

RCOI Response Steering Group Minutes

Date/Time	17/08/2022, 2.30 – 3.30 pm
Venue	Cabinet Committee Room (8.5), Beehive and Virtual via Zoom
Chair	Shane Collins, Relationship Manager, RCOI Response and Engagement Team, National Security Policy Directorate, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
In attendance	Corrections, Customs, Department of Internal Affairs, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, New Zealand Security Intelligence Service, Government Communications Security Bureau, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, Ministry for Ethnic Communities, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Ministry of Defence, New Zealand Police, Statistics New Zealand and the Treasury.
Apologies	Ministry of Education, Crown Law

Item	Topic
1	<p>Welcome and Chair's update</p> <p>The Chair welcomed members and thanked all for attending and acknowledged it was a busy time for all, both across the Royal Commission response – and a range of other areas.</p> <p>The Chair noted that DPMC is scheduled to deliver a paper to Cabinet later in 2022 on the Response Outcomes Framework– but this timing may change acknowledging there a large number of papers across a range of portfolios due for Cabinet consideration in November and December.</p> <p>DPMC is seeking guidance from the Prime Minister on how she may best wish to use her Cabinet time during this busy period. Subject to the Prime Minister's advice, the Response Outcomes Framework paper may go to Cabinet in early 2023. If this happens, the work on the development of the Framework will continue in current timeframes – noting the need to have this completed by year end in any event in support of a paper in early 2023.</p> <p>Also, the Prime Minister is being canvassed as to her view on the annual RCOI report back Cabinet paper taking the form of a briefing from DPMC to Minister Little that he can share with his colleagues. This is noting that any such report back is likely to be of a noting nature only versus seeking Cabinet agreement or decision making on substantive issued – unlike last year when Cabinet's agreement to the long-term response work programme was sought.</p> <p>Minister Little has been canvassed on the Response Outcomes Framework going up in early 2023 – and the annual report back being by way of a briefing to him to share with his colleagues. He indicated his potential comfort with this approach.</p> <p>The minutes of the prior meeting (15 June 2022) were taken as read and accepted for publishing – subject to any further feedback from agencies after the meeting. The Chair advised that the minutes and those of future meetings, including this one, will list agencies in attendance and apologies. This will be at the level of agencies versus individuals.</p> <p>The Chair proposed that Action 26, referring to the Outreach Group to consider the coordination of engagement activity with the Christchurch community, be closed. This is noting the processes now in place to collect</p>

IN-CONFIDENCE

Item	Topic
	<p>information on engagement as part of the monthly tracker update process. There were no objections to this proposal and Action 26 is to be closed.</p>
2	<p>Response to Kāpuia’s letter of advice to Lead Coordination Minister</p> <p>DPMC noted that Kāpuia sent advice to the Lead Coordination Minister on 27 June 2022 regarding its assessment of the Royal Commission response. It is currently intended that a meeting of Responsible Ministers will inform the Minister’s response to the advice. Minister Little’s office is seeing if a meeting can be arranged over coming weeks, noting Ministers prior commitments.</p> <p>Both the advice and Ministers response to it will be published on the DPMC website as per prior practice.</p> <p>DPMC acknowledged that some agencies have briefed their Ministers on Kāpuia’s advice as it applies to their workstreams – and that others may wish to do this to ensure their Minister is fully informed ahead of any Responsible Ministers meeting. DPMC requested a copy of any such advice provided for alignment and coordination purposes.</p> <p>The meeting was also advised that the Lead Coordination Minister met with Kāpuia last week and made it clear that Ministers needed time to consider the advice before he provides a formal reply. He indicated he hoped to send a response by the end of the month. DPMC undertook to circulate a draft response to members once it has been provided to the Minister. (Note: subsequently done via email to members from DPMC on 29 August.)</p> <p>DPMC invited agencies to comment on Kāpuia’s advice and the process for responding to it. Their key point raised included the need for a coordinated response at Ministerial and agency level.</p>
3	<p>Reporting to Lead Coordination Minister</p> <p>DPMC noted that a draft template for new format reporting to the Lead Coordination Minister was included in the meeting documentation. This follows the Minister’s request for an overview report that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a Red, Amber and Green (RAG) status indicator for each line of work. • the RAG status assigned by Kāpuia in its 27 June letter of advice • a high-level summary of risks and mitigations for individual lines of work. <p>The draft template included examples and direction on the nature of reporting required.</p> <p>The proposed new reporting differs from the current monthly milestone tracker by providing value-add through assessment and insight useful for the Minister in his Lead Coordination role. Subject to Ministerial feedback it is intended to supply this new reporting to the Minister every second month in lieu of the current milestone tracker.</p> <p>In the case of identified risks and mitigations, DPMC noted this is not referring to the detailed content of agency programme/project risk registers – rather what is top of mind and would be appropriate for Ministerial level visibility. It was also noted that agencies may wish to ensure no-surprises for their Ministers on information provided to DPMC for passing to the Lead Coordination Minister.</p> <p>DPMC requested views on the grouping of the recommendations into themes. It was noted that the thematic groupings reflected, to a large degree, those Kāpuia has previously used. As a result of feedback provided DPMC undertook to make amendments to the groupings to ensure that specific lines of work having a strong social cohesion foundation are not cast as being national security centric in nature. This was in recognition of the need not to unintentionally “securitise” work that has its foundation in social cohesion considerations.</p> <p>There were no objections to the RAG status criteria proposed in the draft document.</p> <p>DPMC advised that the column titled “Commentary” in the draft template referred to any comment the response Lead Official may wish to provide the Lead Coordination Minister. Accepting there may be many workstreams where no such commentary is provided, this column risked becoming redundant. DPMC advised it would be exploring other means by which any appropriate Lead Official commentary could be provided to the Minister.</p> <p>The need for funding and source related considerations to also inform agencies input was also discussed and noted.</p>

IN-CONFIDENCE

Item	Topic
	<p>DPMC undertook to update the draft template based on the feedback received and send it out for agencies to complete and return – with a return deadline of Friday 26 August. It also undertook to provide the criteria Kāpuia used for its RAG status assignment. (Note: subsequently done via email to members from DPMC on 18 August.)</p>
4	<p>Risk Register</p> <p>A Risk Register for agencies’ review and feedback was included in meeting documentation. This speaks to Action 24: DPMC to create a risk and issue register for RSG – populate it with the matters discussed our February meeting – and circulate it for discussion.</p> <p>It was highlighted that RSG’s approval to the Risk Register was not being sought at this meeting– rather the intent is to socialise the intended approach, seek any immediate feedback, and continue to develop it prior to bringing it back to a subsequent meeting for approval and adoption.</p> <p>It was also noted that the new format reporting to the Lead Coordination Minister discussed under the previous agenda item was listed as a potential additional control for some of the risks included in the draft register.</p> <p>Feedback received included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the risks currently included in the draft were accurately characterised; • agency resourcing and related funding considerations needed to be clearly reflected as risks to ongoing effective response work programme delivery; and • the need to ensure clear ownership of individual mitigation actions is identified in the register – at present it included several high-level statements around which clear ownership was not apparent. <p>It was questioned if the intent was to only capture risks related to the coordination and alignment of the response work programme – and if the risk that the response, overall, may not deliver required outcomes was something that needed to be captured and effectively monitored. It was acknowledged this a valid point – but that work underway on the development of a Response Outcomes Framework and its ongoing monitoring and evaluation elements (see discussion under agenda item 1) will speak to this need – versus this being addressed in the Risk Register.</p> <p>DPMC invited further feedback on the draft register following the meeting to inform its ongoing development – after which it will be brought back to a future meeting for consideration for approval and adoption.</p> <p>New Action (number 28): Agencies to provide any additional feedback to DPMC (Chris Ford) on draft risk register to inform its further development – after which DPMC will it back to a future meeting for consideration for approval and adoption.</p>
5	<p>Policy Community Engagement Tool</p> <p>DPMC thanked agencies that responded to the Policy Community Engagement Tool survey in July.</p> <p>It was suggested funding related questions are included as part of the next Tool survey, recognising that higher levels of engagement on the IAP2 Spectrum require more resource and funding for effective delivery.</p> <p>New Action (number 29): DPMC to include additional questions on any funding related considerations in the upcoming survey of the Policy Community Engagement Tool.</p>
6	<p>Kāpuia update</p> <p>The Secretariat thanked agencies who have engaged with Kāpuia and noted the challenges of engaging under COVID-19 settings. The Secretariat summarised the hui held on 4 August and noted Kāpuia’s letter of advice should be seen as a snapshot in time and not set in stone.</p> <p>It was noted the next hui will be held in person in Wellington, on 15 September. Hui for the remainder of the year will take place on 27 October virtually and 7 December in person. There is no hui scheduled in November, but all scheduling is subject to change as the roopu requires.</p>

IN-CONFIDENCE

Item	Topic
7	<p>Any other business</p> <p>DPMC provided an update on the upcoming Ministerial hui in Christchurch on 3 September 2022. It is an opportunity for Ministers and senior Government officials to meet with the Christchurch communities to discuss the Government's response to the Royal Commission. Invitations were circulated last week.</p> <p>In response to a question from the meeting it was confirmed the annual He Whenua Taurikura will take place over 30 October – 1 November in Auckland – and planning for this is underway.</p> <p>It was noted the RSG meeting is scheduled for 21 September 2022 from 2.00 to 3.00 pm – and this is already in calendars.</p>
8	<p>Meeting closed</p> <p>Meeting closed at 3.25pm</p>

IN-CONFIDENCE