

Response ID ANON-8XZ8-Y6P3-M

Submitted to Targeted Engagement with Regional and Local Authorities about Modernising the Emergency Management Framework
Submitted on 2022-02-08 08:01:37

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name:
Aaron Tregoweth

2 Which online session did you attend?

Dropdown:
Attended multiple

3 Are you submitting this feedback as an individual or on behalf of a group of people?

Behalf of organisation:
On behalf of my organisation

4 Which group of people do you represent?

Organisation:
Waikato Region CDEM Group

5 Which CDEM region do you belong to?

Region:
Waikato

6 What is your email address?

Email:
aaron.tregoweth@waikatoregion.govt.nz

7 Would you like to be contacted with updates in the future?

Comments (optional):
Yes

8 Are you happy for your submission to be attributed to you?

Yes

Guiding principles for policy options

9 To what extent are the guiding principles a fit-for-purpose measurement?

Criteria - Risk assessment:
Neutral

Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Somewhat strong

Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Neutral

Criteria - Consequences:
Neutral

Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Somewhat strong

Criteria - Operability:
Somewhat strong

Functions of CDEM Groups and local authorities

10 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option One - Rating - Risk awareness:
Slightly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option One - Rating - Iwi and Māori participation:
Not at all

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option One - Rating - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option One - Rating - Consequences:
Somewhat

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option One - Rating - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option One - Rating - Operability:
Slightly

11 To what extent does Proposal B (distinct local functions) align with each of the guiding principles?

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Two - Rating - Risk awareness:
Slightly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Two - Rating - Iwi and Māori participation:
Slightly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Two - Rating - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Two - Rating - Consequences:
Somewhat

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Two - Rating - Role clarity and certainty:
Significantly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Two - Rating - Operability:
Somewhat

12 To what extent does Proposal C (strengthened regional approach) align with each of the guiding principles?

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Three - Rating - Risk awareness:
Slightly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Three - Rating - Iwi and Māori participation:
Slightly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Three - Rating - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Three - Rating - Consequences:
Somewhat

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Three - Rating - Role clarity and certainty:
Significantly

Functions of CDEM Groups - Option Three - Rating - Operability:
Somewhat

13 To what extent does Proposal D (regional approach with local support) align with each of the guiding principles?

CDEM Functions - Proposal D - Risk awareness:
Slightly

CDEM Functions - Proposal D - Iwi and Māori participation:
Slightly

CDEM Functions - Proposal D - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

CDEM Functions - Proposal D - Consequences:
Somewhat

CDEM Functions - Proposal D - Role clarity and certainty:
Somewhat

CDEM Functions - Proposal D - Operability:
Somewhat

14 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Function of CDEM Groups - Option's Ranking - Proposal A:
4

Function of CDEM Groups - Option's Ranking - Proposal B:
1

Function of CDEM Groups - Option's Ranking - Proposal C:
2

Function of CDEM Groups - Option's Ranking - Proposal D:
3

15 Which is your preferred option, and why?

Which is your preferred option, and why?:
Proposal B

Comments (optional):

We consider proposal B has most chance of achieving the six guiding principles with an opportunity to move towards the principles of option C and to clarify Section 17 Functions. Option B will maintain Territorial Authorities' strong participation in and leadership of emergency management. The Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group feel it maximises regional coordination and maintains local leadership where the most effective impact on communities is delivered.

D is a very centralised model and devolves delivery away from local communities. For large groups this model will become too difficult to deliver S17 functions effectively and whole of TLA emergency management will be lost.

Proposal B has a positive impact on the guiding principles, Iwi and Māori participation, role clarity and certainty and operability

16 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation of any option?:

No practical challenges foreseen.

17 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each of the options?

Functions of CDEM Groups - Financial Implications Rating - Proposal A:
Low/no set-up costs

Functions of CDEM Groups - Financial Implications Rating - Proposal B:
Low/no set-up costs

Functions of CDEM Groups - Financial Implications Rating - Proposal C:
Medium

Functions of CDEM Groups - Financial Implications Rating - Proposal D:
Significant

18 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each of the options?

Estimated costs - Ongoing - Proposal A:
Neutral

Estimated costs - Ongoing - Proposal B:
Neutral

Estimated costs - Ongoing - Proposal C:
Increased

Estimated costs - Ongoing - Proposal D:
Increased

Membership of CDEM Groups

19 What do you consider to be the top three factors for ensuring meaningful iwi and Māori membership?

What do you consider to be the top three factors for ensuring meaningful iwi and Māori membership?:

The Iwi and Māori participation guiding principle is supported. The top 3 factors considered by the Waikato CDEM Group are:

The consultation and input from key iwi authorities in the consideration of the options and design of methods to achieve Iwi and Māori participation throughout the emergency management system.

Enabling provisions in the legislation to maximise flexibility to account for regional and local differences across NZ.

Principles of equity are applied. Two Māori representatives on each Joint Committee is equal, however, it may not be equitable.

20 What, if any, alternative approaches could we consider to address this situation?

What, if any, alternative approaches could we consider to address this situation?:

Local Government already have mechanisms in place for consultation and collaboration with Māori entities. We suggest these are leveraged on to maximise and progress representation and contribution into the emergency management system

21 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of the proposed new feature (CDEM Group membership takes two forms, with different obligations for iwi and Māori representatives)? How might these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?:

No practical challenges foreseen.

22 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for the proposed new feature?

Membership of CDEM Group - Set-up costs - New feature:

Significant

23 What do you foresee as the likely level of anticipated ongoing costs for the proposed new feature?

Membership of CDEM Group - Ongoing costs - New feature:

Significantly increased

Legal status of CDEM Groups

24 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 1 - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 1 - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 1 - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 1 - Criteria - Consequences:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 1 - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 1 - Criteria - Operability:

Not at all

25 To what extent does Proposal B (explicit recognition of legal status of CDEM Groups) align with each of the guiding principles?

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 2 - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 2 - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 2 - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 2 - Criteria - Consequences:

Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 2 - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 2 - Criteria - Operability:
Slightly

26 To what extent does Proposal C (mandatory delegation to CDEM Groups for them to enter into contracts) align with each of the guiding principles?

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 3 - Criteria - Risk awareness:
Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 3 - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 3 - Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Slightly

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 3 - Criteria - Consequences:
Not at all

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 3 - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Option 3 - Criteria - Operability:
Slightly

27 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Ranking - Proposal A:
3

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Ranking - Proposal B:
1

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Ranking - Proposal C:
2

28 Which is your preferred option, and why? If you selected Proposal C, what else would be useful to delegate to CDEM Groups, and why?

Comment (optional):

It would be useful to standardise the legal status of all Groups in the country.

29 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How can these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?:

There is not enough currently known about the consequences of the proposed change. The issues identified are:

What implications will there be of the change on the Local Government Act (Joint Committees)

How would this change affect current practices with administering authorities? Currently Waikato CDEM Group enjoys the benefits of employment, procurement, financial systems, processes, and staff of our administering authority. It would be a huge cost if Groups had to provide that themselves because of their legal status.

Without knowing the consequences of the proposals, we can't anticipate the cost implications

30 What, if any, alternative approaches could we consider to address this situation?

What, if any, alternative approaches could we consider to address this situation?:

If entering agreements is the motivator for the proposal, then there are probably other ways to solve the issue e.g., Standardise the functions and services to be provided to a Group by its administering authority. There is no indication that S94 Contract in Urgent Cases will be removed, and the Waikato CDEM Group support its retention.

There are other issues relating to the disparity between Joint Committees and Unitary Authorities including: funding mechanisms, LTP processes, annual planning and reporting, Compliance reporting to name a few. Presently there is no clear and consistent mechanism for how Joint Committees carry out these functions.

The WCDEMG is unable to comment on the likely level of set-up or ongoing costs due to the unknown consequences of the proposal.

31 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each of the options?

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Set-up Costs - Proposal A:

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Set-up Costs - Proposal B:

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Set-up Costs - Proposal C:

32 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each of the options?

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Ongoing Costs - Proposal A:

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Ongoing Costs - Proposal B:

Legal status of CDEM Groups - Ongoing Costs - Proposal C:

Accessibility of CDEM Group Plans

33 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

CDEM Group Plans - Option One - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option One - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option One - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option One - Criteria - Consequences:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option One - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option One - Criteria - Operability:

Not at all

34 To what extent does Proposal B (explicit requirement to publish, minus the incorporated documents) align with each of the guiding principles?

CDEM Group Plans - Option Two - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option Two - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option Two - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

CDEM Group Plans - Option Two - Criteria - Consequences:

Not at all

CDEM Group Plans - Option Two - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Slightly

CDEM Group Plans - Option Two - Criteria - Operability:

Slightly

35 To what extent does Proposal C (explicit requirement to publish, including documents incorporated by reference) align with each of the guiding principles?

CDEM Plans - Ranking - Risk awareness:

Not at all

CDEM Plans - Ranking - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

CDEM Plans - Ranking - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

CDEM Plans - Ranking - Consequences:

Not at all

CDEM Plans - Ranking - Role clarity and certainty:

Slightly

CDEM Plans - Ranking - Operability:
Slightly

36 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

CDEM Group Plans - Ranking - Proposal A:
2

CDEM Group Plans - Ranking - Proposal B:
1

CDEM Group Plans - Ranking - Proposal C:
3

37 Which is your preferred option, and why?

Which is your preferred option, and why?:
Proposal B

Comments (optional):

The proposal gives effect to the clear intention of the current Act to make CDEM Group Plans a public document. It reinforces the current ability to incorporate by reference which the Waikato CDEM Group support.
Option B retains the Group Plan as a strategic document, where C would potentially make it very operational and unwieldy.

38 What approach do you currently take to publishing your CDEM Group Plans?

Comments (optional):

We advertise its approval and make it publicly available via Council offices and facilities (libraries etc).
Its available on our Group website and has an ISBN online number.

39 Do you incorporate documents by reference into your CDEM Plan - if so, which documents do you incorporate (e.g. supporting plans, guidelines and technical standards)?

Yes

Comments:

There is no explicit clause in the Group Plan saying other documents are incorporated by reference and we note the capability to do so is provided by S51 of the Act. Documents which live outside the Group Plan and are referred in it include:

Group Controller Policy

Group financial and delegations policy

Community engagement strategy

Training strategy

Group warning systems strategy

Terms of Reference for various groups and committees (Joint Committee, CEG, Advisory groups etc)

Various plans (public education, Group recovery, welfare coordination, lifeline utility group charter and business plan)

40 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each of the options?

CDEM Group Plans - Set-up costs - Proposal A:
Low/no set-up costs

CDEM Group Plans - Set-up costs - Proposal B:
Moderate

CDEM Group Plans - Set-up costs - Proposal C:
Significant

41 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each of the options?

CDEM Group Plans - Ongoing Costs - Proposal A:
Neutral

CDEM Group Plans - Ongoing Costs - Proposal B:
Increased

CDEM Group Plans - Ongoing Costs - Proposal C:
Significantly increased

Undeclared emergencies

42 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Undeclared emergencies - Option One - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Undeclared emergencies - Option One - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Undeclared emergencies - Option One - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

Undeclared emergencies - Option One - Criteria - Consequences:

Slightly

Undeclared emergencies - Option One - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Not at all

Undeclared emergencies - Option One - Criteria - Operability:

Not at all

43 To what extent does Proposal B (response thresholds for coordination of undeclared events, incl. new Controller functions and power) align with each of the guiding principles?

Emergencies - Option Two - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Emergencies - Option Two - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Somewhat

Emergencies - Option Two - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Significantly

Emergencies - Option Two - Criteria - Consequences:

Significantly

Emergencies - Option Two - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Significantly

Emergencies - Option Two - Criteria - Operability:

Significantly

44 To what extent does Proposal C (introduce liability protections for undeclared events) align with each of the guiding principles?

Emergencies - Option Three - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Emergencies - Option Three - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Emergencies - Option Three - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

Emergencies - Option Three - Criteria - Consequences:

Slightly

Emergencies - Option Three - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Not at all

Emergencies - Option Three - Criteria - Operability:

Somewhat

45 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Undeclared emergencies - Ranking - Proposal A:

3

Undeclared emergencies - Ranking - Proposal B:

1

Undeclared emergencies - Ranking - Proposal C:

2

46 Which is your preferred option, and why?

Which is your preferred option, and why?:

Proposal B

Comments (optional):

Recognises and provides for the role in managing and decision-making that District and City Councils have in their communities. It also recognises the leadership that communities expect from their local government.

It gives effect to several of the guiding principles: System performance and accountability, consequences, role clarity and certainty and operability. It will enhance the iwi and Māori participation guiding principal, particularly during response and recovery.

We would note that liability protections should be introduced irrespective of what option is chosen and if proposal B is selected it should also provide for a local transition to recovery without the approval of the Minister (S94B (2)).

47 What do you consider to be the top three factors for enabling effective coordinated responses to undeclared emergencies?

Comments (optional):

The top three factors considered by the Waikato CDEM Group are:

Clear thresholds defined and alignment with the S17 provisions at District and City Council levels.

Clarity that the lead agency is the decision maker and needs to be defined prior to the management of an event (alignment with the Lead Agency proposals). Also, that the proposal allows management of emergency consequences without undermining other legislative processes (e.g., RMA and Health Act)

Clarity about financial obligations and commitments, roles, responsibilities, functions, and powers of key positions (e.g., Controller, Recovery Manager & Welfare Manager) and where they differ and are the same from declared emergencies.

48 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation? How can these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?:

How provisions can be made which enable development of good arrangements at regional and local levels without becoming prescriptive.

Undeclared emergencies need better clarification, and it is generally supported that they are brought into the legislation, however, the Lead Agency definition requires clarification as this could inadvertently provide greater control from central government which is not supported.

49 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each of the options?

Undeclared Emergencies - Set-up costs - Proposal A:

Low/no set-up costs

Undeclared Emergencies - Set-up costs - Proposal B:

Low/no set-up costs

Undeclared Emergencies - Set-up costs - Proposal C:

Low/no set-up costs

50 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each of the options?

Undeclared emergencies - Ongoing Costs - Proposal A:

Neutral

Undeclared emergencies - Ongoing Costs - Proposal B:

Increased

Undeclared emergencies - Ongoing Costs - Proposal C:

Neutral

Concurrent emergencies

51 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Concurrent emergencies - Option 1 - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Concurrent emergencies - Option 1 - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Concurrent emergencies - Option 1 - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Not at all

Concurrent emergencies - Option 1 - Criteria - Consequences:
Slightly

Concurrent emergencies - Option 1 - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

Concurrent emergencies - Option 1 - Criteria - Operability:
Slightly

52 To what extent does Proposal B (legislative direction for responding to concurrent emergencies) align with each of the guiding principles?

Concurrent emergencies - Option 2 - Criteria - Risk awareness:
Not at all

Concurrent emergencies - Option 2 - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Somewhat

Concurrent emergencies - Option 2 - Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

Concurrent emergencies - Option 2 - Criteria - Consequences:
Somewhat

Concurrent emergencies - Option 2 - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Significantly

Concurrent emergencies - Option 2 - Criteria - Operability:
Significantly

53 To what extent does Proposal C (additional guidance for responding to concurrent emergencies) align with each of the guiding principles?

Concurrent emergencies - Option 3 - Criteria - Risk awareness:
Not at all

Concurrent emergencies - Option 3 - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Slightly

Concurrent emergencies - Option 3 - Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Slightly

Concurrent emergencies - Option 3 - Criteria - Consequences:
Slightly

Concurrent emergencies - Option 3 - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

Concurrent emergencies - Option 3 - Criteria - Operability:
Slightly

54 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Concurrent emergencies - Ranking - Proposal A:
3

Concurrent emergencies - Ranking - Proposal B:
1

Concurrent emergencies - Ranking - Proposal C:
2

55 Which is your preferred option, and why?

Which is your preferred option, and why?:
Proposal B

Comments (optional):

Certainty is required to give maximum effect to the guiding principles: system performance and accountability, consequences, role clarity and certainty and operability. This is best provided by legislation, rather than "guidance" as suggest at option C

56 What do you consider to be the top three factors that would provide greater clarity for the effective management of concurrent emergencies?

What top three changes would enable effective coordinated response to concurrent emergencies?:

The top factors considered by Waikato CDEM Group are:

Clarity of thresholds between the levels of emergency management (National, Regional and Local)

Enabling legislation for Groups to determine their management of concurrent "local" emergencies.

57 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?:

No practical challenges foreseen.

58 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each of the options?

Concurrent emergencies - Set-up Costs - Proposal A:

Low/no set-up costs

Concurrent emergencies - Set-up Costs - Proposal B:

Low/no set-up costs

Concurrent emergencies - Set-up Costs - Proposal C:

Low/no set-up costs

59 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each of the options?

Concurrent emergencies - Ongoing Costs - Proposal A:

Neutral

Concurrent emergencies - Ongoing Costs - Proposal B:

Neutral

Concurrent emergencies - Ongoing Costs - Proposal C:

Neutral

Ambulance services

60 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Definition of emergency services - Option One - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option One - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option One - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option One - Criteria - Consequences:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option One - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option One - Criteria - Operability:

Not at all

61 To what extent does Proposal B (add 'ambulanceservices' to the definition of 'emergency services') align with each of the guiding principles?

Definition of emergency services - Option Two - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option Two - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option Two - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

Definition of emergency services - Option Two - Criteria - Consequences:

Not at all

Definition of emergency services - Option Two - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Slightly

Definition of emergency services - Option Two - Criteria - Operability:

Not at all

62 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Definition of emergency services - Ranking - Proposal A:

2

Definition of emergency services - Ranking - Proposal B:

1

63 Which is your preferred option, and why?

Which is your preferred option, and why?:

Proposal B

Comments (optional):

This proposal reflects the current and historic situation in the Waikato CDEM Group and others.

We believe it enhances guiding principles, system performance and accountability and role clarity and certainty.

64 Do you foresee any unintended or downstream consequences of adding 'ambulance services' to the definition of 'emergency services'?

Comments (optional):

While there are many potential consequences for this proposal change, these are the questions raised by the Waikato CDEM Group:

Does this effect the funding of ambulance services?

Will the definition of "emergency services" include Air and Helicopter Ambulance Services?

Can NGOs be directed to be CEG members?

We hope an unintended consequence may be supporting centralised funding of ambulance services the same as other core emergency services.

Lead agencies

65 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Lead agency - Option One - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Slightly

Lead agency - Option One - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Slightly

Lead agency - Option One - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Somewhat

Lead agency - Option One - Criteria - Consequences:

Somewhat

Lead agency - Option One - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Somewhat

Lead agency - Option One - Criteria - Operability:

Somewhat

66 To what extent does Proposal B (hook in the Act to enable the setting out of roles and responsibilities in regulations or rules) align with each of the guiding principles?

Lead agency - Option Two - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Slightly

Lead agency - Option Two - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Slightly

Lead agency - Option Two - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Significantly

Lead agency - Option Two - Criteria - Consequences:

Significantly

Lead agency - Option Two - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Significantly

Lead agency - Option Two - Criteria - Operability:
Significantly

67 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Lead agency - Ranking - Proposal A:
2

Lead agency - Ranking - Proposal B:
1

68 Which is your preferred option, and why?

Which is your preferred option, and why?:
Proposal B

Comments (optional):

We support the proposal to enable clarity and detail to be contained in other instruments (regs, rules, guides etc). This will enable flexibility at regional and local levels where differences in capability and capacity exist.
The proposal will enhance the guiding principles, system performance and accountability, consequences, role clarity and certainty and operability.
One concern raised was how does the Lead Agency fit into the legislation? If we have another pandemic response, then the Ministry of Health would be the lead agency. Does the change to the legislation then mean that, as the Lead Agency, the Ministry of Health could direct CDEM personnel to provide a supporting role with no input from the regions Joint Committee or Coordinating Executive Group?
Additionally, would the changes to Lead Agency and Undeclared Emergencies, when paired together allow central government to direct CDEM personnel and local council staff as the "Lead Agency" as and when required?

69 In drafting the regulations or rules for lead agencies, what do you consider to be the top three factors critical to ensure clarity of agency responsibilities?

In drafting the regulations for lead agency, what top three things are to critical to ensure clarity of agency responsibility?:

The top three factors Waikato CDEM Group considers are:
Alignment with concepts and fundamentals in CIMS 3rd edition.
Transfer of control from one agency to another as events progress and consequences evolve.
Clarity of lead agency responsibility across all 4R's.

Animal welfare

70 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Animal Welfare -Proposal a - Criteria - Risk awareness:
Not at all

Animal Welfare -Proposal a - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Not at all

Animal Welfare -Proposal a - Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Slightly

Animal Welfare -Proposal a - Criteria - Consequences:
Slightly

Animal Welfare -Proposal a - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

Animal Welfare -Proposal a - Criteria - Operability:
Somewhat

71 To what extent does Proposal B (expressly provide for the welfare of animals in emergencies) align with each of the guiding principles?

Animal welfare - option 2 - Criteria - Risk awareness:
Not at all

Animal welfare - option 2 - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Not at all

Animal welfare - option 2 - Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

Animal welfare - option 2 - Criteria - Consequences:
Somewhat

Animal welfare - option 2 - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Significantly

Animal welfare - option 2 - Criteria - Operability:
Significantly

72 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Animal Welfare - Ranking - Proposal A:
2

Animal Welfare - Ranking - Proposal B:
1

73 Which is your preferred option, and why?

Animal Welfare:
Proposal B

Comments (optional):

The proposal formalises existing practice and clarifies management of animal welfare during emergencies is a function of the Controller. It reflects the importance people put on both companion animals and primary livestock. The proposal supports the current activity of agencies e.g., Ministry of Primary Industries. Proposal B enhances guiding principles, System performance and accountability, Consequences, Role clarity and certainty and Operability

74 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

Animal Welfare:

The practical challenges that the Waikato CDEM Group considered are:
There is a variety of organisational capacity and capability around the country and enabling legislation will allow Groups to meet the objectives of the guiding principles in a way that reflect their community needs.
Management of consequences to significant primary livestock populations during response. There should be increased effort to reinforce owners of primary livestock awareness of their own emergency planning and business continuity
There will be financial impacts during response and recovery. Reimbursement of costs for animal welfare should be provided for to enable the function.

75 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each of the options?

Animal Welfare - Set up costs - Proposal A:
Low/no set-up costs

Animal Welfare - Set up costs - Proposal B:
Medium

76 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each of the options?

Animal Welfare - ongoing costs - Proposal A:
Neutral

Animal Welfare - ongoing costs - Proposal B:
Increased

Disproportionately impacted people - planning requirements

77 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

DISPRO - Option One - Criteria - Risk awareness:
Slightly

DISPRO - Option One - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Slightly

DISPRO - Option One - Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

DISPRO - Option One - Criteria - Consequences:
Somewhat

DISPRO - Option One - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

DISPRO - Option One - Criteria - Operability:
Somewhat

78 To what extent does Proposal B (require engagement with disproportionately impacted people in CDEM Group planning) align with each of the guiding principles?

DISPRO - Option Two - Criteria - Risk awareness:
Significantly

DISPRO - Option Two - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Somewhat

DISPRO - Option Two - Criteria - System performance and accountability:
Somewhat

DISPRO - Option Two - Criteria - Consequences:
Somewhat

DISPRO - Option Two - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Significantly

DISPRO - Option Two - Criteria - Operability:
Somewhat

79 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

DISPRO - Ranking - Proposal A:
2

DISPRO - Ranking - Proposal B:
1

80 Which is your preferred option and why?

Which is your preferred option and why?:
Proposal B

Comments (optional):

The proposal makes explicit the implied obligations currently contained in S17 and gives weight and meaning to the S38 obligation. Proposal B enhances the guiding principles, Risk awareness, Iwi and Māori participation and Role clarity and certainty.

81 What does success look like for an inclusive and community-led emergency management approach in practice? What are three key changes needed to get us there?

What does success look like for a an inclusive and community-led emergency management approach in practice?:

Waikato CDEM Group considered these three key changes

Enabling legislation. Prescription will work for some communities and against others.

Integration of emergency management planning with Community Development teams at District and City Council level.

Clarity of meaning of what "disproportionally impacted people" means. How do we know where these people are going to be? There are certain Groups of people who need to be considered as part of the emergency management planning process.

82 Are there any other changes that could be made to the legislation to improve the outcomes for people who are disproportionately impacted, especially Māori and disabled people?

Are there any other changes that could be made to the legislation to improve the outcomes for people who are disproportionately impacted, especially Māori and disabled people?:

No alternative changes were discussed or considered

83 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?:

If option D (Roles and Responsibilities - Functions) is selected, achieving the proposal will be increasingly difficult as District and City Councils are removed directly from S 17 functions.

84 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each of the options?

DISPRO - Set-up costs - Proposal A:
Low/no set-up costs

DISPRO - Set-up costs - Proposal B:
Medium

85 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each of the options?

DISPRO - Ongoing costs - Proposal A:
Neutral

DISPRO - Ongoing costs - Proposal B:
Significantly increased

Critical infrastructure - planning level of emergency services

86 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

ELS - Option one - criteria - Risk awareness:
Slightly

ELS - Option one - criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Not at all

ELS - Option one - criteria - System performance and accountability:
Slightly

ELS - Option one - criteria - Consequences:
Slightly

ELS - Option one - criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

ELS - Option one - criteria - Operability:
Slightly

87 To what extent does Proposal B (Lifeline Utilities must publicly state their Planning Emergency Level of Service every three years) align with each of the guiding principles?

ELS - Option two - criteria - Risk awareness:
Significantly

ELS - Option two - criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:
Not at all

ELS - Option two - criteria - System performance and accountability:
Slightly

ELS - Option two - criteria - Consequences:
Significantly

ELS - Option two - criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

ELS - Option two - criteria - Operability:
Significantly

88 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Critical Infra - Ranking - Proposal A:
2

Critical Infra - Ranking - Proposal B:
1

89 Which is your preferred option and why?

Which is your preferred option and why?:

Proposal B

Comments (optional):

The proposal reflects some of the pro-active decisions of the Waikato Lifelines Utility Group e.g., data sharing and vulnerability planning projects and is generally supported by its members.

Proposal B enhances the guiding principles, Risk awareness, Consequences and Operability

90 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?:

The following challenges were discussed by the Waikato CDEM Group:

Competition between providers may inhibit the openness suggested in Option B (publicly available)

There are critical infrastructure networks which already plan nationally e.g., electricity sector and this level of planning should be recognised to avoid duplication. What they report may change, but the channels may stay the same.

There may be significant resourcing requirement in Critical Infrastructure entities to meet the proposal - an incremental planning requirement would support those entities to develop capacity and capability.

91 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each option?

ESL - Set up Costs - Proposal A:

Low/no set-up costs

ESL - Set up Costs - Proposal B:

Significant

92 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each option?

ELS - Ongoing Costs - Proposal A:

Neutral

ELS - Ongoing Costs - Proposal B:

Significantly increased

Critical infrastructure - reporting, monitoring, and evaluation

93 To what extent does Proposal A (current state) align with each of the guiding principles?

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option One - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Slightly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option One - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option One - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option One - Criteria - Consequences:

Slightly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option One - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:

Slightly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option One - Criteria - Operability:

Slightly

94 To what extent does Proposal B (new monitoring, evaluation, and annual reporting requirements to ensure readiness) align with each of the guiding principles?

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option Two - Criteria - Risk awareness:

Significantly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option Two - Criteria - Iwi and Māori participation:

Not at all

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option Two - Criteria - System performance and accountability:

Slightly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option Two - Criteria - Consequences:
Significantly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option Two - Criteria - Role clarity and certainty:
Slightly

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Option Two - Criteria - Operability:
Significantly

95 Please rank the options from most preferred to least preferred with "1" being the most preferred.

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Ranking - Proposal A:

2

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Ranking - Proposal B:

1

96 Which is your preferred option and why?

Which is your preferred option and why?:

Proposal Two

Which is your preferred option and why?:

The proposal enhances the proposed "planning emergency levels of service" provision and is generally supported by Waikato Lifeline Utility Group members. We consider there is an opportunity for critical infrastructure providers to work together in respect of particular hazards.

Proposal B enhances the guiding principles, Risk awareness, Consequences and Operability

97 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?

What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for the implementation of any option? How can these be mitigated?:

Differentiation between sector groups and local utilities. Where sectors have National governing bodies, they should continue to report to a national body. We would like to see what the proposed penalties for non-compliance might be if option B was selected.

How information from national agencies will filter down to Groups without requiring duplication.

There are strong obligations on District and City Council utility operators to report on a variety of matters. This proposal adds and potentially replicates the existing burden. A full audit / understanding of what reporting obligations exist now and where possible extend them to cover the goals desired by emergency management.

98 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for each option?

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Set up costs - Proposal A:

Low/no set-up costs

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Set up costs - Proposal B:

Significant

99 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for each option?

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Ongoing costs - Proposal A:

Neutral

Reporting, monitoring and evaluation - Ongoing costs - Proposal B:

Significantly increased

Māori Emergency Management Advisory Group (MEMAG)

100 What roles and functions do you see the MEMAG performing?

What roles and functions do you see the MEMAG performing? :

We support the principles of a National Māori Advisory Group.

Are there existing agencies and structures with appropriate networks to provide the advice to CDEM Groups / NEMA to advise on Iwi and Māori participation in emergency management?

101 What do you see as the most meaningful way for the MEMAG to interact with Joint Committees, Co-ordinating Executive Groups (CEGs), and yourselves?

What is the most meaningful way for the MEMAG to interact with Joint Committees, CEGs and yourselves?:

Interaction at a lower level may overlap with iwi/Māori representation at the JC/CEG Level. More work to understand layering of Māori interests through the levels is required. Design this so it coordinates with what Local Government already have or are proposing in respect of Māori wards.

Joint Committee representation

102 What do you consider to be the top three factors for ensuring the success of iwi and Māori representation on Joint Committees?

Top three things to consider:

We support the goal of iwi and Māori representation on Joint Committee. In 2021 the Waikato CDEM Group resolved to explore how iwi and Māori could be represented at Joint committee (within existing legal arrangements). The top factors considered by the Waikato CDEM Group are:

Iwi and Māori need to determine representation.

Representation is equitable, not equal. We do not support the apparently arbitrary number of representatives (2).

103 What electoral process makes sense in your region (e.g. colleges or boundary requirements)?

What electoral process makes sense in your region (e.g. colleges or boundary requirements?):

This process should be determined by iwi/Māori

104 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

Do you foresee any practical challenges with the appointment of Māori CEG members?:

No practical challenges considered or discussed.

Co-ordinating Executive Group (CEG) representation

105 What do you consider to be the top three factors for ensuring the success of iwi and Māori representation on CEGs?

Top three things for consideration:

We support the goal of iwi and Māori representation on CEG. In 2021 the Waikato CDEM Group resolved to explore how iwi and Māori could be represented throughout the emergency management system (within existing legal arrangements).

The top factor is that iwi and Māori determine representation. We support an enabling approach to legislation in this regard.

106 What electoral process makes sense in your region (e.g. colleges or boundary requirements)?

What electoral process makes sense in your region (e.g. colleges or boundary requirements?):

This process should be determined by iwi/Māori

107 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

Do you foresee any practical challenges with the appointment of Māori Joint Committee members?:

No practical challenges considered or discussed.

Iwi and Māori Function

108 What variations, changes, or additions could be made to the requirements to ensure the success of a new iwi and Māori function on Joint Committees?

Comments (optional):

The Waikato CDEM Group support the goal of iwi and Māori participation in emergency management. In 2021 the Waikato CDEM Group resolved to explore how iwi and Māori could be represented and participate throughout the emergency management system (within existing legal arrangements).

109 What are the top three things you have found most effective when engaging with iwi and Māori? Do you have a publicly available strategy or other documentation for such engagement? If so, please add a link.

What other requirements could be included with respect to iwi and Māori under this function?:

Many councils already have Māori engagement frameworks and structures. Use of these should be maximised by emergency management in working towards meeting the guiding principle of iwi and Māori participation.

Additionally, consideration should be given to how Pascifika groups can be included.

110 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

To what extent do you engage with iwi Māori and do you have a public strategy for this?:

The proposed inclusion of Māori in emergency management (e.g., representation on both the JC and CEG) is an improvement from what we currently have, however it falls short of meeting the crowns partnerships obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi and places the burden and relationship risk associated with the selection and appointment process on the councils /CDEM group.

111 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for the proposed new feature?

Iwi/Maori Functions - Set up costs - New feature:
Significant

112 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for the proposed new feature?

Iwi/Maori Functions - Ongoing costs - New feature:
Significantly increased

Consultation on CDEM Group Plans and strategies

113 What would need to be in place to ensure the success of a new consultation requirement to consult with iwi and Māori in developing CDEM Group plans and strategies?

Comments (optional):

We support the goal of Iwi and Māori participation in emergency management. In 2021 the Waikato CDEM Group resolved to explore how Iwi and Māori could be represented and participate throughout the emergency management system (within existing legal arrangements).

114 Does requiring CDEM Groups to 'have regard to' comments go far enough?

Comments (optional):
Yes

Does 'have regard to' go far enough?:

The nature of consultation / submission / input from Iwi /Maori should determine the outcome.

115 Do you foresee any practical challenges with the requirement to consult iwi and Māori in the development of CDEM Group Plans and Strategies? How might these be mitigated?

Do you foresee any practical challenges with the requirement to consult iwi and Māori in the development of CDEM Group Plans and Strategies?:

For plans and strategies other than the Group Plan the desire to consult should be determined by Iwi / Maori.

116 What do you foresee as the likely level of set-up costs for the proposed new feature?

Consultation - Set-up Costs - New feature:
Significant

117 What do you foresee as the likely level of ongoing costs for the proposed new feature?

Consultation - ongoing costs - New feature:
Significantly increased

Additional proposal - iwi and Māori roles and responsibilities in the National CDEM Plan

118 What could be put in place to ensure the success of the proposed change?

Comments:

Iwi / Māori should be involved in this decision.

119 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

Comments :

No practical challenges considered or discussed.

Additional proposal - permanent legislative authority to reimburse iwi and Māori

120 What could be put in place to ensure the success of this change?

Comments:

We support the proposal to enable reimbursement of response costs direct to Iwi and Māori entities. This supports the concept of manaakitanga and acknowledges the resources and effort deployed by Iwi / Māori in supporting communities affected by the consequences of emergencies. We think this proposal applies equally to Pasifika communities / entities and significant NGOs with a role described in the National Plan (e.g., Salvation Army, Red Cross)

121 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

Comments:

The Waikato CDEM Group ask if the National Plan (and guide) would be a better mechanism to provide for this proposal?

Additional proposal - modernised purpose statement

122 What could be put in place to ensure the success of the proposed change?

Comments:

We support the proposed change to the purpose of the Act.

123 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

Comments:

No practical challenges considered or discussed.

Additional proposal - new rule making powers

124 What could be put in place to ensure the success of the proposed change?

Comments:

The principle of NEMA providing and enabling technical support to Groups to meet the provisions of the Act is supported. We note there are existing mechanisms in place to provide such support in the form of Directors Guidelines and Technical Standards. There would need to be very clear parameters for when and how this power was used.

125 What, if any, practical challenges do you foresee for implementation? How might these be mitigated?

Comments:

The imposition of "rules" is very directive and so there is a blurring of the lines between Central Government policy setting role and Local Governments delivery role. Further clarity enabling flexibility for changing.

Additional comments

126 Please let us know if you have any further comments.

Additional Comments:

A review of Group Membership is suggested given that there are different jurisdictions of support agencies and where there may be greater alignment with another Group.