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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
An apology from IMSB Member T Henare has 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, 27 February 2019, 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
At the close of the agenda no requests for public input had been received.

6 Local Board Input
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.”
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 tūpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
| Authoriser          | Sarah Sinclair – Acting General Manager Auckland Emergency Management |
Report on Coordinating Executive Group meeting of 6 May 2019

File No.: CP2019/07783

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 6 May 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Coordinating Executive Group met on 6 May 2019.
3. Agenda items not separately reported to this committee are summarised in this report, including:
   - Enabling, Empowering and Supporting Community Resilience
   - Welfare Sub Function Plans
   - Activation, Structure and Resources Workshop.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:
a) note the report on Coordinating Executive Group meeting of 6 May 2019.

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 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan 2016-21.

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

6. Items from Coordinating Executive Group meetings, not separately reported to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee are summarised in this report.
Reported items

7. Items from the Coordinating Executive Group meeting that require a decision from the Committee are separately reported on this agenda. Agenda items that do not require a decision are summarised in this report.

Enabling, Empowering and Supporting Community Resilience

8. The Coordinating Executive Group received a report outlining Auckland Emergency Management’s community resilience building initiatives that could be considered for the Group’s shared work programme.

9. These initiatives form a part of Auckland Emergency Management work on a framework for the development, engagement and delivery of resilience initiatives to strengthen Aucklanders' resilience. This work is informed by:
   - the community resilience principles in the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Plan 2016-2021
   - pilots commencing from 2017 with child and youth, cultural and linguistically diverse, business, pacific and disability communities
   - the findings in the bi-annual Monitoring Survey
   - the National Disaster Resilience Strategy Objectives - notably ‘enabling, empowering and supporting community resilience’.

10. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to consider the shared approaches to resilience building and share resilience communications and interagency delivery when establishing a shared work programme.

Welfare Sub Function Plans

11. Following the committee’s approval of the Auckland Welfare Plan (February 2019) Auckland Emergency Management has started coordinating the collaborative development of plans for the nine welfare sub functions.

12. Welfare sub function plans are operational plans which define responsibilities, procedures which also covers systems and agreements to enable agencies to respond effectively together.

13. The development of plans for each sub function will be led by the agency responsible for that sub function under the National CDEM Plan 2015, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Function</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>New Zealand Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Goods and Services</td>
<td>Oranga Tamariki – Ministry of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>District Health Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care and protection service of children and young people</td>
<td>Auckland Emergency Management / Ministry of Business Employment and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial support</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and Accommodation</td>
<td>Ministry of Primary Industries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The Auckland Welfare Coordinating Group committed to completing sub function plans as part of the 2019/20 work programme.

15. Both sub function plans for registration and needs assessment involve the collection and analysis of information and the tasking of services to address the needs of people, and their animals, in an emergency. For this reason, the Coordinating Executive Group endorsed combining plans for these sub function plans into one plan.

16. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to receive progress updates on the development of the sub functions plans in August and November 2019, prior to their completion by June 2020.

**Activation, Structure and Resources Workshop**

17. The Coordinating Executive Group held its first quarterly workshop on 4 April 2019, as part of the Group’s collaborative joint work programme.

18. The purpose of the workshop was to review activation protocols to ensure the flow of relevant information between partner agencies in support of operational awareness.

19. The workshop ran a response scenario to explore how agencies move from business as usual to activation, and the processes and time taken to mobilise local and distant resources.

20. Topics discussed included the activation in the case of single-agency and multiple-agency responses, teleconferencing, staffing, data capture and circulation, and situation reports.

21. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed:
   - each agency of the Auckland Coordinating Executive Group is to develop/review protocols to ensure that other Auckland Coordinating Executive Group partners are advised of an emergency activation.
   - Auckland Emergency Management will revise activation protocols to ensure that a Auckland Coordinating Executive Group teleconference is convened within 24 hours of activation
   - each agency is to advise Auckland Emergency Management’s Duty Manager of ‘major’ single agency response or issue as a conduit to other Auckland Coordinating Executive Group members
   - each Auckland Coordinating Executive Group agency is to ensure they have protocols to circulate situation reports to Auckland Coordinating Executive Group partners and the Emergency Coordination Centre
   - each agency is to consider how they could quickly capture and provide data on availability of resources in the lead up to or immediate start of an event, including staff who may live out of the area or district and go to a different office or centre than usual
   - each agency is to consider testing out of hours phone pick-ups as part of business continuity.

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

22. There are no direct impacts on Auckland Council Group arising from the matters outlined in this report.

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

23. There are no direct, local impacts or impacts for local boards arising from the matters outlined in this report.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

24. There are no direct Māori impacts arising from the matters outlined in this report.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

25. There are no financial implications arising from the matters outlined in this report.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

26. The matters outlined in this report support Civil Defence Emergency Management and improving its 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

27. The advice and recommendations from the Coordinating Executive Group meeting on 5 August 2019 will be reported to the next Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee meeting on 28 August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Authoriser       | Sarah Sinclair Acting General Manger Auckland Emergency Management |

---
Update on the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan

File No.: CP2019/08226

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To update the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee on the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan project and request approval to continue with consultation on actions and development of the final draft.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Auckland is at risk from the impacts of a range of natural hazards. Detailed risk assessments have identified 10 key natural hazards and how these hazards may impact the Auckland region.

3. The Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan describes how the risk of these hazards is currently being managed at council and, through consultation within council across eight key functions, the opportunities that exist to work to mitigate future risk.

4. The Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan has been expanded to include wider consultation and action development across the Auckland Council Group.

5. A draft discussion document has been developed that outlines the principles of the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan and draft actions developed for key functions within Auckland Council to facilitate communication and consultation on the plan. It will also be used as the basis for a deeper phase of action refinement.

6. After the final draft is prepared and presented to the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee in August 2019, it will be combined with the natural hazard risk assessments technical supporting documentation and monitoring and evaluation framework into a roadmap outlining how council will implement the Action Plan.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) approve the discussion document to go out for further consultation and action development.

Horopaki

Context

7. Auckland Council’s Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan is a key component of council’s natural hazard management along with the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Plan 2016-2021.

8. The purpose of the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan is to:

b) Identify where Auckland’s natural hazards are and the risks they present.

c) Outline the roles and responsibilities of Auckland Council in managing the risks of natural hazards.

d) Identify the actions Auckland Council will implement or facilitate over the next 10 years to reduce risk from natural hazards.
9. The Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan is designed to be a short- to mid-term (10-year) plan, that can align with Auckland Council’s operational 10-year plan and budget. It also acknowledges how climate change, as a longer-term effect, could likely impact each hazard and how this will affect Auckland’s risk profile during that time, with most hazards increasing in likelihood, and therefore, overall risk.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

10. A series of semi-quantitative risk assessments identified 10 natural hazards (Figure 1) that posed the largest risk to Auckland in terms of their impact to the natural, cultural, economic and social environments:

- Flooding - Waipuke
- Severe wind - Pūkerikeri
- Volcanic activity - Puia o Ruamoko
- Tsunami - Parawhenua o te Moana
- Coastal inundation - Waipuke ki Tai
- Coastal erosion - Horowhenua ki Tai
- Land instability - Horowhenua
- Tornado – Āwhiowhio
- Uncontrolled fire - Mahuika
- Earthquake – Ruamoko

Figure 1 – Outcomes of the risk assessments of the 10 natural hazards included in the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan. Blue hazards are generally managed as part of the work programmes of Auckland Council but may require coordinated management during larger events, management of green hazards are led by other agencies but can be supported by Auckland Council and orange hazards are considered catastrophic and may require specific management strategies.
11. Eight key functions of council were identified as contributing in a significant way to the mitigation of natural hazards risk and engagement partners were identified in each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Function</th>
<th>Engagement partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management and preparedness</td>
<td>Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinating Executive Group Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and leadership</td>
<td>Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinating Executive Group Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, policy and planning</td>
<td>Natural Environment Strategy Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth and Infrastructure Strategy Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk and Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations and consents</td>
<td>Resource Consents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure and Environmental Services Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management</td>
<td>Asset Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and research</td>
<td>Research and Evaluation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, education &amp; community engagement</td>
<td>Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Relationship Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Controlled Organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The development of an initial draft of the Action Plan involved workshops and interviews with a range of stakeholders including mana whenua, stakeholders, key engagement partners and the wider Auckland Council Group.

13. During these initial discussions, priorities, responsibilities and gaps/considerations in current management strategy in each of the eight key functions were identified and draft actions were developed to address those opportunities.

14. A draft discussion document has been developed that incorporates these initial findings (refer to Attachment 1) to facilitate further communication and consultation on the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan. This document was presented to the Coordinating Executive Committee in May 2019 for feedback and is presented here with minor refinements.

15. An important function of the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan discussion document is to encourage engagement partners to think about natural hazard risk in a different way. Particularly, where the distinction lies between how natural hazards risk is managed as a function of their normal work programmes and where a more coordinated approach across council would be needed for disaster management or resilience building. This is being used as the basis for a deeper dive into how we manage natural hazard risk as an organisation.

16. A deeper phase of engagement and action development is underway. This involves meeting again with business units across council who manage the impacts of natural hazards in their work programme, or whose operations would be affected by the impacts of natural hazards, to work on action refinement.
17. Once the final action plan is drafted and presented to the committee, a road map will be developed that will address how the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan will be implemented and used across council. This will include:
   a) the technical natural hazard risk assessments and supporting documentation
   b) the final Action Plan for Auckland Council
   c) details of a monitoring and evaluation framework

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

18. While the current Natural Hazard Risk Management Action Plan does not include Council Controlled Organisations, future iterations will be expanded to outline the roles and responsibilities of other agencies and organisations in managing the risks of natural hazards and opportunities for synergies within the Auckland Council Group.

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

19. The Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan acknowledges the diversity of Auckland, not only geographically, but socially, culturally and economically.

20. During the risk assessment development, the impact of each natural hazard was mapped spatially using GIS tools, to identify the current, historic, or future exposure of the region. This will be used during future engagement with local communities and incorporated into the technical supporting documentation.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

21. Engagement with mana whenua was part of the early development of this document, which guided how it should be considered in the context of Te Ao Māori and where opportunities exist to partner on risk mitigation strategy and action development.

22. Mana whenua will be approached again as a part of the development of the implementation road map to consider where they wish to be involved in the natural hazard risk management process.

23. Mana whenua have advocated for future iterations of the document to include man-made and technological hazards. This is likely to be addressed in a separate document.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

24. Consultation and engagement costs have been factored into the budgets of the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 financial years.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

25. Engagement has been expanded to include a wider section of Auckland Council to ensure the Natural Hazard Risk Management Action Plan identifies all current and future natural hazard mitigation plans across the wider organisation during action development.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

26. Action refinement and draft development will continue.

27. The final plan will be brought to the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Committee in August 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan draft discussion</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
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<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Sarah Sinclair - Acting General Manager Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
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</table>
Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan

Discussion document
Our discussion document

Introduction

Auckland Council’s Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan (NHRMAP) is a key component of Council’s natural hazard management framework, along with the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Plan 2016-2021. It provides information on the 10 natural hazards that are an integral part of Auckland’s location, and describes how the risks of these hazards have been assessed.

This purpose of this document is to facilitate a structured consultation with key partners and stakeholders. Following their feedback, we will produce a final NHRAM Plan for Auckland.

Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan (NHRMAP)

The NHRMAP focuses on Council’s role and responsibilities, which are wider than its civil defence and emergency management function. To create a resilient Auckland, the Council must take action to improve or newly establish a range of programmes and initiatives across the entire organisation that are vital to providing for Auckland’s infrastructure needs.

The Plan sets out actions Council seeks to implement over the next 10 years. These actions are based on guiding principles that include a commitment to embedding Te Ao Maori into managing natural hazards, fostering sustainability and resilience and the need to adapt to climate change, as this will increase the risk from some natural hazards in the future.

Alignment to CCOs

While not included in the current NHRMAP, engagement and alignment with CCO plans and strategies is likely to be undertaken in the future.

Scope

The scope of this document is to provide the high-level overview for the engagement and communications during refinement of the NHRMAP, and finalising of actions.

Our Vision:

‘Create resilience to the potential risks of natural hazards, supported by strengthening our cultural uniqueness with a network of prepared communities and a sustainable environment.’
Statutory framework and international agreements

There is no single statute or plan that provides the framework for managing natural hazards in New Zealand, but the following have strong contributing influences into the Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Purpose in Natural Hazard Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Disaster Resilience Strategy 2019</td>
<td>The National Disaster Resilience Strategy outlines the vision and long-term goals for civil defence emergency management in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002</td>
<td>The CDEM Act is based on the concept of the ‘4 Rs’ - Reduction (of risk), Readiness (for an event), Response (when an event occurs) and Recovery (after the event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Act 2002</td>
<td>Requires councils to have a long-term plan (LTP) that covers, among other things, desired community outcomes and an infrastructure strategy that makes provision for managing risk relating to natural hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>The RMA provides for the management of natural hazards in many ways including defining what a hazard is and outlines roles and responsibilities in natural hazard risk mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Act 2004 (BA), Building Regulations 1992 and Building Code</td>
<td>The Building Act provides a national framework for building control including to ensure, among other things, that buildings are constructed to withstand the effects of natural hazard impacts and to do worsen the effect of natural hazards on the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987</td>
<td>Describes the way that information regarding the exposure of a property to the affects of natural hazards may be included in Land Information Memoranda (LIMs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Sendai Framework**

New Zealand also has international obligations as a signatory to the 2015-2030 Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, which was adopted at the UN World conference in Sendai, Japan as the successor of the Hyogo Framework (2005-2015). The Sendai Framework seeks to:

> “Prevent new and reduce existing disaster risk through the implementation of integrated and inclusive economic, structural, legal, social, health, cultural, educational, environmental, technological, political and institutional measures that prevent and reduce hazard exposure and vulnerability to disaster, increase preparedness for response and recovery, and thus strengthen resilience.”

Roles and responsibilities

We all have a role to play in managing risk from natural hazards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
<td>Councils are required by legislation to be prepared for emergencies, to lead and represent the community, manage the environment, and to ensure buildings and structures are safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Responsible for the well-being of the land, sea, water and biodiversity, including people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td>Overarching strategic direction for civil defence and emergency focused on the four ‘Rs’ of emergency management – Reduction, Readiness, Response and Recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeline utility providers</td>
<td>Keeping essential infrastructure and services operating, and work with CDEM groups on response and recovery outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency services</td>
<td>Fire service, police and ambulance all have a key role in natural hazard management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The private sector</td>
<td>Risk reduction and improving resilience within our built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government organisations</td>
<td>These include institutions such as Rotary, the Salvation Army, NIWA etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland communities</td>
<td>Individuals and communities have responsibilities for well-being and ability to cope with a natural hazard event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project objectives

The purpose of this document is to assemble and integrate information about Auckland’s natural hazards in one place, to provide a basis for more detailed and specific natural hazard initiatives and projects.

The development of the NHRMAP has the following objectives:

- To identify key natural hazards in Auckland and the risks they present so that we can focus our attention on those that present the highest risk
- Outline the role and responsibilities of Auckland Council in managing the risks of natural hazards
- Develop actions Auckland Council will undertake or facilitate over the next 10 years to reduce risk from natural hazards and to increase our resilience.

Key messages

Auckland is at risk from a range of natural hazards

Although the most common natural hazard affecting Auckland is severe weather, we are at risk from a range of natural hazards including those that are more rarely experienced such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. These hazards can also originate from far outside the region such as tsunami or the eruption of volcanoes in the central North Island.

Resilience to the effects of natural hazards can be grown in all areas of Council business

Natural hazards can affect the built, cultural, social and economic environment of Auckland. It is important to foster resilience across all these areas, not just in the community, or the city’s infrastructure.

Developing resilience to the effects of natural hazards is a statutory requirement as well as a social responsibility

In addition to our obligations under various legislation, developing a resilient city and community is a key theme in the Auckland Plan.

Natural hazard risk reduction strategies are already a part of many plans across Auckland Council

The NHRMAP will provide an overview of Council-wide natural hazard risk reduction strategies and help identify synergies and areas for collaboration. It will also help identify areas where more work is needed.
Auckland’s Natural Hazard Risk Profile

Auckland is at risk from a range of natural hazards. This Action Plan considers 10 of these hazards, which are categorised as having ‘very high’, ‘high’, ‘moderate’ and ‘low’ risk based on risk assessments. Each risk profile shows the ‘Present Day Risk’ and ‘Future Risk’. It includes an assessment of the potential future risk and the impact that climate change could have on changing the risk profile. The risk assessments are summarised here, but described in deeper detail in the NHRMAP and associated technical documentation.

\[
\text{Risk} = \text{Likelihood} \times \text{Consequence}
\]

Catastrophic Hazards (require specific disaster management)
Managed by Auckland Council BAU*
Managed by External Partners

* generally, although larger scale events may require specific management.
Flooding - Waipuke

Flooding occurs during or after heavy rain, when our natural or designed drainage systems cannot cope. It becomes dangerous if the water is very deep, travelling very fast, the flood waters have risen suddenly or if the floodwater contains large amounts of debris.

**Geographical scale and extent**

The severity of flooding depends on intensity, extent and duration of the rainfall, catchment size and the urban landscape. Auckland’s urban area has relatively small catchments that are prone to frequent, short, high intensity rainfall events, while the rural area has larger catchments and small rivers where larger-scale weather systems cause flooding to occur. Areas prone to flooding may include low-lying floodplains with streams or rivers, valley floors of steep river catchments and low-lying areas near sea-level and the coast.

**Historic occurrences**

In January 2011, two distinctive storms within six days of each other brought flooding and storm surge with varying degrees of damage and disruption. Near record-breaking rainfall fell in the north east of Auckland, in some places over four times the January average. Many properties and critical infrastructure suffered damage, with the total cost exceeding $20M for the region.

**Likelihood**

Flooding is a frequent, naturally occurring hazard. Damage in the region occurs on average, several times each year with each catchment area of the region having approximately a 50% chance of damage from flooding occurring in any given year.

**Consequences**

Flooding can result in high costs from damage to property, critical infrastructure, productive land and stock losses. It can also bring high social, cultural and environmental impacts including stress from evacuations and failure of critical infrastructure, contamination of waterways and, in extreme cases, injury and death by drowning. The 1-in-100 year flood event has been calculated to be the event with the highest overall risk (likelihood x consequence) in Auckland.

**Current management**

Flood risk is managed by Auckland Council through planning, the proactive renewal of critical stormwater assets, improving community resilience to flooding, publishing flood hazard information, mitigating existing flooding issues and preventing future flooding issues through

---

Auckland Council has forecast to spend (as projected in the 30 year outlook of the Long Term Plan) $1.5 billion on improvements to the stormwater system including targets to reduce the level of flood risk.

As a result, in Auckland, it is the only natural hazard with infrastructure in place region-wide to reduce the impacts of storm flows on people and property.
Severe winds - Pūkerikeri

Severe winds are generally associated with tropical cyclones, extratropical cyclones and other storm events. Tropical cyclones are described by categories ranging from 1 to 5 in relation to the maximum strength of winds. Category 5 storms can generate winds of more than 250 km/hr.

**Geographical scale and extent**

The extent of cyclones and large storms can be widespread, affecting the whole region or wider area of New Zealand.

**Historic occurrences**

Numerous recorded extratropical cyclones have affected Auckland in the last 50 years. These include extratropical cyclone Ita (2014), Innis (2009), Ivy (2004), Sose (2001), Drena (1997), Fergus (1996), Delilah (1989), Bola (1988), Alison (1975), Giselle (1968) and Dinah (1967). Cyclone Bola produced gust speeds of 107 km/h in Auckland. Severe winds can be caused by other storm events that do not originate in the tropics. In 2017 and 2018 multiple severe storms from the Tasman Sea, resulted in damaging winds that impacted infrastructure networks across the Auckland Region.

**Likelihood**

High wind storms occur frequently in Auckland, on average a couple of times a year. The likelihood of tropical cyclones reaching Auckland is rare, however extratropical cyclones often can reach and affect Auckland. The worst tropical cyclones tend to occur from December to April with at least one extratropical cyclone passing within 500 km of New Zealand in most years.

**Consequences**

The consequence of high winds depends on factors such as the resilience of infrastructure, preparedness and warning time. Economic impacts are high with damage to buildings, infrastructure and vehicles, disruption to transport (air travel, railway and roads), power and other lifeline services. Social impacts are a result of injuries and deaths, building damage, business closure and disruption to critical infrastructure, e.g., loss of power.

**Current management**

Severe winds in Auckland are managed through Council policies and building control, infrastructure maintenance activities, emergency response and community education.

---

**Civil Defence:** Prepare the community to prepare for, respond to, and recover from severe wind events through public education and readiness activities.

**Infrastructure strategy:** Assess impact of hazards on Auckland’s infrastructure and identify ways to reduce the impact of hazards.

Land use management and wind zone data for properties.
Volcanic Activity - Puia o Ruamoko

Auckland is partially built on the Auckland Volcanic Field (AVF). Although the volcanoes are small and eruptions infrequent, risk associated with future activity is very high due to the severe consequences they may produce. Auckland is also at risk from ash fall from eruptions from active volcanoes in the central North Island and Taranaki.

Geographical scale and extent
The AVF covers 360 km² and has more than 50 volcanoes. Eruptions can form large craters, such as Lake Pupuke, and Onehunga Reserve, with continued eruptions forming volcanic or scoria cones such as Mt Wellington and Mt Eden. They may also produce extensive lava flows. Many flows have been mapped within the city extending up to 10 km from the source.

Historic occurrences
The earliest volcanic activity in the AVF dates back 250,000 years and the youngest forming Rangitoto Island, which occurred around 600 years ago. Over the past 80,000 years, eruptions from distant volcanoes have deposited at least 82 different ash layers greater than 0.5 m thick in Auckland.

Likelihood
Based on the number and frequency of past eruptions it is estimated there is about one in 1,000 (0.001%) chance an eruption could occur in any one year. This means that there is an 8% probability (one in 12.5 chance) an eruption will occur in the AVF field over any 80-year period.

Consequences
Hazards depend on eruption type, duration and location. Deaths directly caused by an eruption are hopefully unlikely as adequate warnings can usually be issued. However, they can also result in injury or health risks from eye and lung irritation. Properties and infrastructure can be significantly damaged or destroyed by the eruption, lava flow or ash fall. Fresh and waste water systems, transport systems, electricity supply and communication systems can be severely disrupted due to direct damage, overloading, and closures. Eruptions can also cause significant cultural and environmental damage along with high economic costs.

Current management
Volcanic risk in Auckland is managed through Council planning, infrastructure maintenance activities, emergency planning and preparedness and community education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Increasing (with development and population growth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Defence: Prepare the community to respond to and recover from volcanic events through public education and readiness activities.

Volcanic Contingency Plan: Operational planning for Civil Defence and partners to respond in a volcanic event.
Tsunami - Parawhenua o te Moana

A tsunami is a series of waves, typically created by sudden intense movement of the ocean floor resulting from earthquakes, underwater landslides and underwater volcanic eruptions. They can reach heights of 10 m when making landfall.

Geographical scale and extent

Tsunami may be generated from three different sources:
- **Local**: Arrive in less than one hour. May originate from active faults such as the Kerepehi Fault, submarine volcanism in the Tonga-Kermadec trench, or local earthquake
- **Regional**: Arrive in between 1 and 3 hours. Could be produced by events associated with the Tonga-Kermadec Trench, Southern New Hebrides Trench and Hikurangi Subduction System
- **Distant**: Arrive after 3 hours. May originate from anywhere around the Pacific Ocean.

Historic occurrences

Since 1840, 16 tsunami have been recorded on Auckland coasts with wave heights <0.1 to 1.8 m. The majority have been remotely generated, e.g. west of South America and Alaska.

Likelihood

Likelihood varies. The Kerepehi Fault has a return period estimated to be between 4,500 and 9,000 years. Modelling suggests an earthquake along the Tonga-Kermadec Trench – Hikurangi Trough system could produce a damaging tsunami. The greatest ‘external’ tsunami threats come from South America’s west coast. The return period for such an event is low (2,500 years).

Consequences

Tsunami waves can surge considerable distances across inland low-lying areas. Large tsunami waves with limited warning time could cause significant social impacts including injury and drowning from tsunami-induced flooding and debris. Destruction and damage to coastal buildings and critical infrastructure will have immediate and ongoing disruption and economic costs. Significant environmental damage can occur from salt water inundation and debris flows along with pollution through damage to critical infrastructure.

Current management

Given the low likelihood associated with tsunami events, they are predominantly managed through awareness and emergency management techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Increasing (with sea level rise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Increasing (with development and growth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tsunami inundation modelling** to understand the likelihood and extent of predicted tsunami events in the Auckland region.

**Evacuation mapping** to raise awareness of low lying areas of the coast to be evacuated in the event of a tsunami.

Civil Defence Emergency Management **contingency planning**.
Coastal inundation - Waipuke ki Tai

Coastal inundation occurs when low-lying areas are flooded by the sea. Causes include astronomical tides and atmospheric pressure (determines sea level), and wind direction and strength (wave height), or by a combination of these events.

Geographical scale and extent

Risk areas are low-lying areas near sea-level and include Point Wells, Orewa, Whangaparaoa, Auckland Central, Mission Bay, Kohimarama, Big Bay, Glenbrook Beach and Hudson’s Beach. The reclaimed low-lying areas along Kaipara Harbour are also prone to frequent inundation.

Historic occurrences

Coastal inundation has occurred most notably in 1936, 1999, 2011, 2014, and 2017/18. One of the highest storm tides in recent times in Auckland was recorded on the 23 January 2011 at 2.38 m (AVD-48). This event was 0.6 m above the highest recorded spring tides and caused significant flooding.

Likelihood

The National Institute of Water and Atmosphere (NIWA) has modelled coastal-storm inundation as a result of tides and waves. The resultant inundation extent (including sea-level rise) has been mapped across the Auckland region.

Consequences

Although adequate warnings can be issued, some coastal communities may become isolated and people evacuated. Properties, archaeological and heritage sites and infrastructure located along the coast may be disrupted or damaged and stormwater and drainage networks overwhelmed. Coastal inundation can also lead to coastal erosion and land instability. Coastal archaeological and heritage sites may be damaged or destroyed. Saltwater intrusion and contamination up rivers and streams and on farmland can damage crops and pasture. The economic costs of inundation can be high as a result of the direct damage to property and indirect effects of disruption. This is exacerbated by the considerable amount of waterfront development in Auckland.

Current management

Coastal inundation in Auckland is managed through Council policies and planning, infrastructure maintenance activities, emergency response and community education. Examples of management measures include structural protection, beach stabilisation and re-nourishment, land-
Coastal erosion (beach and coastal cliff) - Horowhenua ki Tai

Coastal erosion is the loss of land as the shoreline retreats. There are two key types:

- **Soft**: Includes beaches and dunes that are typically comprised of sand and loose sediments
- **Hard**: Includes erosion and instability of soft to moderately hard coastal cliffs

Coastal erosion is complex and can be caused by a number of processes including high wave energy, high tides and changes to sediment availability and land-use.

### Geographical scale and extent

Coastal erosion is limited to a relatively narrow coastal margin but a high proportion of Auckland’s population and infrastructure is focussed on our coast.

### Historic occurrences

Past occurrences of coastal erosion in the Auckland region have been relatively frequent. Significant events occurred in 1936, 1978, 2008 and 2011. In 1978, Omaha’s beach level was lowered by up to 1 m and the northern tip of the spit eroded 180 m to the south. In 2008, prolonged rainfall triggered a series of coastal landslides on the North Shore resulting in evacuation of houses and demolition of a property in Torbay.

### Likelihood

Coastal erosion is an on-going, time-dependent process. It can be triggered by extreme storms and cyclones. Best practice coastal management encourages the consideration of at least a 100-year timeframe including the potential impacts of climate change.

### Consequences

Land loss may affect buildings, infrastructure and areas of cultural, historical and social significance. Coastal cliff erosion is irreversible. High economic costs come from loss or reinstatement of property and infrastructure and ongoing costs of coastal defence mechanisms. Danger to life from sudden coastal cliff instability and landslides can occur with psychological impacts for those affected or potentially affected either physically or financially.

### Current management

Through the RMA and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS, 2010), Auckland’s Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan includes development controls for land potentially subject to coastal hazards (including coastal erosion). To manage risks to existing development, a range of hard and soft engineering methods may be considered and implemented where cost effective.

### Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

- **Development controls within areas potentially subject to coastal hazards (including coastal erosion) over at least the next 100 years.**
- **Development of a coastal management framework** to guide best practice coastal management.
- **Providing advice** to landowners and members of the public on coastal processes.
- **Develop operational coastal compartment management plans** to support integrated and adaptive management of our coasts.
Land instability - Horowhenua

Land instability includes landslides, subsidence and stream and river bank erosion. It is often prevalent in the soft soils and weak rock that are a common feature across Auckland. Landslides can be triggered by heavy rainfall, earthquakes and human activity such as removal of trees and vegetation, steep roadside cuttings, leaking water pipes or a combination of these.

**Geographical scale and extent**

Most of Auckland is at moderate to high risk of land instability based on the slope and geotechnical properties of the underlying rocks and soils. These are slopes greater than 20° and rocks of the Northland Allochthon.

**Historic occurrences**

The GNS Science landslide catalogue contains more than 135 landslide events that have occurred in the Auckland region since 1993. During the winter of 2008, 98 of the 135 landslides were triggered due to extensive prolonged rainfall (which was 150% above normal rainfall). Impacts included evacuation of some coastal cliff areas, demolition of property and loss of agricultural land.

**Likelihood**

Landslides are common in Auckland, generally triggered by heavy rainfall. Assessing the frequency of land instability in the region is problematic owing to the complex range of contributing factors and processes. However, the 2008 event was quantified as representing a 100-year event.

**Consequences**

Consequences depend on the movement’s magnitude, depth of rupture surface and type of movement. However any infrastructure situated on a landslide, above or below ground, can be expected to suffer significant damage, if not total destruction. Danger to life can occur if the landslide event has a sudden onset or occurs rapidly. Other impacts include loss of valuable land, destabilisation of neighbouring land, environmental impacts of sedimentation in waterways, pollution from toxic waste, costs for debris removal, high cost of stabilisation remedial works and changes to insurance premiums.

**Current management**

Landslides are typically managed through risk reduction efforts such as land-use planning (avoiding development of at-risk areas), and physical mitigation solutions.

**Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan:** Development controls within areas of identified land instability.

**Civil Defence:** Prepare the community to respond to and recover from coastal inundation events through public education and readiness activities.

Providing advice to landowners and members of the public on land instability.
Tornado - Āwhiowhio

A tornado is a violently rotating column of air which is in contact with the ground. The origin of tornadoes is associated with well-developed cumulonimbus clouds or thunderstorm cells on cold fronts. Tornadoes can occur anywhere in New Zealand and will typically last for only a few minutes.

Geographical scale and extent

Tornadoes in Auckland are usually localised and will usually track across the land for two to five km and with a diameter of 20 to 100 m. Wind speeds are in the order of 115 to 180km/h.

Historic occurrences

Auckland tornadoes usually occur less than once per year, but there is a lot of variation from year to year. The 2011 Albany tornado resulted in 1 fatality and $10M costs for damage to property and infrastructure. In 2012 a tornado in the Hobsonville/Whenupai area resulted in the deaths of 3 construction workers and the hospitalisation of 7 others. It destroyed or severely damaged around 170 houses and resulted in an estimated $13 million of damage across the North Shore.

Likelihood

The occurrence of a tornado cannot be predicted. Auckland is prone to short, high intensity, localised storm events, which may produce tornadoes.

Consequences

Potential for widespread damage is low, but injury and death can occur due to flying debris. All critical infrastructure, buildings and sites of cultural significance are vulnerable to a tornado, as one could strike anywhere in Auckland. Consequences include power cuts, blocking of roads and damage to buildings. Disruption and building damage can result in function and financial loss. These costs may also increase where clean-up of debris is required. Environmental damage will be localised to where the tornado occurs and can include the uprooting of trees and other damage to vegetation.

Current management

The risk of tornadoes in Auckland is managed through emergency response and community education. Policy, planning and infrastructure maintenance activities are limited due to the unpredictable, short-lived, localised nature of tornado hazards.

Civil Defence: Prepare the community to respond to and recover from tornado events through public education and readiness activities.
Wildfire - Mahuika

A wildfire is an uncontrolled fire. Strong winds, high temperatures, low humidity and seasonal drought can combine with fuels and topography to produce dangerous fire weather situations.

Geographical scale and extent

There is a risk of wildfire in forested areas to the north including the Woodhill, Mahurangi, and Dome Valley Forests and to the south Whittford Forest. The at risk areas also include our regional parks (Waitakere Forests and Hunua Ranges) and the islands of the Hauraki Gulf. Fires can be caused by uncontrolled agricultural burn-off, arson, careless activities such as campfires, or natural causes such as lightning strikes.

Historic occurrences

The January 2013 Great Barrier Island wild fires near Claris began within coastal scrub land and resulted in a total burnt area of 116 ha.

Likelihood

Short- and long-term weather conditions are a significant risk factor, e.g. prolonged drought increases the degree of forest and grass fuels. The risk of wildfire fluctuates seasonally and from year to year but most fires are contained before they become destructive.

Consequences

If a wildfire isn’t controlled it could result in evacuations, buildings destroyed, loss of life, physical loss and damage to biodiversity, economic loss to agricultural and forestry sectors, road closures and power line damage and water supply catchment loss. There can also be acute health problems associated with smoke inhalation. Islands are particularly vulnerable because of they are usually isolated and lack infrastructure that supports a fast response.

Current management

Wildfire in Auckland is managed through Council policies and planning, emergency response and community resilience. Fire and Emergency New Zealand is the agency responsible for preparing for, responding to and suppressing wildfires safely. They work with Auckland Council to promote fire safety in the community, and also in the construction of firebreaks, and other physical mitigation measures.
Earthquake

An earthquake is a sudden motion or shaking caused by the abrupt release of accumulated stress along a fault, a break in the Earth's crust. Earthquake hazards may include strong ground shaking (dependent on size, depth and near surface materials), fault rupture, permanent ground tilt, subsidence or lateral spreading, liquefaction (where certain soils under strong shaking lose strength and behave like liquids), landslides, rockfalls or tsunami.

Geographical scale and extent

While earthquakes do occur in Auckland, we are located in one of the lowest earthquake activity parts of New Zealand. Auckland is approximately 300 km away from the nearest zone of high activity and historically has experienced very low seismicity. Earthquake intensity varies significantly and the extent of a significant earthquake is widely felt.

Historic occurrences

Auckland's strongest known quake was the 1891 Waikato Heads earthquake, which had a magnitude of between 5.5 and 6.0 and caused only minor damage.

Likelihood

The nearest known active faults are about 25-40 km from central Auckland and are thought to be capable of generating earthquakes of magnitude about 6.7 to 7.2, but are expected to occur less frequently than every 2,000 years. It is thought that the last rupture was over 10,000 years ago.

Consequences

Consequences of a large damaging earthquake affecting the Auckland region are high and potentially include: 1) social impacts as a result of fatalities and injuries from building collapse and earthquake induced landslides, followed by longer term psychological effects; 2) economic impacts from direct building and infrastructure damage, insurance payments and indirect losses from loss of working time and productivity and clean-up costs; 3) environmental and cultural impacts from damage to iconic places, heritage buildings and significant environments.

Current management

Earthquake risk is managed by Auckland Council through the Auckland Strategy, Policy and Research Department, Building Control and Auckland CDEM. Additional regulatory requirements relating to earthquake risk include the Land Information Memoranda (LIM) and building consent process.

Identify areas potentially affected by natural hazards, giving priority to those at high risk of being affected.

Undertake hazard identification and risk assessments for subdivision, use and development using the best available and up-to-date hazard information.

Non regulatory activities include; 1) non-statutory plans and strategies including preparation & implementation of the NHRMAP for Auckland; 2) providing information and education material on Auckland region natural hazards to the public; 3) Civil Defence and Emergency Management Activities.
Taking Action

There are few departments or people within Council that do not contribute in some way towards this task. The Action Plan looks at operations across Council in 8 key functions where it can contribute to natural hazard risk reduction. Using the risk assessments and a series of preliminary workshops to understand how Council currently manages the natural hazard risk in each business area, a process of gaps analysis and high-level action development was undertaken, which are subsequently being refined with key business partners and action owners. The key business areas and engagement partners are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Key engagement contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management and preparedness</td>
<td>• Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CEG Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and leadership</td>
<td>• Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CEG Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, policy and planning</td>
<td>• Natural Environment Strategy Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Growth and Infrastructure Strategy Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk and Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations and consents</td>
<td>• Resource Consents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Infrastructure and Environmental Services Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset management</td>
<td>• Asset Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and research</td>
<td>• Research and Evaluation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, education &amp; community engagement</td>
<td>• Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>• Relationship Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergency management and preparedness

Emergency management is based on five key activities:
- Risk reduction
- Readiness
- Response
- Recovery
- Resilience

In Auckland, this is undertaken and coordinated by the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group, of which Auckland Emergency Management is a member.

Considerations

- The extent of community participation in emergency management and preparedness is generally low at present.
- There are challenges in the coordination, cohesion and cooperation between emergency response agencies, including inefficiencies in sharing information and resources.
- Response capability and capacity in case of a large-scale natural hazard event, is not yet sufficiently tested.
- Public alert and information systems do not yet function as well as they should.
- There is a need to clarify local and national government roles — because of Auckland’s size, these roles are not as clearly delineated as in other parts of NZ.
- Risk reduction is recognised as a key aspect of emergency management, but requires more focus and resourcing.

Draft actions

- Maintain and improve Auckland Emergency Management capability and capacity through a structured training programme and exercising across the Coordinating Executive Group.
- Develop and implement a comprehensive volunteer programme to resource a large scale event.
- Continue active participation in the Auckland Lifelines Group.
- Strengthen the Emergency Coordination Centre functions to reflect industry best practice standards.
- Continue to develop and improve standard operating procedures, early warning and emergency alert systems across the region to reduce the exposure of people and key response networks to the impacts of natural hazards.
- Facilitate business and organisational resilience.
- Develop Auckland Emergency Management’s GIS tools including a Situational Awareness Viewer and GeoConOps in line with national standards.
Governance and leadership

Council’s governance structure is determined by legislation (the LGA) which also provides the framework for enabling Council to take a leadership role in building resilience, including:

- Organisational resilience
- Championing resilience within the wider community (including private sector organisations)
- Empowering Auckland’s communities to be prepared and develop capacity for coping with natural hazard events.

Considerations

- There is a need to improve clarity on the role of elected representatives (the Governing Body) and Council with respect to building community resilience for natural hazards.
- An agreed definition of what resilience to natural hazards means in practice is currently required to facilitate the development and implementation of the programmes to achieve it.
- Commitment to building and strengthening resilience throughout Council and its CCOs needs to be integrated into work programmes and cross-council agreements.
- The coordination of natural hazard management priorities across Council and its CCOs is currently a challenge.

Draft actions

- Continue to develop and implement an Elected Member training framework, which clarifies roles and opportunities.
- Recognise the opportunities of Auckland’s cultural diversity for building community resilience.
- Support the Coordinating Executive Group in contributing to natural hazard risk reduction.
- Reporting on natural hazard risk and mitigation at governance level.
Strategy, policy and planning

Council’s activities are guided by a comprehensive planning framework that sets out the long-term vision of what Auckland wishes to be, now and in the future.

The different components of this framework provide multiple opportunities to recognise that natural hazards are an integral part of our daily lives, and that there are a variety of ways to manage the risk of natural hazard events.

- Relevant and consistent objectives, policies, rules and other implementation methods to manage natural hazards risk needs to be included into Council’s and its CCOs’ planning documents, as part of ongoing reviews, plan changes and law reforms.
- The proposed Resource Legislation Amendment Bill (RLAB) contains several natural hazards specific provisions that will need to be given effect to when passed into law.
- There is potential conflict between providing for Auckland’s growth and managing risks from natural hazards which requires several aspects, e.g. the use of land that may be at risk from natural hazards, and/or not sufficiently addressing the need for resilient infrastructure when developing land.
- There are currently conflicting or not clearly delineated requirements of different pieces of legislation. For example, the requirements for building in floodplains under the Building Act are not the same as those proposed in the Auckland Unitary Plan.

- Continue to embed the risk-based natural hazards management approach into the Auckland Planning Framework.
- Ensure that the Auckland Unitary Plan continues to manage natural hazards to an appropriate degree and based on risk.
- Continue to integrate planning for climate change, resilience building and natural hazard risk management into the Auckland Infrastructure Plan.
- Discuss contradictions in legislative outcomes with government agencies.
Regulations and consents

Regulations such as local bylaws and consents such as resource consents and building consents are the key implementation tools for Council’s policies and plans.

With respect to improving resilience to natural hazard events, resource consents are particularly important because they are usually required for land development, and can include conditions aimed at reducing the risk of natural hazards.

**Considerations**

- There is a lack of available and/or easily accessible data and other information on natural hazard risk at different locations across the region.
- Insufficient guidance is available for regulatory staff across all natural hazards on what natural hazard related information to request from applicants, and how to address natural hazard risk during the consent process.
- Measures or activities that aim to reduce natural hazard risks are not incentivised.
- The provision of natural hazards information in Land Information Memoranda (LIMs) and Project Information Memoranda (PIMs) is not supported by a consistent Council-wide approach.

**Draft actions**

- Standardise Council’s approach to the provision of natural hazard-related information in PIMs and LIMs.
- Formalise Council requirements and guidance for developments with a known natural hazard risk component.
- Ensure that Auckland Unitary Plan rules addressing natural hazard risk are supported by accurate and accessible information.
- Develop a natural hazard management toolbox for regulatory staff managing consent applications.
- Investigate mechanisms to improve consenting for projects aimed at reducing and managing natural hazards.
Asset management

Auckland Council and its CCOs own and manage a wide range of public infrastructure on behalf of the people of Auckland, including roads, water supply, wastewater networks and treatment plants, stormwater systems, parks and recreational facilities, and many other community facilities.

By ensuring that these assets are built appropriately and to a high quality standard, and maintaining them to enable their continued function, Council contributes significantly to increasing the resilience of our built environment.

- Not all asset management plans explicitly address natural hazard risk and its implications for managing Council assets and infrastructure. For some built assets, e.g. coastal structures, asset management plans have not yet been finalised.
- Across Council and its CCOs, the approach to natural hazard risk reduction and resilience strengthening is not always transparent.
- The use of council assets for natural hazard risk mitigation is not currently part of our policy approach.

- Review existing AMPs to assess how natural hazard risk, risk reduction measures and resilience are addressed.
- Formalise Council’s approach to the consenting and vesting of assets that are likely to be affected by natural hazard events.
- Explore our risk-based approach to asset management service level agreements.
- Review resilience planning guidance for key infrastructure assets to address natural hazard risk reduction.
- Develop natural hazard risk assessment criteria for asset renewal strategies and plans.
- Continue to develop Asset Management Plans for all Council structures and assets, and ensure that natural hazard management and resilience are addressed.
Knowledge and research

An integral component of effective natural hazard management is knowledge and good, reliable information. In order to assess risks and make decisions on how to manage them, we need to know and understand the nature and risks of natural hazards first.

Ongoing research and the improvement of Council’s natural hazard knowledge base is therefore one of the most important tools.

Considerations

- Availability: Council has good and reliable data on some natural hazards (for example, coastal inundation, floodplains and tsunami evacuation zones) less or no information on others.
- Accessibility: Of the information that is available, not all of it is readily accessible. In addition, information is held by different parts of Council and is not always generally known.
- Quality: The accuracy and reliability of some of natural hazard information is uncertain, outdated or otherwise unreliable.
- Coverage: Natural hazard data does not consistently cover the entire region to the same quality and degree.
- There is currently no clear appreciation of what additional data and information is required for what natural hazards to support decision-making in the future.

Draft actions

- Continue to progress an agile 10-year Natural Hazards Research Plan that reflects Council risk priorities.
- Maintain and expand the Auckland Natural Hazards Viewer and Information Portal
- Develop a Natural Hazards Data Management Manual.
- Formalise the Auckland Council Group Natural Hazards Specialists Group that works across data researchers and end users.
- Continue to review and develop natural hazard impact models used by Auckland Council
Communication, education and community engagement

An informed and engaged community is a strong community, and one that is much more likely to cope with and recover from an emergency brought about by a natural hazard event.

One of Council’s most important tasks is to ensure that all Aucklanders are knowledgeable about the natural hazards we all live with, know how to protect themselves and their families and are willing and capable to care for others around them when a natural hazard event occurs.

Communication and engagement activities relating to the 4 Rs of emergency management and the fifth R of ‘resilience building’ are a key component of Auckland Emergency Management. The Auckland CDEM Group Plan proposes a range of actions aimed at improving the existing engagement.

- Additional community engagement and education is required to facilitate in particular, the understanding of how hazards might impact on communities.
- Council recognises that public information material aimed at informing Aucklanders about natural hazards and how to become more resilient should be available in languages other than English. Auckland’s diversity is one of its major strengths, and language barriers should be overcome to utilise that strength.
- Develop a more informative and engaging website platform to enhance public knowledge and preparedness for emergency events in Auckland.
- Continue to support existing and develop new and innovative emergency management information and engagement tools.
- Build greater community resilience through engaging strategically about resilience when undertaking infrastructure or empowerment projects or activities.
- Develop community resilience through creating understanding of hazard consequences and impacts for all communities,
Partnerships

Building resilience and managing emergencies involves a wide range of activities, and can only succeed through the cooperation of many different organisations from the public and private sector.

As the lead agency responsible for emergency management in Auckland, one of Council’s most effective tools is building and maintaining partnerships that are instrumental in improving our combined knowledge of natural hazards and working together before, during and after natural hazard events.

Considerations

- There is no clear mandate for any one group or department within Council to support the building and nurturing of long-term strategic partnerships for natural hazard management.
- Mana whenua engagement with respect to managing natural hazard events is at an early stage.
- In most cases, collaboration with other agencies is on a project-basis rather than an ongoing commitment to long-term cooperation.

Draft actions

- Develop a work programme with the Strategic Partnerships Team
- Establish a natural hazard-specific emergency management programme with Mana Whenua.
- Develop relationships with Auckland Council CCOs to create a shared understanding of natural hazard risk and coordinated management response to natural hazards.
What does success look like?

An organisation that is:
- aligned in its understanding of how natural hazards can impact our communities, facilities, and infrastructure
- encouraging sustainable growth, while reducing the risk of the natural hazard impacts
- aligned in its language and the way it considers the risk of natural hazards
- protecting its communities and building resilience across the four environments

Communities that are:
- informed about their exposure to natural hazards
- engaged both during and outside of natural hazard emergency events
- resilient to the impacts of natural hazards and able to bounce back quickly after an emergency.
Next steps

- Finish action development with key engagement partners
- Finalise Draft Plan
- Draft plan sent to designers
- Collate and review technical companion documentation
- Prepare reporting for CEG and CDEM Group
- Prepare organisational engagement strategy to present final document across Council
- Continue to collate and review technical companion documentation
- Present final plan to CEG and CDEM Group Committee
- Final NHRMAP is approved and ready for distribution
- Introduce document across Council following engagement plan
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Updating Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group's list of Controllers, Recovery Managers and Welfare Managers

File No.: CP2019/08551

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To update Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group’s list of controllers, recovery managers and welfare managers.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 requires Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups to appoint personnel to the positions of controller and recovery manager.
3. The National Civil Defence Plan Order 2015 requires Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups to appoint personnel to the position of welfare manager.
4. The Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group maintains a list of authorised controllers, recovery managers and welfare managers. Removal from, or addition to the list of controllers, recovery managers and welfare managers requires a resolution of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee.
5. Ben Hankinson, former Head of Operations, and Kiri Maxwell, former Principal Advisor Strategy and Partnerships, are no longer available to be Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group controllers.
6. Catherine Cooper, former Head of Resilience and Welfare, and Kiri Maxwell, former Principal Advisor Strategy and Partnerships, are no longer available to be Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group welfare managers.

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

a) approve the removal of Ben Hankinson, former Head of Operations, and Kiri Maxwell, former Principal Advisor Strategy and Partnerships from the list of Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group controllers

b) approve the removal of Catherine Cooper, former Head of Resilience and Welfare, and Kiri Maxwell, former Principal Advisor Strategy and Partnerships, from the list of Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group welfare managers.
Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina

Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Wayne Brown - Principal Recovery Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jennifer Rose - Head of response and Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Sinclair - Acting General Manager Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve the Coordinating Executives Group’s amended Terms of Reference as endorsed by the Coordinating Executive Group on 6 May 2019.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Coordinating Executive Group agreed to the recommendations of two reports presented to the February 2019 meeting resulting in the following proposed amendments to the Group’s Terms of Reference:

- membership changes in response to the split of Auckland Emergency Management’s Director and Controller roles
- the addition of quarterly Group workshops.

3. These matters were discussed in reports to the Committee on 27 February 2019 in the Director’s Report on the Coordinating Executive Group’s meeting of 4 February 2019 (Resolution numbers CP2019/1178 and CIV/2019/4) and the Forward Work Programme (Resolution numbers CP2019/1224 and CIV/2019/10) report.

4. Amended Terms of Reference were circulated amongst Coordinating Executive Group members for comment on 4 April 2019 and endorsed at the Group’s meeting on 6 May 2019.

5. Amendments include:

- the addition of the Controller as a member of the Group
- name changes amongst members (Fire and Emergency Management New Zealand and Auckland Emergency Management) and recognition of St John’s role in emergency management
- updating the diagram in Appendix B of the Terms of Reference to reflect these changes and accurately reflect current membership
- provision for quarterly workshops.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) approve the Coordinating Executive Group’s amended Terms of Reference as endorsed by the Coordinating Executive Group on 6 May 2019.
## Ngā tāpirihanga
### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Civil Defence Emergency Management Coordinating Executive Group - Terms of Reference</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ngā kaihaina
### Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Wayne Brown - Principal Recovery Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jennifer Rose - Head of response and Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Sinclair - Acting General Manager Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil Defence and Emergency Management
Coordinating Executive Group
Terms of Reference

Vision
The Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management (CDEM) Group’s vision is:

   Working together to build a resilient Auckland
   He tapui tangata hei ahurangi mo Tamaki Makaurau

This vision will lead Auckland’s contribution to the national vision of a ‘resilient New Zealand’ and to support the vision of Auckland becoming ‘the world’s most liveable city’.

Purpose
To support the Auckland CDEM Group to provide leadership in the delivery of co-ordinated and collaborative arrangements for CDEM among council, partner agencies, clusters, and communities within its group area.

Responsibilities of the Coordinating Executive Group
The CEG is responsible for:

- providing advice to the CDEM Group and any taskgroups or subcommittees of the Group;
- implementing, as appropriate, the decisions of the CDEM Group committee; and
- overseeing the implementation, development, maintenance and evaluation of the Auckland CDEM Group Plan (five year strategy).

Decisions of the Coordinating Executive Group
As far as practicable, decisions will be made by consensus. If it is not possible to achieve agreement then a vote shall be held.

- The decision outcome will be based on the majority of votes.
- Each member is entitled to vote once on an issue.
- A minimum quorum for a CEG meeting is 3 statutory members.

During an emergency
The CEG does not have an operational role during an emergency, however most statutory agencies will be involved during the response and recovery phase.

---

1 The CDEM Group includes a statutorily established committee, with key partners and stakeholders as observers.
2 National CDEM strategy
3 The Auckland Plan
4 CDEM Act 2002 s20(2)
Structure and composition

Membership
Under the CDEM Act, each CDEM Group is required to establish and maintain a Coordinating Executive Group (CEG) comprising of:

- chief executives of the local authority members of the CDEM Group. In the case of Auckland Council, as a unitary authority, the membership is the sole responsibility of the Auckland Council Chief Executive Officer;
- the chief executive or a senior member of a provider of health and disability services operating in the area; and
- senior members of New Zealand Police, Fire and Emergency New Zealand and St John.

A delegations register will be kept to ensure appropriate oversight by the CEG and accountability for any decisions made by the CEG member on behalf of the agency or organisation they represent.

In addition, CEGs are able to co-opt any other person to allow strategic engagement and contribution to decision-making where those co-opted individuals, or the entities they represent, have a vested interest in CDEM stewardship at a management level.

All members are expected to attend meetings or to send a representative who has the equivalent decision-making authority.

The CEG structure diagram in Appendix B illustrates the CEG membership and will be updated, as required, to ensure it continues to accurately illustrate the current membership.

The CEG shall appoint, replace or remove members to and from the CEG and review the composition of the CEG at least every three years to coincide with local authority elections.

Structure
The structure of the CEG consists as follows:

Chair
The Chair and Deputy Chair of the CEG is appointed by statutory CEG members. The Deputy Chair shall fulfil the role and responsibilities of the Chair in the Chair’s absence.

The Chair of CEG is the Chief Executive Officer, Auckland Council.

The Deputy Chair of CEG is the Director Auckland Emergency Management, Auckland Council

Secretariat support
Secretariat support and administration to the CEG is provided by Auckland Council.
Taskgroups
The CEG may establish additional taskgroups that are responsible for completing programmes of work that have been identified in the Group Plan. These work programmes are reported back to CEG via the subgroup Chair or responsible CEG member. For more information on the CEG taskgroups refer to the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management website.

Meetings and workshops

Frequency
Meeting frequency will be quarterly. Dates for these meetings will be set at the beginning of each year to correspond to the CDEM Group committee meetings.

Agenda and minutes items
At least 10 working days before the CEG meeting, members will be invited to submit agenda items. The secretariat will coordinate with the Chair of the CEG to draft and prepare the agenda for the meeting. Any items that need to be discussed at the meetings will also be circulated 5 working days before the meeting. Administration tasks will be managed by Auckland Council. The secretariat support will also coordinate with the Chair of the CEG the minutes of the meeting and distributed to members for confirmation as soon as is practicable after each meeting.

Meeting process
The table below shows the procedure for CEG meetings. The CEG Chair is supported in their role by a minute taker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chair welcomes members, additional attendees are introduced and acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minutes from last meeting are confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Action points from last meeting are updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Members report on agreed CEG work programme and any update on the work programmes of established subcommittees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discussion on key risks, interdependencies and desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MCDEM representative provides national update including collaboration opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Any other business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Meeting closes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop process
Quarterly workshops will also be held. Workshop dates will be set at the beginning of each year to fall between quarterly CEG meetings.

The purpose of workshops is to enable more detailed exploration and consideration of items across CEG membership to develop improvements in planning response, identifying synergies and leveraging joint contributions.
Workshops may be initiated by any CEG member, and the workshop schedule would be updated at each CEG meeting to reflect the CDEM Group priorities and member needs. All members are expected to attend meetings or to send an appropriate leadership-level representative to participate in workshops.

There will be other workshops in the CEG and CDEM work programme for which agency representation will also be sought. Any request will be via the CEG member representing each organisation.

Members initiating items for workshops will liaise with the secretariat to finalise agendas and preparations for workshops, including support material. The secretariat will administer agendas. Materials required to support workshop items will be circulated 5 working days before the workshop by the members initiating that item.
APPENDIX A

Responsibilities of the CDEM Group committee

Under the CDEM Act 2002 every unitary authority must establish a CDEM Group responsible for:

- hazard and risk management, including cost-effective risk reduction;
- personnel management, including volunteers;
- conduct CDEM exercises and training;
- management of public alerting and warning systems;
- provide communications, equipment and facilities to manage an emergency;
- availability of material, services, information and any other resources required for effective CDEM;
- recovery management;
- monitoring and evaluation;
- develop, approve and implement a CDEM Group Plan,
- promote and raise public awareness of, and compliance with the CDEM Act 2002 and other legislative provisions;
- assist other CDEM Groups as required;
- participate in the development of the national CDEM strategy and plan; and
- establishing and maintaining a Coordinating Executive Group (CEG)\(^6\).

Responsibilities of the Auckland Council CDEM department

Auckland Council is the administering authority for both the CDEM Group and CEG, which are supported by the CDEM department. The administering authority is responsible for the funding and coordination of CDEM activities within the Auckland region as below:

- review and align the CDEM Group member work programmes;
- provide advice and technical support for the CDEM Group and the CEG;
- project and programme coordination and management;
- coordinate regional CDEM policy and implementation;
- manage contracts entered into on behalf of the CDEM Group or CEG;
- manage and administer CDEM staff on behalf of the CDEM Group;
- external liaison with the CDEM sector;
- coordinate monitoring and evaluation activities; and
- prepare the annual report for the CDEM Group’s activities, budget and performance.

\(^6\) CDEM Act 2002 s20(1)
Auckland Emergency Management’s 2019 Group Level Exercise - Exercise Flux

File No.: CP2019/08182

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
2. Seek the committee’s endorsement to run the exercise across all participating members of the Auckland CDEM Group.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. Exercise Flux is a Civil Defence Emergency Management Group level exercise designed to test Auckland Emergency Management’s collaboration with partner agencies.
4. Exercise Flux is a functional exercise taking place in the Emergency Coordination Centre intermittently over a 12-week period from 4 June 2019.
5. The aim of Exercise Flux is to test and improve the coordination and operational capability of all functions in the Auckland Emergency Management Emergency Coordination Centre, with support from, and inclusion of, Auckland Council emergency support staff and partner agencies, in the context of a slow-burn escalating event.
6. To ensure Exercise Flux supports opportunities for multi-agency collaboration on exercising, Auckland Emergency Management have established an ‘Exercise Working Group’, comprised of representatives from the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Coordinating Executive Group.
7. The Exercise Working Group will be involved in the end of exercise debrief and will utilise the End of Exercise Report findings to explore further exercise collaboration opportunities.
8. Learnings from Exercise Flux will be provided to Committee members in the form of an End of Exercise Report in November 2019, and adopted into future work plan activities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:
a) endorse Auckland Emergency Management running the exercise across all participating members of the Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.

Horopaki
Context
9. The development of an exercise calendar is a stipulated requirement of the Auckland Group Plan (2016-2021) - Action Item 51: “establish and implement an exercise calendar (minimum two exercises per year) that is aligned with the national exercise programme.”
10. The exercise calendar reflects a commitment (under Clause 104 of the National Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan Order 2015) to supplement national exercises with regular agency and local exercises. This will contribute to building preparedness for national level exercises, specifically the national Alpine Fault Magnitude 8 (AF8) exercise planned for 2020.

11. Regular planning and delivery of exercises provides a way to evaluate capability, identify gaps and issues and to practice established roles and responsibilities. Lessons identified in exercises can be used to update plans and procedures and to improve the ability of agencies to carry out response and recovery activities.

12. A commitment to regular joint-agency exercising, through the formation of an Exercise Working Group, will also contribute to meeting the ‘Review of the Response to the Auckland Storm of 10 April 2018’ recommendation, that we “invest in the building and maintenance of constructive relationships amongst Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group (the Group) members.”

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

13. This report advises Committee members that Auckland Emergency Management will conduct a group level exercise (June – August 2019) involving Auckland Emergency Management and council staff, with support from agency partners, Lifelines and the Auckland Welfare Coordination Group. This exercise is the first step in beginning work toward building an aligned and highly collaborative approach to exercising.

14. This report also advises committee members that Auckland Emergency Management has formed an Exercise Working Group to enhance future opportunities for collaborative exercising. The formation of the partner agency Exercise Working Group will ensure a process is established for effectively sharing exercise learnings, for pooling exercise resources between agencies, and for identifying future exercising opportunities.

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

15. Representatives from WaterCare, Auckland Transport Operations Centre and Ports of Auckland have been advised of Exercise Flux and their participation requested. Participation for these members is partial, which means it will largely occur through remote communication in and out of the Emergency Coordination Centre, as required.

16. Auckland Emergency Management volunteer staff from across a range of Auckland Council departments have also been invited to participate in Exercise Flux. The Executive Lead team have been advised of their participation, which should not exceed two full days of exercising in the Emergency Coordination Centre.

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

17. The recommendations contained in this report have no identified local impacts. The suggested initiative focuses on internal capacity building of Auckland Emergency Management staff, wider council, Auckland Council Support Staff (volunteers), and partner agencies. The exercise will not involve members of the public or local board members.

18. Future exercises may result in local board members being invited to participate. Invitations to participate will be preceded by an Exercise Warning Order and appropriate guidance will be provided.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
19. The recommendations made in this report have no identified Māori impacts.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
20. There are no identified financial implications arising out of recommendations made in this report.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
21. Risk management is a central focus of emergency management. The risk of not proceeding with the recommendations in this report is that Auckland Emergency Management and partner agencies may not be fully prepared or have the capabilities and confidence to effectively respond and recover from a real emergency event.
22. Project management principles applied to the development of Exercise Flux and any future exercises will ensure risks are appropriately addressed.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
23. The committee will be updated on Exercise Flux in August 2019 and will be provided with the End of Exercise Report, documenting the key lessons and areas for improvement identified, in November 2019.
24. Any learnings or improvement actions will be added to the Auckland Emergency Management Evaluation Action Plan for inclusion in an improvements work programme.
25. The Exercise Working Group will be convened in June 2019 and will receive updates on the progress of Exercise Flux and the End of Exercise Report.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Adam Maggs - Head of Capability and Public Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Sarah Sinclair - Acting General Manager Auckland Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In anticipation of the expiration of the National Public Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019), Auckland Emergency Management has carried out a review of their approach to public education. The review:
   • analysed current and on-going public education work against the National Public Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019)
   • identified areas for improvement
   • identified opportunities to better incorporate resilience thinking into our objectives and approaches to public education and capability building
   • recommended the formation of a partner agency Public Education/Capability Working Group to maximise opportunities for partner agency collaboration.
3. The analysis will be used to develop a Public Education and Capability Strategy for 2019 – 2022 which will incorporate public education components and be supplemented by an Implementation Plan. The Implementation Plan is outside the scope of this report.
4. The Coordinating Executive Group meeting on 6 May 2019 confirmed that the approach to public education would benefit from strengthening the links with community resilience objectives and outcomes.
5. Auckland Emergency Management will form a Public Education/Capability Working Group with the Coordinating Executive Group to maximise synergies and opportunities for collaboration.
6. Auckland Emergency Management will ensure the updated approaches to public education and capability building maintain alignment with the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management’s Public Education Programme Strategy anticipated to be released late 2019.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:
   a) note the findings of the Auckland Emergency Management Public Education Review (Attachment A of the agenda report).
Horopaki

Context

7. Section 17 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 establishes clear local responsibility for public education. This includes:
   • consulting and communicating about hazards and risks
   • taking all steps necessary, on an ongoing basis, to maintain and provide, or to arrange the provision of, or otherwise to make available material, services, information, and any other resources for effective civil defence emergency management in its area
   • within its area, promoting and raising public awareness of, and compliance with, the Act and legislative provisions relevant to the purpose of the Act
   • promote civil defence emergency management in its area that is consistent with the purpose of the Act.

8. Auckland Emergency Management’s Public Education Strategy was last reviewed in 2016, following the delivery of the 2016 - 2021 Auckland Group Plan. The Group Plan called for the “development of a public education strategy to enhance disaster preparedness through relevant and meaningful community engagement.”


10. The Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management National Approach to public education focused on empowering people to take responsibility for their own preparedness by changing the way people think about preparedness.

11. Auckland Emergency Management reviewed their approach to public education against the five-part national approach and the four overarching objectives. For detail on the review and outcomes please refer to Attachment A.

12. Since 2016, a number of national and regional strategy documents have aligned with the Auckland CDEM Group Plan’s focus on resilience, including the recently released National Disaster Resilience Strategy and the Auckland Plan. This alignment suggests that Auckland’s approach to public education and capability building for 2019 – 2022 should reflect and incorporate resilience thinking.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice


The four overarching objectives for 2016-2019 were
   • More people are aware of why they need to be prepared
   • More people understand how to prepare
   • More people have taken steps to be more prepared
   • More people are fully prepared (have made plans, stored/checked and updated emergency supplies)
The five-part approach for 2016 – 2019 was made up of the following

- Reframing the conversation
- Targeting the most vulnerable
- Encouraging ownership
- Making preparedness easy, relevant and real
- Being positive and empowering

14. Based on the review findings (Attachment A), and to better align Auckland Emergency Management’s public education and capability building objectives with the Auckland Plan and the recently released National Disaster Resilience Strategy, Auckland Emergency Management put forward some revised objectives and approaches to the Coordinating Executive Group for consideration.

15. The Coordinating Executive Group endorsed the formation of a Public Education/Capability Working Group to consider the following suggested objectives and approaches for 2019 - 2022:

**Objectives:**

- People are aware of how their resilience contributes to their ability to get through disasters
- People have a strong sense of what resilience means to them and understand what they can do to grow their resilience
- People take steps to enhance their resilience in all its aspects
- People, their families and communities are more resilient.

**Approaches:**

- Make the conversation relatable
- Ensure public education is accessible to everyone and is adapted to meet diverse needs
- Enable ownership of resilience
- Make approaches to enhancing resilience easy, relevant and real
- Facilitate people to take action.

16. The review indicated that Auckland Emergency Management would prefer to see the scope of public education objectives broadened from the 2016 – 2019 focus on building ‘preparedness’ toward a focus on building ‘resilience and public capability’ more generally.

17. The proposal to adopt an approach centered around growing Auckland’s resilience reflects the newly released National Disaster Resilience Strategy (2019 – 2029), specifically priority three which calls for: “enabling, empowering and supporting community resilience: building a culture of resilience in New Zealand so that everyone can participate in and contribute to communities’ - and the nation’s – resilience” (2019, p. 2). Attached to this priority is Objective 15 which calls for CDEM Groups to “…embed strategic objectives for resilience in key plans and strategies” (2019, p. 3).

18. The suggested shift toward resilience and capability building also links to the Auckland Plan 2050, specifically the Plan’s focus on “supporting and working with communities to thrive in a changing world” (2018, p.11).

19. The review indicated that a focus on resilience building for public education would enable scope to include the 4Rs – reduction, readiness, response and recovery – under the umbrella of ‘resilience’.
20. The review also pointed toward opportunities where Auckland Emergency Management could benefit from collaboration with partner agencies on the delivery of public education and targeted capability building. Through the formation of a partner agency Public Education/Capability Working Group, learning will be shared across the sector and used to inform the development of an Auckland Emergency Management Public Education and Capability Strategy for 2019 – 2022.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

21. 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**

22. The recommendations contained in this report have no direct local impacts.

23. Local boards will be invited to provide input on the development of the Public Education and Capability Implementation Plan, which will be prepared after the development of the Public Education and Capability Strategy for 2019 – 2022. The Implementation Plan is currently outside the scope of this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

24. Auckland Emergency Management is committed to being responsive to Māori by developing a strategy that is reflective of mātauranga and aligned to te ao Māori values. The Public Education/Capability Working Group will seek to work with Māori to ensure this is realised.

25. Auckland Emergency Management is committed to the development of a strategy that enables shared learning and builds upon the strengths and capability of Māori.

26. Understanding how disaster risk intersects with structural inequality is critical to ensuring we develop a strategy that is responsive to the needs of, and enables, positive outcomes for Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

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

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

28. 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 will not be able to effectively deliver a collaborative approach to public education and capability building for 2019 – 2022. This may also impact on Auckland’s ability to effectively respond and recover from a real emergency event.

**Ngā korina a-muri**

**Next steps**

29. Utilise the Public Education/Capability Working Group to set objectives and develop plans for engagement and collaboration opportunities.
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Introduction

Anticipating the release of the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management’s (MCDEM) revised Public Education Strategy in late 2019, this paper provides a review of Auckland Emergency Management’s (AEM) current approach to public education and suggests new objectives and approaches to public education for the 2019 – 2022\(^1\) period to be considered through the formation of a partner agency Public Education Working Group.

The development of an AEM Public Education Strategy for 2019 – 2022 will help to formalise the public education work currently taking place and will ensure our public messaging and community engagement work reflects the national public education objectives, as well as the objectives of the newly published National Resilience Strategy.

The AEM Public Education Strategy for 2019 – 2022 will be followed by the development of an AEM Public Education Operational Plan which will detail how Auckland Emergency Management intends to meet the objectives and approaches outlined in the Strategy. The development of the Operational Plan is outside the scope of this review which focuses strictly on the revision of the Strategy.

---

\(^1\) These dates align with the four-year period of the previous National Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019) and are subject to change depending on the time period stipulated in the new National Education Programme Strategy.
National approach to public education

The MCDEM National Approach to public education for 2016-2019 focused on making emergency preparedness a part of everyday life by empowering people to take responsibility for their emergency preparedness.

The four national objectives for 2016 – 2019 were as follows:

1. More people are aware of why they need to be prepared
2. More people understand how to prepare
3. More people have taken steps to be more prepared
4. More people are fully prepared (have made plans, stored/checked and updated emergency supplies).

Achieving these objectives involved adopting the following five approaches:

Reframe the conversation:
We will focus more on impacts than hazards (e.g. no power, no water, no transport) and getting people to imagine themselves (and their families) in various situations. It is more effective to focus on specific impacts, such as power cuts and transport outages, as these are common across all significant emergencies, and are relatable for almost all people.

Target the most vulnerable:
Messaging, resources and channels employed will be targeted at our most vulnerable audiences – families with lower incomes, millennials, non-English speakers and new migrants.

Encourage ownership:
We will get people to think about what they need to do now to get their families / households through and prompting them to have conversations with their loved ones.

Make preparedness relevant and easy:
Encouraging people to take small steps to be more prepared and protect the things they love, in a way that works for their family.

Be positive and empowering: We will employ an approachable, positive and empowering approach, with greater use of humour and active engagement through channels such as social media.
Responsibilities under the CDEM Act 2002

Section 17 of the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 establishes clear local responsibility for public education. These are shown in bold below:

(1) The functions of a Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, and of each member, are to:

a. in relation to relevant hazards and risks,—
   i. identify, assess, and manage those hazards and risks
   ii. consult and communicate about risks
   iii. identify and implement cost-effective risk reduction

b. take all steps necessary on an ongoing basis to maintain and provide, or to arrange the provision of, or to otherwise make available suitably trained and competent personnel, including volunteers, and an appropriate organisational structure for those personnel, for effective civil defence emergency management in its area

c. take all steps necessary on an ongoing basis to maintain and provide, or to arrange the provision of, or otherwise to make available material, services, information, and any other resources for effective civil defence emergency management in its area

d. respond to and manage the adverse effects of emergencies in its area

e. plan and carry out recovery activities

f. when requested, assist other Groups in the implementation of civil defence emergency management in their areas (having regard to the competing civil defence emergency management demands within the Group’s own area and any other requests for assistance from other Groups)

g. within its area, promote and raise public awareness of, and compliance with, this Act and legislative provisions relevant to the purpose of this Act:

h. monitor and report on compliance within its area with this Act and legislative provisions relevant to the purpose of this Act

i. develop, approve, implement, and monitor a civil defence emergency management group plan and regularly review the plan

j. participate in the development of the national civil defence emergency management strategy and the national civil defence emergency management plan:

k. promote civil defence emergency management in its area that is consistent with the purpose of this Act.
Auckland Emergency Management’s approach to public education 2016-2019

Education, Consultation and Engagement Strategy 2016-2019

AEM’s current public education strategy entitled: ‘Education, Consultation and Engagement’ (2016 – 2019) is closely aligned with the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management’s 2016 – 2019 Public Education Programme Strategy. Both documents detail the need to focus on our most vulnerable and least prepared communities and outline our responsibility to lead and support communities through the delivery of public education and the maximisation of locally driven initiatives.

AEM have delivered on this approach through the development of resources for our priority audiences in the Auckland region, such as our: youth-based hazard app and interactive hazard model for use in schools, the development of multi-lingual resources and the delivery of the disability pilot project. Auckland Emergency Management has also helped develop hazard and risk awareness through community-based initiatives which seek to give Auckland’s agency over their own preparedness, as well as the development of our new website and hazard viewer which have made risk information more readily available.

Digital Engagement Plan 2016-2019

Alongside AEM’s ‘Education, Consultation and Engagement Strategy’, the AEM ‘Digital Engagement Plan’ (2016 – 2019), was developed to utilise digital engagement to deliver on public education objectives. The Digital Engagement Plan follows the same objectives and approaches outlined in the National Public Education Programme Strategy 2016 – 2019 and utilises the content from the ‘Never Happens’ campaign launched in July of 2016. Outputs of the Digital Engagement Plan have included:

- Auckland-wide social media campaigns targeted at priority audiences
- A rebuild of the AEM website
- Development of learning application for schools

While a review of the Digital Engagement Plan is outside the scope of this paper, the development of an AEM Public Education Strategy for 2019 – 2022 will have implications for how digital engagement is carried out. The Digital Engagement Plan will be revised upon finalisation of the AEM Public Education Strategy 2019 – 2022.
Review of Auckland Emergency Management’s approach to public education

Methodology

With the release the new National Public Education Programme Strategy anticipated in 2019, Auckland Emergency Management have carried out a review of AEM’s public education work by assessing it against the four national objectives and the five-part national approach (as detailed on pages 3-4). We did this by asking AEM staff to comment on the following:

- How have we met the national objectives?
- What could we do differently to meet these objectives?
- How could we re-design / re-frame the objectives for Auckland?

AEM staff were also asked the following questions in relation to the five-part national approach:

- What does the approach mean?
- How are we demonstrating the approach in our work?
- What else could be doing to demonstrate the approach?
- How successful is the approach for meeting public education objectives in Auckland?

Reviewing the objectives

How have we met the national objectives?

Responding to this question our review pointed largely to projects AEM completed in 2018. These included initiatives such as:

- The re-development of the AEM website
- Auckland’s participation in Shakeout, and
- The development of the Auckland Hazard Viewer

The review findings did not comment on whether these projects had been measured against the national public education objectives, suggesting that a revised public education strategy for Auckland might need to provide better ways of enabling AEM to measure the effectiveness of our public education initiatives.

What could we do differently to meet objectives?

Our review highlighted that people would like to see less singularity in our approach to public education by building our messages into our whole work programme and recognising public education objectives as collective objectives across all teams.

Other suggestions for meeting the objectives included:
• Increasing the frequency of public surveys or tools to enable better understanding of when public education objectives have been met
• Building a strong evidence base as a platform to measure progress from
• Better segmentation and understanding of community needs so that public education can be responsive to needs, and
• More focus on communicating the personal dimensions of risk and the impact of hazards

How could we re-frame the objectives?

Our review noted that AEM staff found the current national objectives to be too focused on building ‘preparedness’ without enough focus on what preparedness looks like, or whether preparedness adequately captures the totality of what we would like public education to achieve.

The following suggestions were put forward:

• More focus on defining what it means to be ‘fully prepared’
• A wider focus on community resilience alongside preparedness
• Better incorporation of all the 4Rs (Reduction, Readiness, Response, Recovery) into our public education objectives
• Better definitions around what resilience and preparedness mean for different groups of people (including Mana Whenua)
• Better integration with public education objectives of external partner organisations
• Better integration with public education objectives across Auckland Council

Objectives for consideration 2019 – 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Objectives 2016 – 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. More people are aware of why they need to be prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More people understand how to prepare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More people have taken steps to be more prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More people are fully prepared (have made plans, stored/checked and updated emergency supplies).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Emergency Management Objectives for Consideration: 2019 – 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People are aware of how their resilience contributes to their ability to get through disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People have a strong sense of what resilience means to them and understand what they can do to grow their resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People take steps to enhance their resilience in all its aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People, their families and communities are more resilient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justification for revision

Aligning our public education objectives to the National Disaster Resilience Strategy

The public education objectives for 2019 – 2022 put forward for consideration above, broaden the scope of public education outcomes to focus on resilience (while continuing to recognise preparedness as a component of resilience). This is in direct reflection of the newly released National Disaster Resilience Strategy (2019 – 2029). Priority three of the National Disaster Resilience Strategy calls for: “Enabling, empowering and supporting community resilience: building a culture of resilience in New Zealand so that everyone can participate in and contribute to communities’ - and the nation’s - resilience” (2019, p. 2). Attached to this priority is Objective 15 which calls for CDEM Groups to “…embed strategic objectives for resilience in key plans and strategies” (2019, p. 3).

Aligning our public education objectives with the Auckland Plan (2050)

The objective put forward for consideration strongly reflect Auckland’s strategic direction, as outlined in the Auckland Plan 2050, specifically the Plan’s focus on “supporting and working with communities to thrive in a changing world” (2018, p.11). Linking to the Auckland Plan demonstrates a commitment to working collaboratively across the Council family to ensure AEM’s public education work aligns with public education initiatives across Council.

Alignment of public education objectives nationally and across Council should ensure public education objectives are built into the foundation of AEM’s work programme to avoid public education becoming siloed. A focus on resilience more generally also ensures public education initiatives have the scope to include all the 4Rs – reduction, readiness, response and recovery - within the overall umbrella of ‘resilience’.

Reviewing the approach

Reframing the conversation

The National Public Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019) defines the approach of ‘reframing the conversation’ as:

“Focusing more on impacts than hazards (e.g. no power, no water, no transport) and getting people to imagine themselves (and their families) in various situations. It is more effective to focus on specific impacts, such as power cuts and transport outages, as these are common across all significant emergencies, and are relatable for almost all people.”

What does it mean to reframe the conversation?

Participants were asked to comment on what, in their own words, they understood ‘reframing the conversation’ to look like. Two key aspects were discussed:

- How we communicate, and
Item 14

- What we communicate.

In terms of how we communicate, emphasis was given to:

- The need for a diverse toolkit with a range of visual, verbal and written resources for prompting conversation
- The need to move from one-way communication patterns to two-way conversations resulting in behaviour change.

In terms of what we communicate, people highlighted the need to:

- Identify community priorities and concerns as a basis for what we communicate
- Explore more resources dedicated to communicating resilience messages

How are we reframing the conversation?

The shift toward understanding risks in terms of their impacts - specifically how risks can be translated into human terms - was discussed. AEM’s focus on social connectedness as a key component of preparedness (and of resilience more broadly) was also mentioned as a significant component of reframing traditional preparedness messaging.

What else could we be doing to reframe the conversation?

Some examples regarding what we could be doing to further reframe the conversation, included:

- Using real events and real people to tell stories
- Developing resources (such as videos) which encourage social connection
- Inventive, fun and humorous audio-visual resources which generate interest on our social media channels (i.e. Instagram for Stan)
- Creating a more human face for AEM including stories about what we do in the community during non-disaster times
- Exploring new platforms, such as: briefings on inbound flights, local cinema adverts, more hands-on opportunities to learn through doing

Is reframing the conversation a successful approach for meeting public education objectives?

It was generally agreed that we should continue to seek new ways to reframe the conversation to focus more on the impacts of events and to find ways to make these impacts relatable. However, it was pointed out that this needs to happen within the broader context of social challenges. Leading with societal challenges – poverty, inequality, food security etc – and discussing the impact of disasters within this context will help to make our communication more relatable, particularly to those likely to be disproportionately impacted.
New approach for consideration 2019 – 2022

National Approach 2016 – 2019

“We will focus more on impacts than hazards (e.g. no power, no water, no transport) and getting people to imagine themselves (and their families) in various situations. It is more effective to focus on specific impacts, such as power cuts and transport outages, as these are common across all significant emergencies, and are relatable for almost all people.”

Auckland Emergency Management’s Approach for Consideration: 2019 – 2022

“Reframing the conversation.”

Make the conversation relatable.

“We will make public education content relatable by putting disasters in human terms, discussing risk in its social and cultural context, focusing on the impact of hazards on people’s lives and working to understand community priorities.”

Targeting public education at the most vulnerable

The National Public Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019) defines the approach of ‘targeting public education at the most vulnerable’ as:

“Messaging, resources and channels employed will be targeted at our most vulnerable audiences – families with lower incomes, millennials, non-English speakers and new migrants.”

What does it mean to target public education at the most vulnerable?

There was some contention around the feasibility of this approach given the complex mix of components which create vulnerability. Vulnerability is not attached to discrete groups, therefore the ability to target vulnerability without making assumptions about who is vulnerable poses a significant challenge. Due to this complexity, it was suggested that:

- Targeting vulnerability should be replaced with more widespread attempts at reaching as many people as possible
- More effort should be spent developing an informed and researched view of vulnerability and its relationship to resilience

How are we targeting the most vulnerable?

Utilising our network of agencies who are active in working with different demographic groups, such as The Ministry of Pacific People, was identified as one way we currently work to ensure our messages reach those who might not typically have access to this information.
What else could we be doing to target the most vulnerable?

Answers in response to this question included:

- Identify media channels our target groups utilise
- Spend more time understanding appropriate and effective ways of communicating with target groups
- Build a strong evidence base so assumptions about ‘vulnerability’ can be backed up with evidence
- Develop a public education strategy that builds on what Auckland Council is already doing to seek better whole of Council collaboration and resource sharing
- Continue to tap into social networks and community groups
- Continue to produce relevant translated resources

Is targeting the most vulnerable a successful way of meeting public education objectives?

Instead of the focus on targeting the vulnerable, it was suggested that we spend more time working with a range of different groups to identify the kind of information they would like more of and to design public education tools and resources around what they tell us. Working with community to identify their information needs – as well as what these needs might look like at different points in time (i.e. before vs after a disaster) – was a suggested action that arose from this consultation.

New approach for consideration 2019 – 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Target public education at the most vulnerable.”</td>
<td>Ensure public education is accessible to everyone and is adapted to meet diverse needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Messaging, resources and channels employed will be targeted at our most vulnerable audiences – families with lower incomes, millennials, non-English speakers and new migrants.”</td>
<td>Public education messages and resources are accessible and relevant to everyone and pay attention to what people have told us they need, particularly the needs of those who are likely to be disproportionately affected by disasters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Encouraging ownership**

The National Public Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019) defines the approach of ‘encouraging ownership’ as:

“Getting people to think about what they need to do now to get their families through and prompting them to have conversations with their loved ones.”

**What does it mean to encourage ownership?**

Encouraging ownership was understood by AEM staff as an approach which enables people to take responsibility for their family, as opposed to relying on emergency services and government intervention. Examples of what this might look like, included:

- People tell their own stories
- People are aware of their own risks and are active in mitigating them
- People ask questions such as: ‘how this might affect my family’
- People seek out information and resources to enhance their preparedness / risk knowledge
- People are active in their community (i.e. volunteering)

**How are we encouraging ownership?**

Several key initiatives were raised including the development of the Auckland Hazard Viewer which allows people to use searchable maps to identify their own location specific risks and make informed decisions. Other examples included the redevelopment of the AEM website where people can easily access the information they need to take actions such as developing a plan.

**What else could we be doing to encourage ownership?**

The following suggestions were made regarding how we could be better enhance the ownership of our communities:

- Focus less on simply providing information and more on encouraging people to do something with the information they receive
- Create incentives to motivate personal preparedness by helping people to understand their risks

**Is encouraging ownership a successful way of meeting public education objectives?**

Ensuring public education is delivered in a way that promotes ownership was regarded as essential. Ownership was seen to be a desired outcome of public education as much as an approach to its delivery. Public education which focuses on ‘Community Placemaking’ was seen one way in which ownership could be enhanced. To succeed in enabling ownership, it was noted that AEM would need to develop a clearer collective understanding of responsibility, set limitations on our ownership and
have clear understanding of how ownership can be successfully transitioned from AEM to the community.

New approach for consideration 2019 – 2022

### National Approach 2016 – 2019

“Encourage ownership.”

### Auckland Emergency Management’s Approach for Consideration: 2019 – 2022

Enable ownership of resilience.

“We will get people to think about what they need to do now to get their families / households through, and prompting them to have conversations with their loved ones.”

### We will create the platforms, opportunities and resources which enable people to better understand their resilience and act to enhance their own, their families and their communities’ resilience.

**Making preparedness easy, relevant and real**

The National Public Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019) defines the approach of ‘making preparedness easy, relevant and real’ as:

“We encourage people to take small steps to be more prepared and to protect the things they love, in a way that works for their family / household”

**What does it mean to make preparedness easy, relevant and real?**

Making preparedness ‘easy, relevant and real’ was seen to be closely connected to the other approaches of ‘encouraging ownership’ and of ‘framing the conversation’.

Making preparedness easy, relevant and real was thought to look like:

- Removing barriers to preparedness (information is easy to access and to act upon)
- Making information meaningful and simple (for everyone)
- Ensuring public education focuses on the reality of the impact of hazards

**How are we making preparedness easy, relevant and real?**

The following were identified as ways in which we have demonstrated this approach:
- Ensuring we are an open and readily available source of information: such as through
  buddy with Local Boards to ensure political stakeholders are well informed
- Cutting the jargon in our public information collateral: such as by ensuring the Auckland
  CDEM Group Welfare Plan could be understood both by the Auckland Welfare Coordination
  Group and by members of the public
- Using innovative messaging platforms such as Safe Swim signs to make it easier for the
  public to access the information they need, when they need it.

What else could we be doing to make preparedness easy, relevant and real?

In response to this question people raised several points about new tools and methodologies AEM
could be embracing to engage with the public in a way that makes preparedness easy, relevant and
real. This included ideas such as the use of public exercises and interactive creative spaces as a way
of reducing complacency around disasters. The Melbourne Arts House ‘Refuge’ project was referred
to as an example of what Auckland could be doing to enable ‘peace time’ opportunities for the
public to step into simulated disaster environments.

Other suggestions included utilising human centred design in our work to ensure that mediums such
as storytelling are used as a legitimate way of learning about hazard impacts. These suggestions
called for new ways of talking to ensure our messages are engaging enough to stimulate a genuine
public interest. Using non-traditional mediums of communication such as art, design, video and
storytelling could be considered as a way of triggering public interest.

Is making preparedness easy, relevant and real a successful way of meeting public education
objectives?

Making our public education easy, relevant and real was evidently deemed a fundamental way of
ensuring public education objectives are achieved. While this review recommends maintaining this
approach, it suggests aligning it more closely with the new objectives put forward for consideration
to focus on making resilience building ‘easy, relevant and real’.

New approach for consideration 2019 – 2022
Be positive and empowering

The National Public Education Programme Strategy (2016 – 2019) defines the approach of being ‘positive and empowering’ as:

“We will employ an approachable, positive and empowering approach, with greater use of humour and active engagement through channels such as social media.”

What does it mean to be positive and empowering?

Adopting an ‘empowerment’ approach was understood as working to facilitate – rather than to drive and direct – community action. Adopting a ‘positive’ approach was understood as communicating risk in a way that does not draw on alarmist messages.

How are we being positive and empowering?

Comments relevant to this question reiterated AEM’s role in facilitating the development of community-driven initiatives, such as community resilience plans led by community members and supported by AEM.

What else could we be doing to be positive and empowering?

Finding ways to discuss risk and vulnerability without creating a sense of helplessness is critical to the success of our public education work. Risk messaging needs to be accompanied with equally strong messaging around the affirmative action people can take to address their risks. Utilising humour to achieve this balance is one method AEM may consider adopting in future public education initiatives.

Is being positive and empowering a successful way of meeting public education objectives?

This approach is certainly one that could benefit from greater exploration. Ensuring people feel empowered, or at least motivated to act, is fundamental to ensuring public education messages are translated into actions which will reduce risk and enhance resilience.
New approach for consideration 2019 – 2022

National Approach 2016 – 2019

“Be positive and empowering.”

Auckland Emergency Management’s Approach for Consideration: 2019 – 2022

Facilitate people to take action.

“We will employ an approachable, positive and empowering approach, with greater use of humour (where appropriate) and active engagement through channels such as social media.”

People are not made to feel helpless when informed of their risks but are encouraged and provided with the tools and information they need to take action to mitigate their risks and enhance their resilience.

Next steps

Based on the findings and recommendations made in this review, and the feedback received from the Auckland CDEM Coordinating Executive Group on this review, we suggest the following next steps:

1. Establish a Public Education Working Group to develop a Public Education Strategy (2019 – 2022) for Auckland Emergency Management. The Working Group will be made up of representatives from the Auckland CDEM Coordinating Executive group and will be responsible for:

   a) Identifying opportunities for external agency alignment on public education objectives related to resilience building
   b) Developing collective understanding of the scope of public education objectives
   c) Developing measures against which public education objectives can be measured
   d) Understanding how public education can address multiple risk factors to ensure public education reaches people who are likely to be disproportionality affected by disasters
   e) Providing feedback on Auckland’s Draft Public Education Strategy
   f) Reviewing the Draft Public Education Strategy against the revised National Public Education Programme Strategy when it is released later in 2019.


4. Develop a Public Education Programme of Work to align with the 2019 – 2022 Public Education Strategy.

5. Develop a revised Digital Engagement Strategy to align with the 2019 – 2022 Public Education Strategy.
Appendix A: Strategic alignments

(due for revision)

Auckland Emergency Management Public Education Strategy (2019 – 2022)
(in development)

National Resilience Strategy (2019 – 2029)
Auckland Plan 2050
Auckland Group Plan (2016 – 2021)

(to be developed)

Auckland Emergency Management Digital Engagement Plan (2019 – 2022)
(to be developed)
Forward Work Programme

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To update the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee on the Forward Work programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. A report updating the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee on the Forward Work programme is a standing item on the committee’s agenda.

3. The format of this update report has been revised to better reflect recent decisions on actions under the Group Plan 2016-21 and joint work across Coordinating Executive Group agencies. Scheduled reports for the committee’s next quarterly meeting and upcoming workshops amongst Coordinating Executive Group agencies are identified. The report is accompanied by two attachments:
   - Auckland Coordinating Executive Group and Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee Forward Work Programme 2018/19 (Attachment A)
   - Coordinating Executive Group - Joint Workshops and Meetings (Attachment B).

4. Scheduled reports to the Committee’s August 2019 meeting include:
   - General Managers Update
   - Report on the Coordinating Executive Group
   - Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan
   - Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery
   - Auckland Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller and Recovery Managers List (if required by changes)
   - Welfare Sub Function Plans
   - Forward Work Programme

5. Upcoming workshops of Coordinating Executive Group agencies before end of July 2019, include:
   - Joint exercising Working Group
   - Joint Action Plan Working Group
   - Community Resilience Building Working Group
   - Public Education Working Group

6. The format of this report and its attachments will be reviewed to more clearly convey key information before the next Committee meeting.
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee:

a) approve this update on the Auckland Coordinating Executive Group and Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group Committee Forward Work Programme 2018/19.

b) note the Coordinating Executive Group’s Joint Workshops and Meetings.

Horopaki

Context

7. An update on the work programme to implement actions in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan 2016-21 is a standing item on the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee’s agenda. The familiar summary of the work programme in table form is appended as Attachment A.

8. The Committee agreed to reflect interagency priorities to implement the intent of the Group Plan and to respond to priorities arising since the publication of the Group Plan (CIV/2019/10). An additional attachment setting out joint workshops and meetings of Coordinating Executive Group agency representatives is appended as Attachment B.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

Revised Reporting Format

9. Agreements in response to reviews of the 10 April 2018 storm and the SIMS Pacific fire have seen additions to the Coordinating Executive Group’s work programme. At its February 2019 meeting the Coordinating Executive Group agreed to recommendations for the:

- development of a revised work programme to reflect inter-agency priorities for work to implement the Group Plan intent and to respond to priorities emerging since publication of the Group Plan before the next schedule update
- the addition of quarterly workshops to the Coordinating Executive Group annual schedule.

10. This report has been revised to provide an update on:

- scheduled reports to the Committee’s August 2019 meeting generated out of the work programme
- project specific joint workshops and meetings
- the next quarterly meeting of the Coordinating Executive Group.

11. The format of this report and attachments will be revised to set out the key information more clearly and simply before the Committee’s meeting on 28 August 2019.

Scheduled Reports

12. The Auckland Coordinating Executive Group and Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee forward work programme 2018/19 is appended as Attachment A.
13. Work undertaken to implement actions identified in the Group Plan reported to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Committee meeting on 28 August 2019 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Managers Update</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Executive Group Meeting</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Hazards Risk Management Action Plan</td>
<td>For the approval of the CDEM Group Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways to Preparedness: A Planning Framework for Recovery</td>
<td>For the approval of the CDEM Group Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland CDEM Group Controller and Recovery Managers list (update report on additions/removals if required)</td>
<td>For the approval of the CDEM Group Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Sub Function Plans</td>
<td>For approval of the CDEM Group Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Work Programme (update for the next period)</td>
<td>For approval of the CDEM Group Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The agenda for the next committee meeting may also include reports generated out of unscheduled work arising in the intervening period.

**Upcoming Workshops**

15. Joint workshops and meetings for Coordinating Executive Group agencies are set out in Attachment B.

**Project Specific**

16. Items occurring before the end of July 2019 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Action Plan Working Group</td>
<td>22 May 2019 (further meetings being arranged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Exercising Working Group</td>
<td>19 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resilience Building Working Group</td>
<td>Rescheduled following the Christchurch Mosque Attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education Working Group</td>
<td>Arrangements being made in line with Coordinating Executive Groups meeting on 6 May 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quarterly Workshops**

17. The Coordinating Executive Group’s next Quarterly workshops is scheduled for 29 July 2019. Workshop topics will be confirmed in advance of the workshop.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

18. The work outlined in this update is undertaken in fulfilment of functions under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. Council group impacts and views relating to individual items of work will be addressed when work programme items are separately reported on.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

19. There are no local impacts arising from this report. Any local impacts or local board views relating to items on the work programme are addressed when individual items are reported on to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Committee.
**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**  
**Māori impact statement**

20. There are no impacts on Māori arising from this report. Any impacts for Auckland Māori relating to items on the work programme will be addressed when individual items of work are reported on.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**  
**Financial implications**

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

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

22. There are no risks arising from this report.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**  
**Next steps**

23. An update on the Forward Work programme will be reported to the committee at its next meeting on 28 August 2019.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**  
**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Auckland CEG and CDEM Group Committee Forward Work Programme 2018/19 Programme</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CEG - Joint Meetings and Workshops</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**  
**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Wayne Brown - Principal Recovery Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorisers | Jennifer Rose - Head of Response and Recovery  
Sarah Sinclair – Acting General Manager Auckland Emergency Management |
## Auckland CEG and CDEM Group Committee Forward Work Programme 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CEG Action Needed</th>
<th>Date of CEG action</th>
<th>Auckland CEG and CDEM Group Committee Action Needed</th>
<th>Description of Activity</th>
<th>Accountable</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Linkage to Group Plan Action (key)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>To provide the CDEM Group committee with a plan of activity for the 2018/19 financial year.</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>standing CEG and committee agenda item</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>4 May 2019</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>28 February 2019</td>
<td>Auckland CEM Action 4 of 8 Directives 7.14 and 7.15</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>HRR/MAAP postponed from original date of 5 May 2019.</td>
<td>Action 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>5 August 2019</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>29 August 2019</td>
<td>To develop a recovery framework to align with national and regional direction.</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>NOTE: Date for Director’s Guidelines for Recovery Management delayed and not known.</td>
<td>Actions 62, 65, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>9 August 2019</td>
<td>update</td>
<td>29 August 2019</td>
<td>To develop a Welfare Plan to align with national and regional direction.</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>4 February 2019</td>
<td>adopt</td>
<td>27 February 2019</td>
<td>To develop a revised list of Group Controllers, Welfare Managers and Recovery Managers.</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action 36 (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>5 August 2019</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>28 August 2019</td>
<td>To develop a public education strategy to enhance disaster preparedness and understanding of disaster preparedness through the Auckland MCEM Group, quarterly presentations.</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Item added as part of the Auckland CDEM Group’s programme.</td>
<td>Action 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>4 February 2019</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>27 February 2019</td>
<td>To ensure the Auckland CDEM Group are aware of emergency preparedness and capacity required.</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Measure: FY18/19 Business Plan - Content and capability.</td>
<td>Action 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>5 August 2018</td>
<td>update</td>
<td>6 monthly reporting 29 August 2018</td>
<td>To ensure the lessons learned from events and exercises are realised.</td>
<td>Emergency Management Operations + Group</td>
<td>CEG agreed in August 2017</td>
<td>Action 35, 40, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>9 August 2018</td>
<td>update</td>
<td>6 monthly reporting 29 August 2018</td>
<td>To assess the interoperability of operating centres between agencies across the region and implement recommendations as made by the Emergency Service Information and Communications Strategy.</td>
<td>FEHZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action 37, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>6 monthly reporting 29 August 2018</td>
<td>update</td>
<td>6 monthly reporting 29 August 2018</td>
<td>To provide an update on the new empowerment approach and practical examples.</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action 29, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>5 November 2018</td>
<td>update</td>
<td>28 November 2018</td>
<td>To provide a report with recommendations from the review of the Committee in November 2018.</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Review was added following the 19 April storms. CEG endorsed a review of the storm in May</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity No.</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>CEG Action Needed</td>
<td>Date of CEG action</td>
<td>CDEM Group Committee/Action Needed</td>
<td>Date CDEM Group committee action</td>
<td>Description of Activity</td>
<td>Accountable</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>SMRS Pacific Mobile Fire review</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>5 November 2018</td>
<td>Update on findings of review</td>
<td>28 November 2018</td>
<td>Update on findings of the independent review of the SMRS Pacific Mobile Fire review</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Activity added in November 2018 at direction from CEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Update on the Well Prepared Responses to Natural Disasters and Other Emergencies</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>4 February 2019</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>27 February 2019</td>
<td>The Minister of Civil Defence is due to issue an official response to the recommendations of the TAO Review. As part of this process, there will be an official call for submissions. Auckland CDEM Group is expected to author a submission when the call is released.</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Activity added in November 2018 at direction from CEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Welfare Sub Function Plan Development</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>5 May 2019, 5 August 2019, 4 November 2019</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>26 August 2018, 28 August 2019, 27 November 2019</td>
<td>Development of welfare sub function plans to support the delivery of welfare services during an emergency</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Activity added in May 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CEG – Joint Workshops and Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Key Skills/Attributes</th>
<th>Project Lead</th>
<th>Proposed Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joint Exercising Working Group</td>
<td>CEG members agreed to work together with Auckland Emergency Management to build an aligned approach to joint exercising, and to establish a working exercise group with membership made up of CEG agency representatives</td>
<td>Representatives for this group ideally should be either be planning/developing exercises now or have an interest in building capability in their agency</td>
<td>Adam Maggs</td>
<td>19 June 2019</td>
<td>Ivan Green (NZDF) Andrew Hayton (Harbourmaster) Jane Rollin (MCDEM) Mark Deoki/Graham Ferguson (St John) Marty Brown/Russell Mitchel (NZ Police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attendance to the AEM Incident Management Team Meeting</td>
<td>Invitation for CEG agency partners to recommend a suitable candidate from their agency to provide representation on the Incident Management Team meetings</td>
<td>Representatives for these meetings will be able to contribute in building a common understanding of emergency management processes – such as the Coordinated Incident Management System and its application across agencies.</td>
<td>Alexis Reed</td>
<td>7 June 2019 - 5 July 2019</td>
<td>Andrew Fisher (NZDF) Rua Pani (AT) Jane Rollin (MCDEM) Glenn Metcalfe/Andy Everiss (St John) Marty Brown/ Russell Mitchel (NZ Police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joint Action Plan Working Group</td>
<td>Nominate a representative from your agency to be a part of a Joint Evaluation Action Plan working group</td>
<td>Representatives will help develop protocols and reporting template for the Joint Evaluation Action Plan – a background in performance and/or continuous improvement may be suited for this role</td>
<td>David Murphy</td>
<td>Wednesday, 22 May 2019</td>
<td>Andrew Fisher (NZDF) Andrew Hayton (Harbourmaster) Jane Rollin (MCDEM) Mark Deoki/Graham Ferguson (St John) George Fanamamu/David Brown/ Sam Adams (NZ Police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Resilience Building Working Group</td>
<td>Nominates a representative from your agency to be on a CEG Community Resilience Building working group. Representatives will explore community development actions that could be delivered, focus areas will include, shared approaches to resilience building, shared resilience communications and inter-agency delivery.</td>
<td>Melanie Hutton and Thomas Hardy (FENZ)</td>
<td>Bring rescheduled</td>
<td>Kalama Cotter (NZDF) Jocelyn Peach (Health CEG rep) Rua Pani (AT) Jane Rollin (MCDEM) Pete Hoskin (St John) Nikki Latimer/Mark Clayton (NZ Police)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CEG Joint Future Workplan Workshops</td>
<td>CEG members to participate in quarterly workshops to update the Joint Forward Work Programme to reflect tasks and programmes arising from ACDEM initiatives. Official CEG members to participate; delegates can represent on your behalf if you cannot attend.</td>
<td>Sarah Sinclair</td>
<td>Tuesday, 2 April 2019</td>
<td>Glen Gowthorpe (NZDF) Jocelyn Peach (Health CEG rep) Rua Pani (AT) Jane Rollin (MCDEM) Graham Ferguson/Glenn Metcalfe (St John) Karyn Malthus (NZ Police) John Cavanagh (MSD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agency Partner Data Sharing Working Group</td>
<td>Nominates a representative from your agency to provide representation on an Agency Partner Data Sharing Working Group to look at ways agency partners better share information to gain a common operating picture.</td>
<td>Sarah Sinclair</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Mara Vandermerwe (NZDF) Andrew Hayton (Harbourmaster) Jane Rollin (MCDEM) Dave Richards (BJA) (St John) Ben Lee/Andy Fabish (NZ Police)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Education / Capability Working Group</td>
<td>CEG agreed (6 May 19) joint working group for development of Draft Public Education Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>