	Community Forum Private Bag 4999 Christchurch 8140

Meeting notes for the meeting of the Community Forum
17 September, 6pm
Level 2, Christchurch RSA, Christchurch

Present:	Community Forum members: Betty Chapman. Weng Kei Chen,Wendy Gilchrist, Maria Godinet-Watts, Ruth Jones, Andre Lovatt, Tom McBrearty, , Jocelyn Papprill, John Peet, Patricia Siataga, Emma Twaddell, Amanda Williams, Siong Sah (John) Wong.
Apologies:	Community Forum members: Martin Evans, Trevor McIntyre, Gill Cox, Rachel Vogan, Faye Parfitt, Lesley Murdoch, Brian Vieceli, Leah Carr, Darren Wright Richard Ballantyne, Phil Clearwater, Deborah McCormick Hon Nicky Wagner, Associate Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery
Chair:	Tom McBrearty (Acting)
In Attendance:	Mike Scott, Advisor to the Assistant Chief Executive, Change Management Office, CERA s9(2)(a) , Advisor, Ministerial and Executive Services, CERA

Agenda

Recovery Lessons and Legacy project

Jane Bryden – CERA Recovery Lessons and Legacy team

Discussion:	

1. Jane began by thanking the Forum for their time at the Recovery Lessons and Legacy teams' first meeting with them on August 2015. She explained that since this meeting, the Recovery Lessons and Legacy team had been considering the Forum feedback from that meeting and considering how best the Forum might contribute its skills and experience to the Recovery Lessons and Legacy project.

2. She then explained that the Recovery Lessons and Legacy project is one of a number of learning legacy projects underway looking into the Canterbury earthquake recovery, and sits within a 'whole of recovery' learning legacy programme led by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC). Discussions aimed at aligning the DPMC and the CERA projects have been progressing and as a result, the CERA team was in a better position to brief the Forum more fully.

3. She outlined the three main objectives of the project:
    - Share our story and improve understanding of what happened, how and why.
    - Deliver a legacy of knowledge, tools and experiences for the benefit of local, national and international communities.
    - Help minimise the impacts of future disasters, and improve preparedness, resilience and recovery in New Zealand and overseas.

4. The most important objective is the third; we want to make this information available to others so they can learn from what we have been through.

5. The project has two work streams – The overall Recovery Lessons and Legacy project, and the Social Recovery Lessons and Legacy. The Social Recovery Lessons and Legacy team's project is well underway; they finished their last interview with participants this week. The DPMC work programme sits around these two projects to capture the full picture. It also encompasses other non-governmental agencies e.g. Red Cross and ties in with their legacy projects, pulling everything together with a framework.

6. The project team has undertaken work on these areas of the project so far:
   - Foundational research
   - Audience analysis to Identify audiences that might benefit from this work
   - Defined our research areas, i.e. scope – this has taken some time as CERA has many subject areas.
   - Sought advice about collection methods
   - Considered the ethical and privacy implications of the research process
   - Initiated a project to record CERA's own approach to developing a recovery lessons and legacy project

7. For foundational research, the team has:
   - Reviewed the approach of similar projects from around the world and spoke with people who worked on them.
   - Talked with strategic partners and national and international agencies about the project and our aims.
   - Researched the potential audiences for our work and considered their needs and preferences for receiving our information.

8. Some of the overseas projects looked at include the Victorian (Aus.) bush fires, Hurricane Katrina 2005, Japanese Earthquakes and Tsunami 2011, the repurposing of the London Olympics facilities, the Iraq war rebuild, and the Novopay inquiry. The team has also talked to the Waimakariri District Council, the Selwyn District Council, and overseas organisations such as the United Nations and the World Bank.

9. Globally it appears people and organisations aren't very good at learning and taking/providing advice.

10. A key learning from this research was that information must be easy to access and easy to use, so a key objective for CERA is to make sure the information from this project is relevant and easily usable by future audiences.

11. The research areas covered by the project are now defined as: Recovery Narrative and Timeline, and 19 areas of focus within CERA's organisational evolution and work.

12. The Recovery Narrative and Timeline will be a web-based interactive digital storyboard of key dates, decisions and events across CERA's lifespan. It will include things such a media analysis of content relating to CERA, and the earthquake recovery and rebuild in general.

13. CERA's organisational evolution and work will cover 19 separate areas of CERA's work programme, including all areas that have existed from the organisation's inception until the present day. Examples of these areas are Demolitions and Operations, Communications, Central City, Policy and Programme Management Office.

14.
15. CERA has a large number of different work areas and projects, many of which have been completed. The project team used key criteria such as the use to a future user, and the relevance to CERA's core role, to analyse which areas to research.

16. The project team has sought advice about collection methods, and will be using a mix of interviews, media and document analysis, workshops and a questionnaire for current and former CERA staff which will be delivered online.

17. The project team has also considered the ethical and privacy implications of their research, guided by an Ethics Panel also involving the University of Canterbury and the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, to decided issues around interviewing, consent and storage of information.

18. The project team plans to create outputs from their project which are practical, easy-to-use, fit-for-purpose tools. The first output will be a website to be released in March/April 2016, which will include the recovery timeline and narrative, case studies, guides and tool kits. The second output will be a legacy report outlining CERA's key lessons. CERA will also develop a reference guide which could be used by other agencies and organisations who might want to create lessons and legacy projects in the future.

19. The team also plans to establish a Content Review Group, to undertake the function of guiding, critiquing and checking their outputs before they are released. This group will consist of experienced, trusted and knowledgeable CERA staff and external people.

20. Documents created as outputs for the Legacy project and presented to the CRG for review could be short stories, case studies, bullet point lists or 'toolkits' . Outputs will also potentially include more detailed documents for academia, policy advice for other government departments and other governments overseas.

21. The project team is aware of and values the experiences and knowledge of the Community Forum, and believes Forum participation in the Lessons and Legacy project would enhance the project outcomes.

22. Jane outlined some possible options for how the Forum could contribute to the project, and invited the Forum to decide what way of contributing suits them best:

    - Two "permanent" Forum members of the CRG, plus a third member option which would participate on a rotation basis to provide their expertise on specific content of the work product for review;
    - A rotation of forum members on the CRG;
    - Regular meetings with the Forum to update them on the overall project, potentially also where draft work requiring review can be presented so the Forum can choose which member would be best to serve as the 3rd member for reviewing that work;
    - A workshop for all Forum members to record their insights and experiences working with CERA and throughout the response and recovery stages, from a Community Forum perspective.

23. Jane then explained the steps her project team will take next to progress the legacy project. This will include working to complete all planned interviews and workshops, continuing to work with DPMC on their new programme approach, establishing the Content Review Group and having this operational by late October, and developing and reviewing project outputs and products.

24. The Forum then asked Jane a number of questions about the Recovery Lessons and Legacy project, and their potential involvement in it.

25. The Forum noted that the majority of the information the legacy project would provide for future use will be available online. They asked what would happen if no internet connection was available (e.g. after a disaster) or how difficult this information might be to download if

there is a lot of it? Jane replied that there is no single solution to this; its likely that hard copy wouldn't be accessible either. She explained that the project team was committed to ensure easy web access, quick and easy to download, including the ability to display information in a mobile app, to ensure accessibility by the maximum number of people even in the event of an internet outage. The information needs to be communicated on multiple platforms to ensure it reaches those who could learn from it.

26. The Forum asked how this research links with research done by Civil Defence – didn't information/manuals already exists which provided similar information for disaster response? Jane explained that the CERA project will be much broader than just disaster response information. The immediate response period will be included (including pre-CERA), but the recovery response period which comes after this would also be captured by the CERA project.

27. The Forum enquired as to what period of time the legacy project will be capturing? Jane reiterated that it will cover a time span from pre-CERA, during CERA's operation, and through to November/December 2015.

28. Jane explained further about the interactive web based time line which will be a key product of the Legacy project.

29. The Forum expressed concern that some areas of research would be left out, and that it would be good to see information on these too. Jane explained that many of the people who will be interviewed for the project will have worked in multiple areas of CERA's work programme, so can provide information about areas that may not be included in the timeline, and noted that many of the areas of research listed are collective terms, they contain more than one project. The legacy project has had to prioritise what it includes due to limits created by the short time frame they are working with.

30.

31. The Forum emphasised that it is important to look at projects that weren't successful too. Jane agreed and reiterated that these will be included and reiterated that those areas of CERA's work programme which were not included, weren't included because they didn't meet the project's criteria for usefulness for the public and future audiences. The primary criteria for what is chosen relates to what will be of use in the future.

32. The Forum suggested that health and safety during the recovery and rebuild is an important area, and that this should be included. They suggested that some efforts in the recovery may have been too cautious, and that we may be able to learn from this. The Forum gave an example of lack of access to dangerous buildings being a significant obstacle for people and organisations; Jane agreed that this was a valid concern for many, that there may be a role for CERA in this particular issue where an activity, or lack of, impacted on the overall recovery, but noted that depending on the issue, another agency might be identified as better suited to record a specific legacy.

33. The Forum questioned where 'leadership' as a topic was in the areas chosen for inclusion? It was explained that this topic will be covered within the areas of recovery governance, community, and other areas which contain elements of leadership. The Forum emphasised the importance of including information about challenges related to leadership within recovery and rebuild organisations. They gave the example of the important difference between 'management' and 'leadership' – some managers involved in the recovery and rebuild haven't been leaders, and this has caused problems.

34. Jane then provided more detail about the website which will be created as part of this project. DPMC seek to make one website which will contain all the information collected for the legacy project, and to be able to provide cross reference and connections to information

from different sources (e.g. agencies). A prototype website is currently under development.

35. To conclude her presentation, Jane engaged the Forum in a discussion about the Content Review Group and their potential involvement with it. She explained that the Content Review Group is required to review everything that will be published as an output from the Legacy project. It will be a mix of CERA and independent external people – to provide an outsider's perspective. The group will include representatives from CCC, ECan, and perhaps people who have been involved with similar legacy projects. The Minister would like the Forum to be involved in the Content Review Group in some capacity.

36. The potential options for the Forum's involvement in the Content Review Group were discussed. It was agreed that the first option using only 2 representatives would provide consistency, and representatives could report back to the Forum. Members of the project team would also regularly visit the Forum for updates so all members would still be included.

37. The group would meet primarily online due to physical distance between members. The total commitment would be approximately 10-12 working days. The Forum suggested that in order to get the best effort, it would be good if the members could receive compensation for their time. Many Forum members are becoming fatigued, as most of them have served on the Forum for a number of years now.

38. The Forum posed further questions to Jane following the discussion about the Content Review Group, regarding the group and also returning to the Legacy project content as discussed earlier in the meeting.

39. The Forum asked what exactly is included in the media analysis which will be carried out for the Legacy project. Jane replied that this analysis captures all media related to CERA over its time of operation. The Forum feels that media communication is a source which is important to learn from. Jane noted there is a fine line between capture and analysis however, and the project team will need to ensure their work remains free of bias and judgment. External people in the project team will help with this.

40. The Forum asked whether a reflection on the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery legislation is included in the project, to assess whether this approach was best? Jane assured the Forum that this would be included.

41. The Forum suggested the inclusion of 'predictions' made in the initial disaster response phase about governance approaches for the recovery and rebuild, and a reflection on whether these eventuated or not. A 'Cross Party Forum' held very early post the February 22nd earthquake in Christchurch at Addington Raceway was suggested as the source of this information. It was concluded that more information would need to be gathered about this meeting before any steps could be taken to include such information in the Legacy project.

42. The Forum sought clarity around whether it would have an opportunity to review the Legacy Report prior to its publication, the time commitment required, and how long this report will be. Jane explained that the report will be a summary, as there are so many areas of CERA's work and associated topics to cover. She agreed to confirm whether or not the Forum would have an opportunity to review the report prior to publication.

43. The Forum asked what will happen to CERA's records and files? These will be kept to meet the requirements of public records legislation.

44. The Forum asked about the cost to the taxpayer of the recovery effort, how can this return be measured? They suggested this could be part of the legacy report. Jane suggested that

analysis of this might be outside CERA's scope. Links to the work of other government agencies (e.g. Treasury) could be made however.

45. The Forum was also interested in a cost/benefit analysis of philanthropy and volunteers efforts in the recovery, given the large scale of this.

46. Jane finished by explaining that we need to be realistic and understand it is simply not possible for the project to look at everything that could potentially be included, but that Forum input was welcomed and would be considered.

Decisions taken:	

1. The Forum will hold further discussion on the nature of their involvement with the Content Review Group
2. . This will hopefully be decided upon by the next meeting on 1 October. Following the discussion, their decision will be communicated to the Legacy project team by the Acting Chairperson.

3. The Forum as a whole will participate in the Legacy project by holding sessions (number TBC) with a researcher from the Legacy project team (Rosemary Du Plessis) to capture their legacy.

4. The first of these meetings with the researcher will be held immediately following this Forum meeting. These meetings will only include the Forum members, the researcher, and a note taker.

Meeting closed:	7.30pm (8.15pm including Forum discussion with Legacy project team researcher, which followed the ordinary meeting).
Next meeting:	1 October 2015