displaced and the best practical shelter or emergency accommodation solutions.
- Auckland Emergency Management and Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment will work together to ensure a seamless transition between shelter or emergency accommodation into temporary accommodation.
- People accessing this sub-function will also be referred to other sub-functions for further support and will be encouraged through active case management to identify further accommodation options if return home is not possible.

**Challenges**
- Housing availability in Tamaki Makaurau / Auckland and shortage of commercial accommodation.
- Geographical clustering of appropriate commercial accommodation options.

**LEAD AGENCIES**
- Auckland Emergency Management (Shelter & Emergency Accommodation)
- Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (Temporary Accommodation)

**SUPPORT AGENCIES**
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Social Development
- NZ Defence Force
- NZ Red Cross
- Te Puni Kōkiri
- The Salvation Army

**TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION**
- Housing New Zealand
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Social Development
- NZ Defence Force
- Te Puni Kōkiri

**INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS**
- Needs Assessment
- Financial Assistance
- Household Goods and Services
He āwhina ā-pūtea
Financial assistance

The Ministry of Social Development coordinates the provision of information about, and access to, the range of financial assistance available to people affected by an emergency.

Principles

- Agencies are responsible for determining whether eligibility criteria are met for the financial programmes they administer.
- Participating agencies will provide information on the assistance available through their agency, including contact information.
- People affected by emergencies have access to information on the range of financial assistance available through a variety of formats.
- Agencies will liaise closely with other sub-function agencies to ensure that where multiple needs are identified, the individual and/or family receives a wrap-around service to meet those needs, including financial assistance.

Planning actions

- Coordinate planning undertaken by all agencies involved in the provision of financial assistance.
- Coordinate the development of public information, including culturally and linguistically diverse options, so people affected in an emergency know how they can access the services provided.
**Response actions**
- Monitor the situation to ensure that available financial assistance meets the needs of those affected.
- The amount and type of financial assistance will depend on need and eligibility. Extra measures of assistance can also be granted depending on the scope and scale of the emergency.
- Pre-prepared information on and access to a range of financial assistance will be available through a variety of channels.
- In a large-scale emergency, the Government 0800 Helpline may be activated in consultation with the Group and the National Welfare Coordination Group.

**Challenges**
- Increasing public awareness of available support.
- Coordination of multiple agencies.

---

**LEAD AGENCY**
Ministry of Social Development

**SUPPORT AGENCIES**
- Accident Compensation Corporation
- Earthquake Commission
- Inland Revenue
- Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment
- NZ Red Cross
- The Salvation Army

**INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS**
- Needs Assessment
- Shelter and Accommodation
- Household Goods and Services

---

“We hadn’t faced this before. We didn’t know what to do, where to go and who would help.”
Te tiaki kararehe
Animal welfare

Animal welfare helps provide for the needs of animals when their owners (or people in charge) are not able to do so themselves due to the consequences of an emergency.

Principles

- All animal owners, or people in charge of animals, should develop their own plans to care for their animals during emergencies.
- Comprehensive emergency management to support an all-hazards and all-species approach.

Planning actions

- Lead the development of animal welfare planning arrangements involving all animal welfare sub-function support agencies.
- Develop plans to allow animals, accompanied by owners, to attend nominated Civil Defence Centres for registration.

“ My animals are a part of my family. I would never leave my animals. ”
Response actions

- Coordinate the animal welfare sub-function for all animals (including animal rescue, animal shelter, food, water, husbandry and veterinary care and other essentials) delivered by support agencies. This includes companion animals, production animals, animals in research, testing and teaching facilities, zoo and circus animals and wildlife.
- Animal rescue should be considered across welfare and operations functions in the Emergency Coordination Centre.
- Resources should be mobilised as soon as possible during an emergency.

Challenges

- Temporary housing of animals.
- Dependence on assistance animals.
- Risk of pet owners breaching cordon to retrieve animals.
- Creating a scalable framework.

LEAD AGENCY
Ministry of Primary Industries

SUPPORT AGENCIES
(SHELTER & EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION)
- Federated Farmers of New Zealand
- New Zealand Companion Animal Council
- NZ Veterinary Association
- Royal NZ Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
- Auckland Council Animal Management
- World Animal Protection

INTERDEPENDENCIES WITH OTHER SUB-FUNCTIONS
- Needs Assessment
- Shelter and Accommodation
He huarahi e whai wāhi mai ai te tangata
Ways to get involved

To be prepared and able to deal with emergencies, here are some key considerations and questions to get you started:

1. Understand risk
   - How might you and others be affected by an emergency?
   - Are there reasons that make you more vulnerable to the impacts of an emergency?
   - What could you do to reduce your exposure or vulnerability to risks? It needn’t cost money.
   - Future-proof your life by considering long term changes in your environment, including the impacts of climate change, for example the likelihood of severe storm events.

2. Plan to stay safe
   - Have you discussed what you, your family, community or business plan to do if an emergency occurs?
   - Does your place of work have a business continuity plan?
   - Do you know how you are going to contact each other during and after an emergency?
   - Where would you and those closest to you meet up if there are communication or access issues?

3. Be prepared
   - Thinking about the potential impacts that could occur, for example, power, water, communications outages, transport issues, needing to stay in or out of home for an extended period of time...
     - What information and resources do you, your family, community or business need to have available?
     - What strengths and resources do you have available now and how could you use them to cope during and after an emergency?
     - Try to find solutions that benefit you every day which will also help in an emergency e.g. solar lighting, a car phone charger, access to camping gear, maintaining a full gas bottle for cooking.
4. Stay connected
- Get to know people in your neighbourhood and community.
- Support and participate in local community events.
- Communities and businesses that know each other are stronger in good times and in bad.

5. Stay informed
- Find out more; talk to others about emergency risks and resilience; sign up for emergency alerts and warnings.
- Keep learning and building your own capacity to deal with disruption and problem solve so you, your whānau and community can be more resilient.
- For further information go to the Auckland Emergency Management website: aucklandcivildefence.org.nz
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To update the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee on the forward work programme, including increased opportunities for collaboration and joint work across Coordinated Executive Group agencies.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The forward work programme outlines work to implement the actions from the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan’s ‘Framework for Action’.

3. Reporting on the forward work programme is a standing item on the agendas of the Coordinating Executive Group and Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee meetings to support their oversight. Progress on the forward work programme is reported under headings in the Update on the Coordinating Executive Group meeting on 4 February 2019 report and in two separate reports included on the agenda.


5. The forward work programme increasingly involves collaboration across the agencies represented on the Coordinating Executive Group. The Group has agreed to schedule quarterly workshops, to fall between quarterly meetings to reflect the collaborative nature of the Group’s ongoing forward work programme.

6. The Group has agreed that the Forward Work Programme should be developed between the agencies to ensure the programme reflects the Group’s commitments and priorities.

7. The Coordinating Executive Group’s Terms of Reference will be amended to reflect agreement to hold quarterly workshops and this will be reported to the Committee for endorsement at its meeting in May 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) endorse revisions to the form of Forward Work Programme to:

i) reflect interagency priorities for work developed to implement the intent of the Group Plan

ii) respond to priorities arising since the publication of the Group Plan, before the next scheduled update,
Horopaki
Context
8. One of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee functions is to “develop, approve, implement and monitor a civil defence emergency management group plan and regularly review the plan” under section 17 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

9. One of the Coordinating Executive Group’s functions is to “oversee the implementation, development, maintenance, monitoring and evaluation of the civil defence emergency management group” under section 20 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

10. The Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan 2016-21 includes a ‘Framework for Action’ summarising actions across the 5 ‘R’s that Auckland must progress to become a resilient region.

11. The forward work programme is a standing agenda item for Coordinating Executive Group and Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee meetings. The forward work programme includes actions for the 2018/2019 financial year as well as ongoing strategic initiatives from past actions.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Forward Work Programme
12. Progress on the forward work programme is outlined in two reports included on the agenda for the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee:
   i) Pathways to Progress: A Planning Framework for Recovery

13. Progress on the forward work programme is also outlined on three items in the Update on the Coordinating Executive Group Meeting on 4 February 2019 report, included on the Committee’s agenda:
   i) Joint exercising across agency partners
   ii) Joint Evaluation Action Plan
   iii) Working to build community resilience together.

14. These items reflect that much of the forward work programme requires our coordinating agencies to working with Auckland Emergency Management on combined responsiveness. Much of the discussion at the Coordinating Executive Group related to items which had involved collaboration across the agencies or new opportunities for further collaboration.

15. Recent developments within the wider emergency management sector and the prospect of ongoing change will increase the need for cross agency collaboration. Examples of recent developments include the Technical Advisory Group review, the forthcoming National Disaster Resilience Strategy, and the next review of our Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee Group Plan.

16. The Coordinating Executive Group also agreed to schedule quarterly workshops in addition to the Group’s quarterly meetings to workshop collaborative work. These workshops will be added to the formal forward work programme of the Group.

17. This report recommends that the forward work programme is developed to reflect work across the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group. This will include regular workshops.
Terms of Reference – Coordinating Executive Group

18. The Coordinating Executive Groups Terms of Reference will be amended to provide for quarterly workshops and associated processes and reported to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee in May 2019 for endorsement.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

19. The matters outlined in this report support fulfilment of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee’s role. There are no council group impacts arising from this report. Any impacts relating to items on the work programme are addressed when separately reported on.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe

Local impacts and local board views

20. There are no local impacts arising from this report. Any local impacts and/or local board views relating to items on the work programme are addressed when separately reported on.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

21. There are no impacts on Auckland’s Māori arising from this report. Any impacts for Auckland’s Māori relating to items on the work programme are addressed when separately reported on.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

22. There are no financial implications arising from this report. Any financial implications relating to items on the work programme are addressed when separately reported on.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

23. There are no risks arising from this report to be mitigated. Any risks and their mitigation relating to items on the work programme are addressed when separately reported on.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

24. The Forward Work Programme is a live document that will be continuously updated based on the needs of the wider Auckland region and the suggestions of the Coordinating Executive Group and Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee.
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Demonstration of the new Auckland Emergency Management Website

File No.: CP2019/01753

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity to demonstrate the new Auckland Emergency Management website.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The new Auckland Emergency Management website can be accessed at the following links:
   Website: https://www.aucklandemergencymanagement.org.nz/
   Hazard Viewer: https://aucklandcouncil.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=81aa3de13b114be9b529018ee3c649c8

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:
   a) thank staff for the demonstration of the new Auckland Emergency Management Website.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
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