

Delivering better responses to natural disasters and other emergencies

Government response to the Technical Advisory Group's recommendations

AUGUST 2018

**Delivering better responses to natural
disasters and other emergencies –
Government response to the Technical
Advisory Group's recommendations.**

August 2018

ISBN: 978-0-947520-06-9 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-947520-07-6 (online)

Cover photograph by
Mark Hannah



Hon Kris Fafoi
Minister of Civil Defence

Delivering better responses to natural disasters and other emergencies

The Government is committed to ensuring people and communities are well taken care of and supported in any emergency or disaster, wherever and whenever it happens.

In January 2018, I released a report by a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) that provided advice and options on how to deliver better responses to natural disasters and other emergencies.

The Government has carefully considered the TAG's report and its 42 recommendations, and this is our response.

The TAG was asked to focus on response (and readiness to respond) within the emergency response system, and so that is the focus of this report. However, the Government wishes to acknowledge that community resilience and preparedness is a very important part of emergency management.

Across New Zealand, regions are leading innovative work to enhance our resilience, and we applaud the great work underway.

Throughout the emergency management system there is passion and commitment from all those who respond to emergencies, paid staff and volunteers alike. The people who roll up their sleeves to help when disaster strikes are the backbone of our response system.

In recent years, significant global and local events have changed how we think about emergency management. The Canterbury and Kaikōura/Wellington earthquakes and the Port Hills fire are still fresh in our minds.

A changing climate means we get more frequent storms and floods. Globally, we see the impact of tsunami, pandemics, cyber-attacks, armed conflict, and other hazards that cause serious harm to people, environments, and economies. Our risks are changing.

Our response system must change too to ensure it works when we need it. Improvements are therefore needed to clarify, strengthen, modernise, and professionalise it, to ensure it performs when needed.

This response sets out a broad, multi-year work programme that will deliver extensive change to New Zealand's emergency response system.

Many of the proposals in the TAG report are not new, and some were raised in the review of the Canterbury earthquake response. Without the significant change set out in this response, we run the risk that a future review will make the same recommendations. If we don't act, our people, economy, and environment could be more adversely affected than might otherwise be the case.

We have worked with local government, iwi, communities and other agencies as we developed this response. I would like to thank the TAG, led by Hon. Roger Sowry, and all those who contributed.

I look forward to continuing this important work to deliver better responses to emergencies, for all our communities.

Improving how New Zealand responds to natural disasters and other emergencies requires us to make progress in five key areas:

- 1 Putting the safety and wellbeing of people at the heart of the emergency response system
- 2 Strengthening the national leadership of the emergency management system
- 3 Making it clear who is responsible for what, nationally and regionally
- 4 Building the capability and capacity of the emergency management workforce
- 5 Improving the information and intelligence system that supports decision making in emergencies

The Government's response to each of the TAG's recommendations is in Appendix 1.

Contents

Putting the safety and wellbeing of people at the heart of the emergency response system	4
Strengthening the national leadership of the emergency management system	6
Making it clear who is responsible for what, nationally and regionally	8
Building the capability and capacity of the emergency management workforce	10
Improving the information and intelligence system that supports decision making in emergencies	12
Appendix 1: The Technical Advisory Group's specific recommendations	14
Chapter 1: National level (functions and structure)	15
Chapter 2: Regional structure	19
Chapter 3: Declarations	22
Chapter 4: Role of Iwi	25
Chapter 5: Capability and capacity	27
Chapter 6: Authority	30
Chapter 7: Intelligence	35
Chapter 8: Information and communication	38

Putting the safety and wellbeing of people at the heart of the emergency response system

What do we want to do and why?

Community resilience and preparedness is a very important part of emergency management. Our system expects individuals, families, whānau, communities, and businesses to be prepared to help themselves when disaster strikes. So people can do this effectively, we need to ensure that people are at the heart of the emergency management system.

Our current response system places a lot of emphasis on getting our infrastructure up and running, which is undoubtedly important. But emphasising the wellbeing of those affected by an emergency is equally important.

Effective communication with the public is essential in a response. We want to ensure better communication with the public during emergency responses so that people know what is going on, what to expect, and what to do. It is important that we use the wide range of information sources and channels that are available.

Early warning systems are a critical component of our system. They enable individuals and communities at risk from hazards to act effectively and in sufficient time to reduce the likelihood of death, injury, and damage to property and the environment. The Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management has had a strong focus in recent years on improving the consistency of warnings to the public across all hazards. This work will continue. Any delays in providing warnings about potential tsunami puts lives at risk. We want to ensure that any delays in the current system are removed.

Early and effective engagement with communities and individuals affected by an emergency is critical to support them in the immediate aftermath and in their longer-term recovery. We want to see improvements in how people's welfare needs are registered and assessed on the ground during responses. This includes common standards for collection of welfare data. This is about how we find out what individuals or households need during a response and what questions to ask. We want to ensure that our processes for meeting those welfare needs are in good shape.

We recognise that people and communities face different challenges during and following natural disasters and other emergencies. Our role is to ensure that all New Zealanders get a consistent standard of care in an emergency, no matter who or where they are.

We recognise that iwi bring a great deal of capability in relation to emergency management. We want greater recognition, understanding and integration of iwi/Māori perspectives and tikanga in emergency management – before, during, and after an event. We also want to recognise and support the role of marae who look after people in an emergency.

We know that some communities and individuals are more vulnerable to negative impacts than others. The Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management will continue to engage with the disabled and other communities to ensure that their needs are met before, during, and after an emergency.

Although there is significant strength and resilience within rural communities, the challenges they face are different to those faced by urban communities due to the dispersed and isolated nature of the rural population. Our emergency response system must accommodate this.

What are we doing now and what will we do in the next 12 months?

- Improve communication with the public in an emergency response so they know what is going on, what to expect, and what to do.
- Improve how important strategic information is shared with key decision makers, spokespeople, and the media, so they get the right advice at the right time.
- Continue current work on improving the consistency of warnings to the public across all hazards.
- Speed up tsunami warnings.
- Scope work needed to identify and upgrade suitable marae for emergency management purposes.
- Work with Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups to scope a system to capture and store welfare registration and needs assessment data using common standards and robust processes for data collection.



NZ POLICE IMAGE SUPPLIED

What will take a bit longer?

- Develop a longer-term approach to working with iwi on matters of governance and planning.
- Implement agreed changes to welfare registration and data collection systems and processes.

Links to TAG recommendations

- 4.1 Recognise the capability that iwi bring to emergency management.
- 4.2 Legislate to enable iwi to participate in planning for and responding to a natural disaster or other emergency, and to bring more clarity to their role.
- 7.3.3 Increase the speed by which alerts are provided and distributed.
- 8.1 Confirm the Mayor as the primary spokesperson and provide the Mayor with supported strategic communications advice.
- 8.2 Recognise strategic communications as an essential element of effective response.
- 8.4 Ensure timely, consistent, and proactive use of the range of appropriate media channels both for communication, and for gathering intelligence.



Strengthening the national leadership of the emergency management system

What do we want to do and why?

The Government has a core role in ensuring that our emergency management system is fit-for-purpose and will work when called upon. This role is wider than just 'response' – the emergency management system covers the 4Rs of risk reduction, readiness, response, and recovery.

We want greater nationwide consistency and where it is needed, stronger, directive national leadership. We want to work collaboratively with stakeholders to improve the performance of the emergency management system.

We agree with the TAG that the national emergency management agency, whether it is the existing Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management or a new agency, needs to play a greater leadership role in the emergency management system. It should continue to have a strong 'all hazards and risks' and operational 4Rs focus.

It needs to work with communities, iwi, business, local government and central government agencies to create an emergency management system that is able to plan for, withstand, respond to and support recovery from emergencies when they occur.

This involves activities such as standard setting and monitoring, developing common ways of working, building the capability of the emergency management workforce, leading investments in system-level infrastructure, and providing assurance to the Government and the public that the system is able to perform.

The national agency must also have a strong operational function to lead the coordination of a response to national-scale emergencies, regardless of what hazard causes them, and to support local government to coordinate the response to local-scale emergencies.

Outside of the national agency, other government agencies manage incidents that happen in their patch, because they have expertise in dealing with particular hazards. For example, the Ministry for Primary Industries leads responses to biosecurity threats and the Ministry of Health leads on risks to human health. The national emergency management agency comes in to support these agencies when needed.

For some risks and hazards, such as infrastructure failure, it's not clear who should be in the lead. We will work with agencies to clarify and confirm which agencies are best placed to have lead agency responsibilities for specific hazards.

We want government agencies to ensure that the emergency management system works together and is fit-for-purpose far into the future. This means better stewardship of the system.

Finally, we want New Zealanders to recognise that emergency management is broader than what the outdated term of 'civil defence' suggests. We want to keep it simple and call it what it actually is – 'emergency management'.

What are we doing now and what will we do in the next 12 months?

- Develop options as to the functions, form, and location of our national emergency management agency.
- Enhance stewardship through existing chief executive governance arrangements, supported by Ministers, to drive greater cohesion across the emergency management system.
- Work with government agencies to clarify and confirm lead agencies responsible for hazard-specific incidents.

What will take a bit longer?

- Strengthen the leadership of our national emergency management agency to set, monitor and enforce national standards for emergency management, so there is a consistent minimum standard of care across the country.
- Retire the name 'civil defence' and replace it with 'emergency management' to better reflect the broad and integrated nature of who the emergency management sector is and what it does.

Links to TAG recommendations

- 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.7** Agree to establish a new National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) to provide strong national leadership.
- 1.5** Agree that the NEMA's monitoring responsibilities, and OAG responsibilities, will be used to full effect through publication of results.
- 1.6** Agree that lead agency responsibilities are allocated to appropriate agencies.
- 1.8** Strengthen incentives and accountability for system stewardship.

Making it clear who is responsible for what, nationally and regionally

What do we want to do and why?

Most of our readiness for, and response to, emergencies happens at the local level. Local authorities in each region are required to form a Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Group to provide for and coordinate emergency management in the region.

CDEM Groups can largely determine how they operate and what they do. This has allowed for flexibility and innovation. However, it also means we have a wide variety of approaches to emergency response, and variable practices and capability, from region to region.

Local authorities are also able to undertake emergency management independently of the Group and the TAG noted that some don't 'buy-in' to the Group approach. If some local authorities don't participate fully then we may not get the full benefits of economies of scale to support a capable workforce. We want cooperation and coordination to maximise the impact and reach of readiness activities, and an understanding of hazards and their impacts at a regional scale.

Inconsistent approaches across New Zealand makes it harder for the Government to ensure that people are getting a consistent minimum standard of care across the country, and for the national agency and other Groups to support responses.

We want all local authorities to engage fully in the regional approach so there is consistency, collaboration, and capability and therefore confidence in the emergency response system.

We want to keep some flexibility for local innovation to meet local needs; we know there is no 'one size fits all'. However, some rebalancing is needed so that flexibility doesn't get in the way of the smooth operation of readiness and response.

We want relevant people in the system to know what their role and authority is in an emergency. Currently, roles and authority are not as clear as they could be, resulting in duplication, gaps, confusion and frustration, and ultimately a poorer response.

We want to tighten all of this up, primarily through changing the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 to clarify functions and authority, and making regulations under that Act to set national standards. We also want to ensure that the Co-ordinated Incident Management System is used consistently across all agencies operating in the system.

The national agency will follow this up with good monitoring and assurance processes. It will also continue to do national planning for how agencies will work together and who will do what, when.

We will work with local government on all of this.

What are we doing now and what will we do in the next 12 months?

- Continue to review national plans with agencies to improve planning and arrangements for how agencies will work together and who will do what.
- Formalise roles and responsibilities in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System.
- Clarify in relevant documents what 'lead agency' means (e.g. the Co-ordinated Incident Management System manual, the National Security Systems handbook, and the National CDEM Plan).
- Encourage CDEM Groups to co-opt ambulance services onto their Co-ordinating Executive Groups.



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL IMAGE SUPPLIED

What will take a bit longer?

Changing the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act to:

- Require local authorities to cooperate as a CDEM Group within each region with shared emergency management services and personnel.
- Clarify that Mayors declare states of local emergency for their district or city and require that they consider the advice of a Controller (where this is practicable).
- Provide for the National Controller, Group Controllers and Local Controllers to each have a clear function and power to coordinate an emergency response in the appropriate circumstances.
- Require CDEM Groups to have a clear decision point and communications for when there is an emergency so it is clear who is in charge.
- Clarify criteria for declaring a state of local emergency (that emergency powers are, or likely to be, necessary).
- Determine whether the Director of Civil Defence Emergency Management should be able to intervene in a local response where there are matters of national interest.
- Include ambulance services on each CDEM Group's Co-ordinating Executive Group.

Links to TAG recommendations

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2.1, 2.2 | Require CDEM Groups to: take a regional approach consistent with the intent of the CDEM Act; and to provide adequate funding and resourcing for effective CDEM activities. |
| 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 | Strengthen: national standards over minimum requirements; CDEM Group (joint committee) governance; and accountability for Group performance. |
| 2.6 | Require the development of shared emergency management services across the CDEM regions (majority view). |
| 3.1, 3.3 | Clarify that Mayors have primary authority to declare states of local emergency for their representative districts; and retain the ability for the Minister of Civil Defence to declare any state of emergency. |
| 3.2 | Require training and advice as a precondition for any person (primarily the Mayors) using their authority to declare a state of local emergency. |
| 6.1 | Enable the Director to direct Group Controller(s) during an emergency under the CDEM Act when there are matters of national interest. |
| 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 | Create generic authorisation of accredited Controllers; and require and confirm clear authority at the Group level and for Group Controllers. |
| 6.6, 6.7 | Assign default tasking to agencies; and clarify and review lead agency descriptions. |
| 6.8 | Require use of the Co-ordinated Incident Management System. |
| 6.9 | Extend membership to key entities required to coordinate and effective response. |



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL IMAGE SUPPLIED

Building the capability and capacity of the emergency management workforce

What do we want to do and why?

Managing an emergency is complex. People and organisations involved in emergencies need to have the appropriate experience, skills and competence to perform their roles and manage public safety effectively and efficiently.

The Government agrees with the TAG that there is a pressing need to build the capability and capacity of the emergency management workforce.

Our long-term goal is to build the capability and capacity of the emergency management workforce so it has the right number of skilled people who are prepared to respond 24/7.

We envision a workforce in which there are career pathways, consistent and high-quality training and development, and clear professional standards and accreditation processes.

To support this, we will establish Fly-in Teams to provide an immediate solution to localised issues of staff capability and capacity. Fly-in Teams will be able to rapidly respond to emergencies and will have the right skills in place to support CDEM Groups to manage emergencies effectively and consistently, irrespective of where in New Zealand they occur.

We want to professionalise the Controller position so that every person who holds a statutory Controller appointment under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act meets mandatory competency standards. This will mean they have the skills, knowledge, and experience to do the job well and hold an accreditation to do so.

We also want to build the capability of the response workforce more broadly. The workforce that contributes to the emergency effort will always include staff for whom this is not their day job. As such, it is essential that people who perform key roles within the Co-ordinated Incident Management System structure have the appropriate knowledge, skills, experience, and aptitude to deliver on their role.

Building the skills and capabilities of volunteers is also important, as volunteers are an essential part of our emergency response system and will continue to be so. This will happen as the result work currently underway in the Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management working with a number of partner agencies. It will be supported by the longer-term changes that will be delivered as we build the overall capability and capacity of the emergency management workforce.

What are we doing now and what will we do in the next 12 months?

- Design and implement Fly-in Teams.
- Implement a revised Controller development programme to replace the current one.
- Continue to build capability, through the use of unit standards and training, for those operating in Co-ordinated Incident Management System roles in central and local government.
- Work with local government to ensure that capability development solutions work for both central and local government. This includes co-designing the approach to Controller certification.
- Continue to work across local government, emergency services and relevant government agencies on ways to improve volunteer capability and capacity, and to ensure volunteers are kept safe in the system.

What will take a bit longer?

- Roll out of a programme for professionalising Controllers, which includes implementing a certification scheme for Civil Defence Emergency Management Controllers.
- Amend the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act to enable Fly-in Controllers to undertake their statutory function anywhere in the country.
- Enable the Director of Civil Defence Emergency Management to personally accredit/veto Controller appointments.
- Develop regulations to specify definitions for 'suitably qualified and experienced' in relation to Controllers and 'suitably trained and competent personnel' for other Co-ordinated Incident Management System functions.
- Enforce the expectation that people in relevant Co-ordinated Incident Management System roles are trained and competent.

Links to TAG recommendations

- 5.1 Strengthen the professionalism of emergency management, with a particular focus on Controllers.
- 5.2 Establish Fly-in Teams.
- 5.3 Ensure a consistent high standard of volunteer competence.

Improving the information and intelligence system that supports decision making in emergencies

What do we want to do and why?

Effective decision making before, during, and after emergencies can significantly improve outcomes for communities. When an emergency strikes, response authorities and the public need to make decisions about what to do. To do this, they need timely and relevant information, and analysis about what it means.

We agree with the TAG that we need to improve how we synthesise vital information into a common picture of what is going on so that decision makers have the information they need when they need it. This is a significant undertaking but one that we believe is essential if we are to improve our response to emergencies.

Science advice is often an important part of an emergency response and we want to make sure that it is well integrated into our emergency response system. It is important that science speak with one credible and authoritative voice so that we get informed messages to the public.



NZ POLICE IMAGE SUPPLIED

Gathering and distributing information that people can use is a fast-moving area as technology develops. Although this is challenging, it provides opportunities. We want to figure out how the emergency management system can better gather, consume and use information. The goal here is to ensure timely communication so that people know what is going on, what to expect, and what to do.

Finally, we agree with the TAG that there is a need to look into the physical and technological issues with the existing National Crisis Management Centre in the Beehive's sub-basement. We want to ensure it is fit-for-purpose and can support agencies to work together to manage significant national events.

What are we doing now and what will we do in the next 12 months?

- Include strategic communications and public information experts in Fly-in Teams.
- Continue to upgrade IT infrastructure in the current national emergency management facility.
- Implement arrangements for an Auckland-based facility to manage a national crisis if the Wellington facility is unavailable.
- Progress elements of the Common Operating Picture, including pulling together existing work on data needs.
- Develop a business case for a Common Operating Picture.
- Put structures in place to build the capability of those working in the intelligence function in responses.
- Undertake the first stages of a business case for a new national emergency management facility.
- Formalise a system to integrate science advice into emergency responses and document this in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System.

What will take a bit longer?

- Develop and implement a Common Operating Picture (depending on what the business case shows).
- Build a new national emergency management facility (depending on what the business case shows).
- Continue developing the capability of those working in the intelligence function.

Links to TAG recommendations

- 7.1 Establish a new national emergency management facility (replacing the Bunker) with a fit-for-future physical layout and technological functionality.
- 7.2 Invest in the technology to ensure a fit-for-purpose Common Operating Picture.
- 7.3 Establish an integrated 24/7 operation for the monitoring, alerting and warning of emergencies.
- 7.4 Recognise the importance of science intelligence as part of situational awareness.
- 8.3 Include and deploy trained and experienced Public Information Managers and Strategic Communications in 'Fly-in Team'.
- 8.4 Ensure timely, consistent, and proactive use of the range of appropriate media channels.



CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL IMAGE SUPPLIED

Appendix 1: The Technical Advisory Group's specific recommendations

Chapter 1: National level (functions and structure)

1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.7 Agree to establish a new National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA)

TAG Recommendation		Proposed Government Response
<p>Agree to establish a new National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) as a departmental agency hosted by DPMC to replace MCDEM (1.1).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>We agree with the TAG that we need greater nationwide consistency and stronger, directive national leadership to work collaboratively with the range of parties involved in emergency management to continually improve the performance of the sector. The national emergency management agency (whether it be the Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management (MCDEM) or a new national emergency management agency) must play a greater leadership role within the sector. It should have a strong 'all hazards and risks', operational, 4Rs focus as recommended by the TAG. It needs to work with communities, government agencies, emergency services, lifeline utilities, businesses, and other organisations to create an emergency management system that is ready and able to respond to and support recovery from emergencies (irrespective of cause) when they occur.</p> <p>It would do this by working with others to build the capability and capacity of the system to plan for, withstand, respond to, and recover from an emergency. This would involve activities such as standard setting and monitoring, common ways of working, workforce development, and leading investments in system-level infrastructure. It would also provide assurance to the government and the public as well as lead (and support) the all hazards and risks response to national and local emergencies. The latter role would require it to have a strong operations/ response function, working alongside other lead agencies and Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Groups.</p> <p>We have asked for further work to be done on the best functions, form, and location of the national emergency management agency.</p>
<p>Agree that the core function of NEMA is to enable the Director CDEM to meet their functions and duties and exercise their powers under relevant emergency management legislation, including (1.2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the national authority for support and coordination in states of local emergency, and control in national emergencies (1.2.1). • Taking an oversight role through developing, monitoring and evaluating the all hazards-all risks national CDEM Strategy and Plan, and addressing matters of national interest in Groups' and other agencies' plans and activities (1.2.2). • Assuring system capability and performance through setting standards and monitoring that those standards are being met (1.2.3). 	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>Covered in response to recommendation 1.1.</p>

Note that this will require more proactive leadership of the sector, and an assertive, and when required, directive stance, as envisaged in the provisions of the CDEM Act (1.3).	Agree in principle	Covered in response to recommendation 1.1.
Retain the 4R's all hazards—all risks perspective within NEMA, with a focus on operational responsibilities, and consider shifting strategic policy advice responsibilities to a separate part of DPMC (1.4).	Agree in principle	Covered in response to recommendation 1.1.
Ensure that NEMA has the resources and the capability to credibly do the job expected of it (1.7).	Agree in principle	Covered in response to recommendation 1.1.

1.5 Agree that the NEMA's monitoring responsibilities, and OAG responsibilities, will be used to full effect through publication of results

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Agree that the NEMA's monitoring responsibilities, and OAG responsibilities, will be used to full effect through publication of results (1.5).	Agree in part	<p>We agree that NEMA's monitoring responsibilities should be used to full effect through the publication of results. However, we see the monitoring role as having more to it than simply publishing results. The following functions are also necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting CDEM Groups to self-evaluate performance against those standards and make the necessary changes at the organisational level. • Undertaking objective reviews, evaluations and assessments of CDEM Group and national level arrangements and the sector's performance, capacity and capability. • Identifying what is working well and where improvements are needed to CDEM Group and national emergency management arrangements. • Monitoring the implementation of recommendations and actions identified through reviews to ensure they are effective and sustainable in the long term. <p>We do not believe that the Office of the Auditor-General (OAG) has a role in this process, as it is a core function of the national agency. However, OAG may have a high-level audit role through requiring mandatory public reporting of expenditure/performance against the Group Plan (links to recommendations in 2.2).</p>

1.6 Agree that lead agency responsibilities are allocated to appropriate agencies

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Agree that lead agency responsibilities are allocated to appropriate agencies (1.6).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The term 'lead agency' is used in a range of documents and its meaning changes with context and by document. The scope and number of definitions has led to a range of interpretations, making the responsibilities and authority of a lead agency unclear. As the TAG noted, "this situation is confusing, occasionally contradictory, and in an emergency, it is potentially risky."</p> <p>We support clarifying and reviewing lead agency descriptions and allocating lead agency responsibilities to appropriate agencies. We view lead agencies as those that have the mandate to manage the response to an incident until it transitions to become an emergency under the CDEM Act (2002).</p> <p>Lead agencies should be determined by the extent to which they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the specialist expertise and experience for particular hazards and threats. • Have the appropriate regulatory levers, protocols, agreements, and existing relationships with relevant sectors. • Promote sectoral risk reduction and readiness as a subset of their broader policy interests.
<p>The Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment is specified as lead agency with responsibility for infrastructure failure. There are also calls to be made in relation to responsibility for transport and water (1.6.1).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>We have asked for further work to be done to clarify and confirm which agencies are best placed to have lead agency responsibilities for specific hazards. This includes confirming lead agency responsibilities for infrastructure failure (including transport and water). Until that point, there will be no change to existing lead agency arrangements.</p> <p>However, we do not support the recommendation as written because 'infrastructure failure' is not sufficiently specific to warrant an individual agency having lead agency responsibilities for it.</p> <p>Current arrangements in which the relevant transport agency has the lead agency mandate for managing responses to road, rail, air, and sea transport risks seem sensible.</p> <p>The Government is reviewing '3 Waters' infrastructure to develop options and recommendations needed to create a strong, sustainable '3 Waters' network. The Department of Internal Affairs is leading this work and proposals are due with Cabinet in late 2019. We recommend that decisions about which agency should lead water responses be taken after this time.</p> <p>There is further work needed to confirm whether the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment should be the lead agency with responsibility for ICT, energy, and fuel-supply failure.</p>

<p>Responsibility for assessing, monitoring, and alerting the hazard risk in relation to geological and meteorological risks (earthquake, tsunami, flood, other weather) is clarified (1.6.2).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Early warning systems that enable individuals and communities threatened by hazards to act effectively and in sufficient time to reduce the likelihood of death, injury, and damage to property and the environment are a critical component of our system. As a first priority we have asked MCDEM and GNS Science to work together to speed up tsunami warnings. We note that volcanos and landslides are also geological risks that we assess, monitor and provide warnings for as needed.</p> <p>MCDEM has had a strong focus in recent years on improving the consistency of warnings to the public across all hazards. This work will continue.</p>
<p>The Ministry for Social Development is specified as lead agency with responsibility for welfare aspects of response (1.6.3).</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The term lead agency relates to leading response to an event caused by a hazard. This is not welfare, which is one of seven core functions in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System. In a response, all these functions come under the mandate of the lead agency running the response.</p> <p>Under the current framework (that was put in place in 2015 in response to the findings of the review into the 22 February 2011 Christchurch earthquake), the CDEM Group is responsible for ensuring that there is an effective welfare function across its region. This is delivered within a national framework led by the national emergency management agency (currently MCDEM). This makes logical sense and we see no need to change it.</p>

1.8 Strengthen incentives and accountability for system stewardship

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Strengthen incentives and accountability for system stewardship (1.8).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>We agree there is a need for greater nationwide consistency and stronger, directive national leadership. The national emergency management agency would work collaboratively with the range of parties involved in emergency management to continually improve the performance of the system. This includes strengthening the accountability for stewardship of the emergency management system (particularly in respect of multi-agency issues) so we can remain confident that it will remain fit-for-purpose and fit-for-the-future.</p>
<p>Developing transparency, governance, and structural approaches to strengthen collective action and stewardship in this sector (1.8.1).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>We support public sector chief executives from across the emergency management sector working more collaboratively to improve transparency, collective action, and system governance. The Hazard Risk Board (HRB) has a role in managing civil contingencies and hazard risks through appropriate governance, alignment, and prioritisation of investment, policy and activity. As such, we see HRB as the most appropriate governance body to provide stewardship for the system. We will support HRB as it fulfils its system stewardship role.</p>
<p>Considering joint accountabilities in departmental CE's performance agreements, backed up in Ministerial letters of expectation (1.8.2).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>Working with HRB may involve including joint accountabilities in departmental chief executives' performance agreements, backed up by Ministerial letters of expectation. We have yet to determine if this is the right approach.</p>

Chapter 2: Regional structure

2.1 Require Groups to take a regional approach consistent with the intent of the CDEM Act

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Require Groups to take a regional approach consistent with the intent of the CDEM Act (2.1).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>We support a strengthened regional approach to emergency management while still providing flexibility for local delivery to suit local needs and characteristics.</p> <p>We intend to amend the CDEM Act so that the CDEM Group and member local authorities have clear and separate responsibilities for emergency management. Groups (local authorities collectively) would continue to be responsible for planning and providing for emergency management. Groups would have an explicit function to coordinate emergency management activity across the region through the Group Plan, work programme, and shared emergency management service agreement. Local authority members would be required to give effect to the decisions of the Group, including to resource the decisions of the Group.</p> <p>We intend to also provide more flexibility for Joint Committee Groups to agree which member local authority will act as the Group's statutory administering authority. The regional council remains as a default unless the Group agrees otherwise. This reinforces the current intent of the CDEM Act that the regional council does not have any greater governance role than any other member.</p> <p>We intend to also enable Group members, in an emergency when an urgent decision is required, to attend a Group (Joint Committee) meeting by audio/visual link, rather than having to be physically present, in order to achieve a quorum. This has been an issue in the past for Group leadership in an emergency.</p> <p>From this, we expect increased economies of scale, capability, capacity, and interoperability between regions to deliver better emergency management services across the 4Rs. There is still flexibility to tailor activities to suit local needs and characteristics. Emergency management personnel can be embedded in local authorities to take account of the needs of, and maintain connections with, local communities.</p>

2.2 Require Groups to provide adequate funding and resourcing for effective CDEM activities

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Require Groups to provide adequate funding and resourcing for effective CDEM activities (2.2).</p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<p>It would be difficult and precedent setting to specify, regulate and enforce a requirement for 'adequate' funding on local government.</p> <p>Expected cost savings from shared emergency management services will enable Groups to more adequately fund emergency management.</p> <p>We intend to make regulations under the CDEM Act to require Groups to publicly report to their communities and to the Government on expenditure and performance against the Group Plan and regulations. This means that the community and the Government can better hold Groups and local authorities to account, which will encourage Groups to more adequately fund emergency management.</p>

2.3 Strengthen national standards over minimum requirements

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Strengthen national standards over minimum requirements (2.3)	Agree	We intend to make regulations under the CDEM Act to establish minimum standards for Groups (to be monitored by a national emergency management agency (MCDEM or a new agency) with appropriate penalties for non compliance), which include performance standards and consistent operating practices and systems for emergency management that align with the Co-ordinated Incident Management System.

2.4 Strengthen Group (joint committee) governance

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Strengthen Group (joint committee) governance (2.4).	Agree in part	<p>A legislative change to 'require' that only Mayors and regional council Chairs can participate in Group governance and that they may not delegate this to another elected member is at odds with normal local government practice and may slow down governance if it affects the ability to meet quorum.</p> <p>Genuine and effective participation of elected members is a cultural issue that is difficult to legislate for. Strengthening the Group approach by requiring that local authorities give effect to and resource activities decided by the Group is expected to incentivise stronger local authority participation in governance.</p>

2.5 Strengthen accountability for Group performance (through NEMA monitoring and OAG audit)

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Strengthen accountability for Group performance (through NEMA monitoring and OAG audit) (2.5).	Agree	We intend to make regulations under the CDEM Act to establish minimum standards for Groups, to be monitored by a national emergency management agency (MCDEM or a new agency).

2.6 Require the development of shared emergency management services across the CDEM regions (majority view)

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response
<p>Majority view. Require the development of shared emergency management services across the CDEM regions (2.6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regional or unitary council responsible for resourcing and administration (2.6.1). • Consistent Emergency Management Office structures, with Emergency Operating Centres across the CDEM Group area (2.6.2). • Regional appointment and oversight of all controllers, with clear line management and an emphasis on appointments embedded within territorial authorities (2.6.3). • Defined functions and responsibilities for respective territorial and regional councils (2.6.4). <p>Minority view. Strengthened Status Quo – no change to the functions and requirements set out in the current CDEM Act, but bolster implementation with stronger national standards (through NEMA), and stronger accountability for resourcing, capability, and performance (through NEMA monitoring and OAG audit).</p>	<p>Agree in part to majority recommendation</p> <p>We intend to make regulations under the CDEM Act to require Groups to establish publicly available shared emergency management services agreements that set out how the Group will deliver emergency management across the region, in accordance with the Group Plan and regulations.</p> <p>We also intend to make regulations to require consistent organisational arrangements. This would include that Groups maintain the ability to establish and operate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Emergency Management Office (EMO) to undertake the Group’s planning and programme management, risk reduction, and readiness for response and recovery activities. • An Emergency Coordination Centre, Emergency Operations Centres (EOC), and Recovery Management Offices, where operationally appropriate; and to staff Co-ordinated Incident Management System functions, to respond to emergencies and undertake recovery. <p>The regulations would also ensure that emergency management personnel, including Controllers and Recovery Managers, have clear functional direction and management from, and accountability ultimately to the Group, although this may be managed on a day-to-day basis through the Coordinating Executive Group (CEG). They are not subject to direction from local authority members or chief executives (even though they are employed by the Group’s administering authority and may be domiciled in local authority member offices).</p> <p>We will not require, however, that the regional council is responsible for resourcing and administration. Another member may be better placed to undertake that role. We would provide flexibility for the Group to agree which member local authority will act as the Group’s statutory administering authority and how the Group will apportion and collect funding. The regional council remains as a default administering authority unless the Group agrees otherwise.</p> <p>Through shared emergency management service agreements, the Group would provide for emergency management across the 4Rs on behalf of its member local authorities. Activities could be delivered on a region-wide basis or tailored to the particular characteristics of each district, including its hazards and risks and what is needed to manage them. Some Group personnel, including Local Controllers may be domiciled with local authorities to engage the local authority in emergency management activities, integrate with other local authority work, and to have a physical presence in each district to stand up an EOC. However, they would remain accountable to the Group.</p>

Chapter 3: Declarations

3.1 Clarify that elected representatives (the mayors) have primary authority to declare states of local emergency for their representative districts

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Revise section 25 of the CDEM Act to give mayors the primary role (3.1.1).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>We intend to amend the CDEM Act so that there is no overlap in who is responsible for declaring a state of local emergency over what area, in the first instance. The Group appointee would declare for the Group area (region) and may declare for more than one district, and the Mayor would declare for one district or one or more wards. As a backup, we would provide for a representative of any member of the Group to declare if the Mayor (or Mayor's designate) is unable to declare.</p> <p>We would require the Group, when considering whether to declare, to seek and consider comment from any affected Mayor unless the circumstances are impracticable or the situation is urgent.</p> <p>We would also require that Mayors and Group appointees receive and consider the advice of a Controller before making a decision to declare, unless the circumstances are impracticable or the situation is urgent.</p> <p>We would also clarify that the word 'area' in the CDEM Act refers to the whole Group area rather than a district or ward.</p> <p>The CDEM Act also provides for Mayors and Groups to give 'notice of a local transition period' that makes emergency powers available to assist recovery, which currently mirrors the declaration process. We would therefore mirror the changes above to giving notice of a local transition period, where this is appropriate.</p>
<p>While mayors have primary authority, provide for the Chair of the Joint Committee to be able to declare in appropriate circumstances (consulting with affected mayors where practicable) as a multi-district or CDEM Group-wide declaration may be most appropriate (3.1.2).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Covered in response to recommendation 3.1.1.</p>

3.2 Require training and advice as a precondition for any person (primarily the mayors) using their authority to declare a state of local emergency

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Require training and advice as a precondition for any person (primarily the mayors) using their authority to declare a state of local emergency (3.2).	Disagree	We intend to provide for Mayors and Group appointees to receive advice from qualified Controllers prior to being able to use their authority to declare a state of local emergency. Defining what constitutes training, implementing it, and monitoring compliance would add costs that we do not consider are commensurate with the problem or potential benefits. We will encourage Mayors to seek training as soon as practicable after election as part of a Mayor's induction into the role.
If a mayor is not trained then another trained representative of the elective members of the Joint Committee (the Group) will need to declare (3.2.1).	Disagree	See above.

3.3 Retain the ability for the Minister of Civil Defence to declare any state of emergency (local or national)

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Retain the ability for the Minister of Civil Defence to declare any state of emergency (local or national). No change to the current CDEM Act is proposed (3.3).	Agree	No change to the CDEM Act required.

3.4 Amend guidance to include ‘public confidence’ as a factor to consider in deciding to declare a state of emergency

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Amend guidance to include ‘public confidence’ as a factor to consider in deciding to declare a state of emergency (3.4).	Agree in part	<p>Public confidence is an outcome of robust information, clear and timely communication and strong leadership. To achieve the outcome of greater public confidence the Government intends to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake work related to other TAG recommendations that will result in a more timely flow of information and a common operating picture, which will assist authorities and the public to be aware earlier of the nature and scale of the event, and take precautionary actions and communication to enhance public confidence. • Make regulations to require Groups to set out a process in their Group Plan by which the Group will determine when an incident is deemed to be an emergency for the purposes of the CDEM Act and how that is communicated to agencies in the emergency management system. Groups may communicate such a decision to the public along with any messaging, in order to inform and assure the public. • Encourage Groups/local authorities (supported by central government) to identify in their arrangements (such as standard operating procedures) the actions necessary to maintain public confidence in an evolving situation, including effective public information about the incident and how the local authority and/or Group is managing the incident. • Amend the CDEM Act so that it is explicit that the criterion for declaring a state of local emergency is that the emergency power(s) under the CDEM Act are necessary, or likely to be necessary, to manage a response to the emergency (assuming also that the tests for an ‘emergency’ as defined in the CDEM Act are met).

3.5 Provide the option of the mayor declaring a ‘major incident’

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Provide the option of the mayor declaring a ‘major incident’ (3.5).	Agree in part	We will not provide for a statutory ‘major incident’ declaration but to achieve the outcome of greater public confidence the Government intends to respond as outlined above in 3.4.
Under a major incident the legislative powers available are limited to those that the councils and emergency services (such as Police) can use under other Acts (3.5.1).	Agree in part	Covered in response to recommendation 3.5.

Chapter 4: Role of Iwi

4.1 Recognise the capability that iwi bring to emergency management

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Recognise the capability that iwi bring to emergency management (4.1).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>We seek to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater recognition, understanding and integration of iwi/Māori perspectives and tikanga in emergency management. • Greater recognition, understanding and integration of the capacity and capability of marae to look after people in an emergency. <p>Officials from the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC), assisted by Te Puni Kōkiri, will engage with iwi and Groups to explore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iwi representation on the CEG of each Group, to ensure iwi input into advice to the Group on governance and planning. How iwi are represented in areas where multiple iwi are present will also need to be worked through. • An explicit requirement for Groups to consult with iwi/Māori on emergency management planning, particularly when developing their Group Plans. <p>Officials from DPMC, assisted by Te Puni Kōkiri, will also engage with iwi and Groups to explore a proposal that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups work with marae in their region to identify marae that could, and want to, have a role in emergency responses (noting that marae are one community facility amongst many); and any infrastructure upgrades and training needed to enable those marae to respond effectively. • Groups undertake planning, understand their tikanga, and develop protocols with those identified marae that may be required, including to support reimbursement for welfare-related expenses. <p>The national emergency management agency will be responsible, on an ongoing basis, for providing Groups with support and guidance, and for monitoring progress on engagement with iwi, Māori and marae.</p>

4.2 Legislate to enable iwi to participate in planning for and responding to a natural disaster or other emergency, and to bring more clarity to their role

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Appropriate iwi representatives to be part of the Groups' Coordinating Executive Group (CEGs) (4.2.1).	Agree in principle	We agree in principle that iwi should be represented on CEGs, pending engagement with iwi and Groups as outlined in 4.1 above and noting that there is a question as to how iwi will be represented in areas where multiple iwi are present.
Appropriate iwi representatives to be included on the Group Joint Committees (Groups) (4.2.2).	Disagree	<p>We do not favour iwi membership of Groups because Group members are elected (Mayors and regional council Chairs).</p> <p>Iwi can be invited to attend Group meetings and to provide specialist knowledge and advice, but do not have voting rights. The national emergency management agency will strongly encourage Groups to seek advice from iwi on strategic governance decisions.</p> <p>The responses in 4.1 and 4.2.1 represent other ways for Groups to engage with iwi, Māori and marae.</p>

4.3 Look to the recent Mana Whakahono-a-Rohe amendments to the RMA as a model for a future CDEM Act amendment

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Look to the recent Mana Whakahono-a-Rohe amendments to the RMA as a model for a future CDEM Act amendment. Both the Local Government Act and recent amendments to the RMA provide examples of legislative changes sought (4.3).	Disagree	At present, we do not favour the Mana Whakahono-a-Rohe arrangement as a model for engagement given the work proposed in 4.1 and 4.2.1 above.

Chapter 5: Capability and capacity

5.1 Strengthen the professionalism of emergency management, with a particular focus on Controllers

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Require all Controllers (Group and National) to meet one mandatory national standard of technical and personal competency, prior to them being accredited as a CDEM Controller (5.1.1).	Agree	<p>We intend to make regulations under the CDEM Act to establish the mandatory national standard of technical and personal competency for national, regional, and local CDEM Controllers. This can be done irrespective of decisions about accreditation/certification that are discussed below. This can be done within the existing legal framework.</p> <p>In advance of any national certification system being implemented, national monitoring of CDEM groups should require demonstrated evidence from the Group that its Controllers meet the standard that has been set and their plan for achieving this (recognising that it will take time).</p> <p>DPMC's National Security Workforce Directorate and MCDEM are currently contracting a provider to deliver a revised Controller development programme that includes a capability framework, a refreshed learning solution for Controllers, and a tool to measure current capability against the framework. The final solution will replace the current Massey/MCDEM Controller Development course.</p>
Confirm that only accredited Controllers are permitted to act as Controllers during any declared state of emergency (5.1.2).	Agree in principle	The aim is that eventually, all Controllers are accredited so only accredited Controllers will be permitted to act during an emergency. However, the transition to a professional emergency management workforce will need to be carefully managed to ensure that current capacity, both paid and volunteer, is retained. We will also need to acknowledge prior learning/experience, and potentially build in a period of transition so that experienced and suitable people have a window in which to be appropriately recognised.
Investigate the ability to leverage off the Australian Emergency Management experience (5.1.3).	Agree	We will look at experience from other jurisdictions as we develop the approach to professionalising the Controller position and to building the capability of the emergency management workforce more generally.
Require the Director to personally confirm that a Group Controller meets the expected standard prior to formal accreditation (5.1.4).	Agree in principle	Covered in response to recommendation 5.1.2.
Investigate a process by which the status of someone as an accredited Controller is reviewable (5.1.5).	Agree in principle	Covered in response to recommendation 5.1.2.

Develop national training and professional competency for all the relevant Coordinated Incident Management System (CIMS) functions (5.1.6).

Agree in principle

New Zealand’s Co-ordinated Incident Management System helps to achieve effective co-ordinated incident management across responding agencies by establishing common structures, functions and terminology. To give effect to the Co-ordinated Incident Management System, people performing key roles at the national, CDEM Group, and local levels during a response are expected to be trained and practiced in its use.

The workforce that contributes to the emergency effort will always include staff for whom this is not their day job as well as volunteers. These people play a crucial role in the emergency management system and will continue to do so. However, we need to ensure we are providing a career pathway that provides people in key roles the level of experience, training and support that their role warrants. Those in key Co-ordinated Incident Management System roles (i.e. the Co-ordinated Incident Management System function managers) should be appropriately skilled and trained to fulfil their roles. Others should have a basic understanding of how the system works and their role within it.

Under the CDEM Act, CDEM Groups are required to ensure that suitably trained and competent personnel, including volunteers are available for effective emergency management in their area. We intend to make regulations under the CDEM Act to establish what suitably trained and competent means. Work is underway within DPMC to build capability among those operating in Co-ordinated Incident Management System roles in central and local government. We are currently working on a number of unit standards (and context specific training through MCDEM) to achieve this.

We do not propose a formal ‘professionalising’ of the Co-ordinated Incident Management System roles. However, over time we do expect to see an increasing percentage of people in these roles with the relevant unit standard. Monitoring by the national agency would focus on this.

5.2 Establish Fly-in Teams

TAG Recommendation

Proposed Government Response

Have national teams of professional CDEM Controller and other essential roles (such as CIMS functions, strategic communications, and science) that can be immediately deployed (either on the request of the Group Controller, or on the discretion of the Director) (5.2.1).

- Provide for professionals to be on the ‘Fly-In’ roster from a variety of agencies (5.2.1.1).
- Recognise that some or all of national support roles are likely to be required with any state of emergency that is more than minor (5.2.1.2).
- Investigate where these priority roles can be sourced from (secondments are a possibility) (5.2.1.3).

Agree

We agree that Fly-in Teams are an essential capability in the emergency management system. The key benefit of Fly-in Teams is that they can rapidly deploy to emergencies, and have the right skills in place to effectively and consistently support CDEM Groups to manage emergencies, irrespective of where they occur in New Zealand. We agree that these teams should include experienced Public Information Managers and Strategic Communications experts as required, and the teams should have the capability to engage effectively with local Māori. The staffing and rostering requirements for Fly-in Teams will be confirmed during the development stage, however, we agree that a variety of agencies could provide people.

5.3 Ensure a consistent high standard of volunteer competence

TAG Recommendation		Proposed Government Response
<p>During an emergency response when deployed for the purposes of urban light rescue, shift oversight of trained and accredited NZRTs to FENZ as the agency with the most appropriate functional alignment with the volunteer capability (5.3.1).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>The Director of CDEM is currently working with CDEM Group Managers, New Zealand Response Team Leaders, Fire and Emergency NZ, NZ Police, Ministry of Health, Maritime NZ, and NZ Search and Rescue to explore options for building a robust and sustainable volunteer capability and capacity for emergency management. This work will cover the role of volunteers in the system, health and safety issues related to their tasking, and their training. This work will address the TAG’s recommendations regarding volunteers.</p> <p>If established, the national emergency management agency (NEMA) would likely have a role in understanding what kinds of volunteer capability are required, the level of capability for different functions, and any relevant standard(s) necessary. This would include working with WorkSafe to obtain clarity on its accountability when Groups engage volunteers, and how best to protect volunteers from liability.</p> <p>The NEMA and agencies with mandates for technical or specialist functions would also likely have a role in accrediting volunteers or training providers so that volunteers are recognised as being competent and able to appropriately assist during emergencies. Ultimately, building volunteer capability is a subset of the wider work to lift emergency management capability overall. We propose looking into a range of models including from Australia’s State and Territorial Emergency Services (SES) in recognising / training / accrediting volunteers as this work develops.</p>
<p>NEMA to work with WorkSafe New Zealand to get clarity on its accountability when Groups engage volunteers (and other employees) in response (5.3.2).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>Covered in response to recommendation 5.3.1.</p>
<p>For NZ Response Teams (5.3.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that during an emergency response when deployed for the purposes of urban light rescue, FENZ have control of the teams if they are trained, equipped, and resourced to an agreed accredited level (5.3.3.1). • FENZ and NEMA to work with CEG Chairs and NZRTs on how the teams can be recognised as being trained for responsibilities that they can appropriately assist with during emergencies (5.3.3.2). 	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>Covered in response to recommendation 5.3.1.</p>
<p>Identify how New Zealand can incorporate best practice from Australia’s State and Territorial Emergency Services (SES) in recognising / training / accrediting volunteers, including assessment of volunteers’ existing qualifications (5.3.4).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>Covered in response to recommendation 5.3.1.</p>
<p>Explore how best to protect volunteers from liability if they are ‘in the system’ i.e. NZRT, USAR (5.3.5).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>Covered in response to recommendation 5.3.1.</p>

Chapter 6: Authority

6.1 Enable the Director to direct Group Controller(s) during an emergency under the CDEM Act when there are matters of national interest

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Enable the Director to direct Group Controller(s) during an emergency under the CDEM Act when there are matters of national interest (6.1).</p>	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>We intend to do further policy work on enabling the Director of CDEM to intervene in a local response where there are matters of national interest. This work will consider how such a power fits with existing national intervention provisions in the CDEM Act, the proposed national Fly-in Teams, and appropriate criteria for national interest, including checks on the intervention power.</p>
<p>Include appropriate checks and balances to this command authority (6.1.1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting out circumstances of national interest requiring intervention (6.1.1.1). • A requirement that any use of the authority is transparently reported (6.1.1.2). 	<p>Agree in principle</p>	<p>Covered in response to recommendation 6.1.</p>

6.2 Create generic authorisation of accredited Controller appointments

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Provide for qualified people to be brought in during events (Fly-in Teams – see Chapter Five) and be able to (6.2.1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access the relevant CDEM Act powers of a Controller, (6.2.1.1). • Enable them to act in the role of CDEM Controller anywhere in the country (6.2.1.2). 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>We intend to amend the CDEM Act so that, if requested by a Group, accredited Controllers are automatically authorised to operate as the Group Controller in that Group's region.</p>

6.3 Require clear command authority at Group level

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Require any 'local' or secondary Controllers to be under the clear command authority of the Group Controller in charge of an event (noting there will be roster changes). They do not have independent powers (6.3.1).	Agree	We intend to amend the CDEM Act to provide that Local Controllers must perform their function to coordinate a response to, and manage the consequences of, emergencies; and may exercise their power to direct personnel and control other resources that are made available by agencies, unless directed otherwise by the Group Controller.

6.4 Confirm the authority of Group Controller

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Reinforce that there is no mandate for the Group Controller to be subject to direction by those that might have a different relationship to them outside a state of emergency (6.4.1).	Agree	<p>As per our response to Chapter 2 on regional structures, we intend to make regulations under the CDEM Act to ensure that emergency management personnel, including Controllers and Recovery Managers, have clear functional direction and management from, and accountability ultimately to the Group, although this may be managed on a day-to-day basis through the CEG. They are not subject to direction from local authority members or chief executives (even though they are employed by the Group's administering authority and may be domiciled in local authority member offices).</p> <p>We intend to confirm the authority of Group and Local Controllers in emergency responses through non-statutory means, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that Group/Local Controllers are appropriately selected, trained and accredited (addressed by the professionalisation workstream) so that they understand their statutory role and accountabilities. • Reinforcing in operational documents such as Director's guidance, and in Controller training, the status and accountabilities of the Group/Local Controllers. • Working with stakeholders in local government and the emergency system to adjust expectations, for example, incorporate into the Mayor's training.

6.5 Require clear control authority for Group Controllers

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Ensure that when a state of emergency is declared under the CDEM Act the Group Controller has control over the emergency response. This includes being able to task other agencies (6.5.1).</p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<p>We intend to amend the CDEM Act so that the National Controller, Group Controller and Local Controller each have a clear function to coordinate a response in the appropriate circumstances (a state of national emergency, a state of local emergency, and an undeclared emergency) and a corresponding power(s) to achieve this function. The powers are generally to 'direct' personnel and/or their performance, and/or 'control' other resources that are made available by agencies.</p> <p>We also intend to amend the CDEM Act to clarify authority for Group/Local Controllers in an undeclared emergency such that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups are required to set out in their Group Plan a policy for how an emergency is recognised for the purposes of the CDEM Act and communicated to relevant agencies. The national emergency management agency (MCDEM or a new agency) would facilitate Groups to collectively develop a model approach. • The Group Controller and any Local Controllers have a power in an undeclared emergency and when there is a state of local emergency (but not a state of national emergency) to direct personnel and control resources made available by agencies. The Local Controller must exercise this power unless directed otherwise by the Group Controller. Group/Local Controllers would have appropriate corresponding protection from liability.
<p>Develop and set out parameters of agency tasks – such as appropriate limits and preconditions – in the relevant Plans (National CDEM Plan Order for nationally managed hazards and Group CDEM Plans (6.5.2).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The national emergency management agency will facilitate continuous improvement of preparedness and planning for responses by setting out default tasking and arrangements for how agencies will work together and who will do what in the National CDEM Plan and Group Plans and their supporting plans, as these are reviewed.</p>
<p>Develop effective mechanisms to bind and clarify responsibilities (6.5.3).</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>Section 59 of the CDEM Act requires agencies to undertake any CDEM functions and duties required by the National CDEM Plan and Group Plans. No further mechanisms are proposed.</p>

6.6 Assign default tasking to agencies

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Require that relevant agencies specifically consider likely emergency response tasks and assign responsibilities, including (6.6.1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CIMS functions (for example, logistics, planning, intelligence) within operation centres (6.6.1.1). • Commonly experienced short-term tasks of manning cordons, rapid assessment and air traffic control (6.6.1.2). • Roles and responsibilities as part of the Fly-in Team discussed in Chapter Five (6.6.1.3). 	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The national emergency management agency (MCDEM or a new agency) will facilitate default tasking and arrangements for how agencies will work together and who will do what in the National CDEM Plan and Group Plans and their supporting plans, as these are reviewed.</p>

6.7 Clarify and review lead agency descriptions

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Review the list of lead agencies so that it covers agencies with the primary mandate for overseeing a particular hazard or risk across the 4R's (including who manages the response to an incident) and ensure consistent expression through relevant documents (6.7.1).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>There are varying definitions of the term 'lead agency' in different documents. We agree that this needs clarifying. We propose the term 'lead agency' is agreed as meaning 'the agency with a mandate to manage the response to an incident through legislation, under protocols, by agreement, or because it has the expertise and experience. The lead agency establishes control to coordinate the response of all agencies involved' (Co-ordinated Incident Management System definition). This definition is aligned with that in the National CDEM Plan.</p> <p>In the event that an incident escalates to become an 'emergency' (as defined in the CDEM Act), MCDEM and CDEM Groups have overall control of the response (depending on whether the emergency is national or local). The agency managing the hazard would continue to have responsibility for managing the specific incident (e.g. Fire and Emergency New Zealand managing the fire, Ministry for Primary Industries the biosecurity incursion, local government the flooding).</p> <p>In line with DPMC's development of a national risk register, we consider that agencies with a lead role outside of response should be referred to as 'risk coordinating agencies'.</p> <p>We intend that all relevant documents that refer to 'lead agencies' be updated to reflect these terms. Such documents include the Co-ordinated Incident Management System manual, the National Security Systems Handbook, and CDEM Group Plans.</p>
<p>Change references to lead agency to clarify that, when a state of emergency is declared under the CDEM Act (6.7.2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Controller (Group or National) has overall control to manage the emergency (6.7.2.1). • The agency managing the hazard continues to have responsibility for managing the specific incident (6.7.2.2). 	<p>Agree</p>	

6.8 Require use of CIMS (2nd edition)

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
NEMA to require all entities listed at the front of the CIMS 2nd Edition to commit to using it, and collectively updating it to add clarity and reflect NZ legislative roles and authority (6.8.1).	Agree	We intend to require all relevant agencies in the emergency response system to use the latest edition of the Co-ordinated Incident Management System.

6.9 Extend membership to key entities required to coordinate an effective response

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Extend CEG membership to include Ambulance as emergency services and also iwi (see separate recommendation in Chapter Four) as appropriate for the area (6.9.1).	Agree in principle	We agree in principle to amend the CDEM Act to provide for Ambulance to be a member of the CEG, subject to further work on implementation.
Emphasise the role of the Regional Emergency Management Advisors (currently with MCDEM) and recognise them as full members of the CEGs (6.9.2).	Disagree	We will not include Regional Emergency Management Advisors as members of the CEG. This is to maintain their autonomous roles as advisors to the Group and CEG, and for monitoring performance of the Group on behalf of the Director of CDEM.

6.10 Representatives from agencies in the CEG to attend emergency operations centres

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Emphasise the importance of the liaison role when there is a declared CDEM state of emergency (6.10.1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For services such as Police, Fire and Emergency New Zealand, Ambulance, iwi, district health boards, (6.10.1.1). • Ensure they are represented at the activated operation centre following a catastrophic event (such as a large earthquake) or when it is activated to respond to a developing event (such as a weather event) (6.10.1.2). 	Agree	Chief executives of agencies will be required to ensure that there is appropriate representation of their agency at an EOC to the extent possible, and that this expectation is reflected in agencies' plans and standard operating procedures.

Chapter 7: Intelligence

7.1 Establish a new national emergency management facility (replacing the Bunker) with a fit-for-future physical layout and technological functionality

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Enable a national emergency to be controlled and managed from the new facility (7.1.1).	Agree in principle	In an emergency, agencies need to work together to co-ordinate an effective response. A place to do this from is a critical part of our emergency management infrastructure. Our existing facility in the Beehive's sub-basement (the National Crisis Management Centre) is outdated and has significant physical shortfalls. While addressing its IT issues through the Common Operating Picture (see recommendation 7.2) and an existing IT infrastructure upgrade project (see recommendation 7.1.4) will help improve the functionality of the existing facility, these activities will not address its physical issues. We have done a preliminary analysis of options around a new facility and have asked that a more detailed business case be developed.
Provide for all current CIMS functions, along with a common operating picture and strategic communications (7.1.2).	Agree	The business case for the new facility will ensure that all Co-ordinated Incident Management System functions are accommodated.
For national resilience, provide for two facilities and/or easy transfer of base operations (7.1.3).	Agree	MCDEM has recently signed an agreement with the Ellerslie Racecourse to provide an Auckland-based facility from which to manage a national crisis if the Wellington facility is unavailable for a sustained period. We will consider issues of national resilience in the business case referred to under recommendation 7.1.1. MCDEM is investigating arrangements to address issues with the current facility while the work in recommendation 7.1.1. is done.
Maintain effective technological links with other operating centres (Groups, Police, FENZ, Defence, Ministry of Health, and Transport for example) (7.1.4).	Agree	MCDEM is already upgrading the IT infrastructure within the current national facility. This will improve access to IT systems inside and outside the current facility. Work on a Common Operating Picture (recommendation 7.2.1) will also contribute to this.
Systems to be adaptable so that all central government organisations can effectively operate out of the central facility if required (7.1.5).	Agree	Covered in response to recommendation 7.1.4.

7.2 Invest in the technology to ensure a fit-for-purpose Common Operating Picture

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Investigate technology needed for a Common Operating Picture based on international best practice models as a strong contender for New Zealand's common operating model (7.2.1).	Agree in principle	<p>When an emergency strikes, response authorities and the public need to make decisions about what to do. They need timely, relevant information to do this. We agree with the TAG that we need to improve how we synthesise vital information into a common picture for decision makers.</p> <p>There is lots of activity already underway in local and central government and by other parties. We have supported work to pull this together into a coherent approach. This work will include government and non-government entities. It will provide immediate benefits for the sector by making the data everyone needs available for them to use and by creating an early common operating picture in the existing National Crisis Management Centre. This work will also help us to understand what, if any, additional investment is needed.</p>
Expect all entities with emergency operations functions to collectively solve the challenge of cross agency systems to share intelligence, and situational assessment (7.2.2).	Agree	The work (outlined in recommendation 7.2.1) will involve a wide range of government agencies. It will be overseen by the Hazard Risk Board, the members of which are chief executives of agencies with lead agency responsibilities or key support roles. It also has good connections with local government through MCDEM.

7.3 Establish an integrated 24/7 operation for the monitoring, alerting and warning of emergencies

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Investigate the benefit of using the new national emergency management facility as part of the 24/7 operation (7.3.1).	Agree in principle	This will be considered as part of the approach outlined in 7.3.2 below and as required in the business case work outlined in recommendation 7.1.1.
Utilise and integrate with existing 24/7 capabilities to provide intelligence and assessment of developing or shock emergencies (with an all hazards and risks approach) (7.3.2).	Agree in part	New Zealand's current hazard risk monitoring approach is decentralised. A large number of agencies are involved in assessing risk across a range of natural and human-made hazards and security threats. An all-hazards environment may need a greater degree of integration as a national emergency management agency responsible for managing the response effort and addressing the consequences of emergencies needs to know where emergency management activity may be needed. We plan to take an approach that involves consolidating monitoring information for use by a range of users first. If the consolidated monitoring proves to be of use and greater integration is considered valuable, then this decision (and potentially business case) will be made at that time.
Increase the speed by which alerts are provided and distributed, particularly in regard to simplifying or shortening current practice and providing timely and geographically accurate tsunami warnings (7.3.3).	Agree	<p>Early warning systems that enable individuals and communities at risk from hazards to act effectively and in sufficient time to reduce the likelihood of death, injury and damage to property and the environment are a critical component of our system. MCDEM and GNS Science are working together to streamline and speed up tsunami warnings.</p> <p>MCDEM has had a strong focus in recent years on improving the consistency of warnings to the public across all hazards. This work will continue.</p>

7.4 Recognise the importance of science intelligence as part of situational awareness

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
<p>Develop and expert group based on the UK SAGE model (7.4.1).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Science advice is often an important part of an emergency response. It is important that decision makers receive the best possible advice based on the available information in a timely, coordinated, and understandable way.</p> <p>Within New Zealand, there is a range of existing mechanisms in place at national and CDEM Group level. Work was done with the previous Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor to set up a system akin to the SAGE model at the national level. The network of Chief Science Advisors has a role to play. The country's Crown Research Institutes (CRIs) have a role to play in emergency management across the 4Rs. Through their peak body, Science New Zealand, they are currently looking at how they contribute now and how this could be enhanced.</p> <p>These varying strands of work will be connected up to develop a coherent model that operates at national and Group level. This is akin to the SAGE model recommended by the TAG but tailored to the New Zealand context. This will be formalised and documented in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System and the National Security System handbook as appropriate.</p>
<p>Enable relevant science capability to embedded as part of the Fly-in Team (7.4.2).</p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<p>As noted in our response to recommendation 7.4.1, science advice is a critical part of most, if not all, emergency responses. The work referred to in response to recommendation 7.4.1. will ensure that science advice is available to people managing the response to an emergency. This may require them to be included in the Fly-in Team but other methods may be more appropriate.</p>

Chapter 8: Information and communication

8.1 Confirm local Mayor as primary spokesperson

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Provide the mayor with supported strategic communications advice (8.1.1).	Agree	<p>The Mayor in the affected area should be the primary spokesperson in a response as they are the known and credible face in their communities. To do this well, they need support from an effective strategic communications function, so they get the right advice at the right time.</p> <p>Work to formalise and strengthen the strategic communications function (recommendation 8.2) along with work on the Common Operating Picture (recommendation 7.2) will ensure that this support is available to spokespeople. Training for Mayors (recommendation 3.2) will support Mayors in their role.</p>
Require Group plans to identify arrangements for a regional spokesperson when managing an event that crosses territorial boundaries (8.1.2).	Disagree	<p>We think that this is too low a level of detail for the Group Plan. Formalising the strategic communications function in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System (recommendation 8.2) will increase the prominence of this function and will lead to Group's identifying and documenting who they are supporting when.</p>

8.2 Recognise Strategic Communications as an essential element of effective response

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response
Recognise Strategic Communications as an essential element of effective response (8.2).	<p>Agree</p> <p>Effective communication with the public and key stakeholders such as Ministers and Mayors is essential in a response. We agree with the TAG's recommendations in this area. Strategic communications and Public Information Management (PIM) are two separate functions. The strategic communications function was first implemented during the 22 February 2011 Christchurch earthquake response. There is now some confusion within the system as to how the strategic communications and PIM functions relate to one another. This will be clarified by formalising the strategic communication role (and its relationship to the PIM role) in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System, a review of which is currently underway.</p> <p>We have also identified other things that will strengthen the effectiveness of communications within a response including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Controllers to understand the strategic communications role so that it is used effectively and communications objectives are embedded in response processes. • Standardising best practice across the response framework, including a full range of communication channels e.g. iwi radio, access radio, social media. • Including strategic communications and PIM in Fly-in Teams as required. <p>Support for these activities is a key role of MCDEM or a potential NEMA.</p>
Deploy strategic communications support immediately for all sudden onset emergencies such as earthquakes, and other disasters depending on scale (8.2.1).	<p>Agree</p> <p>Arrangements to ensure strategic communications and PIM support have been developed and will continue. As noted in recommendation 8.3, Fly-in Teams should include experienced Public Information Managers and Strategic Communications experts.</p>
Provide communications advice and support for the Minister(s), local MPs, Mayors and Chief Executives/Director (8.2.2).	<p>Agree</p> <p>See response to recommendations 8.1.1 and 8.2.1.</p>
Liaise with their counterparts in other agencies (such as Police, Fire, MFAT, and NZDF) to shape a comprehensive situation report for national and international media (8.2.3).	<p>Agree</p> <p>Inclusion of the strategic communications function in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System will address this.</p>
Work from both the NCMC and 'on the ground', to cover strategic communications needs (8.2.4).	<p>Agree</p> <p>Inclusion of the strategic communications function in the Co-ordinated Incident Management System will address this.</p>

8.3 Include and deploy trained and experienced PIMs and Strategic Comms in 'Fly In Team'

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Include and deploy trained and experienced PIMs and Strategic Comms in 'Fly In Team' (8.3).	Agree	The development and implementation of Fly-in Teams is essential. These teams should include experienced Public Information Managers and Strategic Communications experts as required. Fly-in Teams should also have the capability to engage effectively with local Māori. More detail about the Fly-in Teams is given in response to recommendation 5.2.
Allocate the task of maintaining the database of people with strategic communications, and other specialist communications capability, for deployment as part of the Fly-in Team (8.3.1).	Agree	Establishing and maintaining Fly-in Teams and associated databases of people is a key role of the national emergency management agency (either MCDEM or NEMA).
Resource capability for social media monitoring and use (8.3.2).	Agree	It will be important for Fly-in Teams to have good social media capability. As noted in recommendation 8.3, we agree that Fly-in Teams should include experienced PIM and strategic communications experts.

8.4 Ensure timely, consistent, and proactive use of the range of appropriate media channels both for communication, and for gathering intelligence.

TAG Recommendation	Proposed Government Response	
Ensure timely, consistent, and proactive use of the range of appropriate media channels both for communication, and for gathering intelligence (8.4).	Agree	Some parts of the emergency management sector have not kept pace with the changing communications environment e.g. citizen journalism, a diverse range of information sources, new channels, and increasing speed. As part of the work on effective communications and a common operating picture, consideration will be given to how the emergency management sector can better consume and use information from the public. There are some good examples nationally and internationally to draw on.

