



ORDER PAPER

CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE

Monday, 27 August 2007 commencing at 10:00 a.m.

Refreshments will be available from 9:45 a.m.
Lunch will be available at approximately 12:30 p.m.

Venue:

Council Chamber
Environment Canterbury
58 Kilmore Street
Christchurch

MEMBERSHIP:

Ashburton District Council
Christchurch City Council
Environment Canterbury
Hurunui District Council
Kaikoura District Council
Mackenzie District Council
Selwyn District Council
Timaru District Council
Waimakariri District Council
Waimate District Council

Cr Darryl Nelson
Cr Sue Wells (Chairperson)
Cr Kerry Burke (ECan Chairperson)
Mayor Garry Jackson
Mayor Kevin Heays
Mayor John O'Neill
Mayor Michael McEvedy
Cr Richard Lyon
Mayor Jim Gerard
Mayor John Coles

Inquiries to:

*Emergency Management Office
58 Kilmore Street
Christchurch
Telephone: (03) 365 3828
Fax: (03) 365 3194
Website: www.ecan.govt.nz*



*Environment Canterbury is the administering
authority of the Canterbury Civil Defence
Emergency Management Group*

COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 DECISION-MAKING REQUIREMENTS

Except as below, a statement of compliance and a completed decision checklist is required for any agenda item on a council committee or the council recommending that a decision be made. This will be the responsibility of the person signing off the agenda item.

The compliance statement and checklist will not be used for:

- Recommendations that information be received or that the Council make a decision.
- Decisions taken under the Resource Management Act 1991 or the Biosecurity Act 1993 in relation to resource consents, decisions required when following the procedures set out in Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, other permissions, submissions on plans, or references to the Environment Court.
- Decisions taken to proceed with enforcement procedures under various primary or secondary legislation or regulations, including procedures under the Resource Management Act 1991, the Biosecurity Act 1993, the Local Government Act 2002, and Environment Canterbury Bylaws.
- Administrative and personnel decisions that are entirely internal to Environment Canterbury.
- Other decisions where the procedures to be followed are set out in Legislation.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

The council committee (or the council) must formally certify that:

- (a) It is satisfied that it has sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being and the effects on community outcomes, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions.
- (b) It is satisfied that it knows enough about and has given adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision.

INFORMATION CHECKLIST

(a)	A Statement of the Proposed Decision
(b)	A Statement of the Objective of the Proposed Decision and the Issue or Problem being addressed
(c)	A list of all reasonably practicable options, (including doing nothing).
(d)	For each option in (c): An evaluation of the Benefits and Costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being.
(e)	For each option in (c): A statement of the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted or achieved in an integrated and efficient manner.
(f)	For each option in (c): A statement of the Impact, if any, on Environment Canterbury's capacity to undertake its statutory responsibilities
(g)	If the Proposed Decision is a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water, a statement of how Maori values have been taken into account
(h)	A Statement of significant inconsistencies, if any, with any Existing Policy, Plan or Legislation arising from the Proposed Decision.
(i)	A statement how the views and preferences of affected or interested persons have been given adequate consideration during the definition of the problem or issue, the objective, the assessment of options and the development of the proposed decision, including the particular contribution of Maori to the decision-making process.

Notes:

The significance of proposals and decisions determines how much time, money and effort is put into exploring and evaluating options and obtaining the views of affected and interested parties. The significance of proposals and decisions is determined through reference to criteria contained in the policy on significance.

The policy on significance together with Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002 set out the Council's requirements in relation to decisions. Some decisions can only be made through the Long-Term Council Community Plan, or after the Special Consultative Procedures set out in the Act have been used, (refer to the policy on significance and the Act).

All decisions of Environment Canterbury are subject to the decision-making requirements of section 76 of the Act unless inconsistent with specific requirements of other legislation.

Inquiries to:

Emergency Management Office
58 Kilmore Street
Christchurch
Telephone: (03) 365 3828
Fax: (03) 365 3194
Website: www.ecan.govt.nz



Environment Canterbury is the administering authority of the Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group



AGENDA

CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE

Monday, 27 August 2007 at 10.00 a.m.

1. Apologies – Mayor Garry Jackson
2. Minutes of Previous Meeting p. 1
3. Matters arising

MATTERS FOR DECISION

4. EMO Annual Report 2006-2007 p. 10
5. Ratification of Christchurch City Council Local Controllers p. 26
6. Draft National CDEM Strategy p. 27

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

7. Facilities Review Project p. 31
8. Social Resilience/Social Lifelines Project p. 33
9. Exercise Cruickshank: Influenza Pandemic Exercise p. 35
10. CDEM Group Plan and Local CDEM Arrangements Development p. 40
11. Group Controller's Report p. 41
12. MAF On-Farm Adverse Events Assistance Policy Review
13. General Business
14. Next meeting: Monday, 26 November 2007

Inquiries to:

*Emergency Management Office
58 Kilmore Street
Christchurch
Telephone: (03) 365 3828
Fax: (03) 365 3194
Website: www.ecan.govt.nz*



*Environment Canterbury is the administering
authority of the Canterbury Civil Defence
Emergency Management Group*

**CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY
MANAGEMENT GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 21 MAY 2007
COMMENCING AT 10.10 A.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL, HIGH STREET, RANGIORA**

PRESENT

Joint Committee Members:

Cr Darryl Nelson	Ashburton District Council
Cr Sue Wells (Chairperson)	Christchurch City Council
Cr Sir Kerry Burke	Environment Canterbury
Cr Kelvin Coe	Selwyn District Council
Cr Richard Lyon	Timaru District Council

CEG Members:

Alastair Humphrey	Canterbury District Health Board
Bob Upton	CDEM Group Controller
Murray Sinclair	Christchurch City Council
Paddy Clifford	Hurunui District Council
John Lovell	Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management
Mark Chubb	NZ Fire Service (<i>from 10.25 a.m. until 12 noon</i>)
Paul Davey	Selwyn District Council
Warwick Isaacs	Timaru District Council
Jim Palmer	Waimakariri District Council

Others:

Wilson Brown	Selwyn District Council
Les Pester	Waimakariri District Council

Canterbury Emergency Management Office Staff:

John Fisher	Regional Civil Defence Manager
Jon Mitchell	Group Emergency Planner

Environment Canterbury Staff:

Helen Grant	Hazards Analyst
Robyn Pay	Administration Officer

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mayor Garry Jackson (Hurunui District Council), Mayor John O'Neill (Mackenzie District Council), Mayor Michael McEvedy (Selwyn District Council) and Mayor Jim Gerard (Waimakariri District Council).

An apology for lateness was also received from Paddy Clifford.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2007, as circulated, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Cr Wells – Cr Nelson

3. MATTERS ARISING

- Referring to item 3 (Matters Arising), Dr Humphrey noted his presence at this meeting as a result of an invitation issued to DHBs.
- Referring to item 8, Jon Mitchell noted Helen Grant's attendance at the meeting to give a brief presentation under General Business on a tsunami booklet currently being prepared.

MATTERS FOR DECISION

4. EMO THIRD QUARTER REPORT 2006-2007

The Regional Civil Defence Manager presented the report, noting an underspend at the end of the quarter of approximately \$27,000. Staff anticipated that the position at the end of the year would be approximately square.

The committee perused the report section by section, and the following two points were raised:

- The Pandemic Roadshow opened last week. Members were given the opportunity to go through the roadshow at the end of the Joint Committee meeting.
- Cr Burke referred to Public Education Public Information item 6.4 (page 25), and sought clarification of the quantity of resource material to be produced. Staff confirmed that there was a variety of resource material including posters, banners, booklets, and the "shaky house".

Resolved

That the EMO Third Quarter Report 2006-2007 be adopted.

Cr Wells – Cr Nelson

5. STRATEGY WORKSHOP – 19 MARCH 2007

Jon Mitchell presented this report summarising the strategy workshop day held in March. The report noted the five main subjects discussed at the workshop:

- What are the key issues facing us?
- Defining resilience
- Measuring what we do
- Future direction of the CDEM Group
- Where to from here

The report was discussed at length at the CEG meeting and the recommendations in the report were those of the CEG.

One of the main outcomes of the workshop was identification of the need to achieve a higher degree of shared understanding of the respective roles of the CDEM Group, Joint Committee, EMO, member authorities and other agencies. One way of achieving this was seen as identifying more meaningful outcomes for the CDEM Group within the LTCCPs of member authorities and the plans of partner agencies.

There was general support at the workshop for the CDEM Group's emphasis to move towards risk reduction and community resilience (and away from agency readiness and response as at present).

The workshop and the CEG supported Canterbury's involvement in the production of effective guidelines for the development of the next round of CDEM Group Plans. The guidelines are due to be completed by July, but the Ministry has indicated that this timeline may be optimistic. In answer to a question regarding effect of the delay in production of the guidelines, staff noted that the Ministry considers that plan reviews must be commenced (rather than completed) within five years. This relieves some of the urgency to complete the plan reviews, but means the review of Canterbury's plan needs to commence early in 2008.

It was however noted that the timing of the review of the plan and local arrangements could have budget implications and timing was therefore important. While it would seem sensible to wait for the guidelines (to avoid duplication in work for territorial authorities), it was thought that some preliminary work may be able to be commenced before receipt of the guidelines. The Committee requested that a further report on this be prepared for the next meeting, and that this report include details of timelines and processes.

It was noted that work is continually being done on reviewing local arrangements. CDEMOs identify areas where there are gaps and work is done, eg Welfare. There was some thought that local arrangements would be more useful if they were reviewed more frequently than the current five years. The Ministry noted that activations and exercises provide good opportunities to analyse plans on an ongoing basis, but they supported a major review at five-yearly intervals. Another suggestion was that reviews would be timelier if linked into territorial authority LTCCPs.

Paddy Clifford, the Chairman of CEG, spoke about the first recommendation in the report. This recommendation referred to the establishment of a specific project in the work programme to look at building community resilience in risk communication and public education activities.

Mark Chubb pointed out that resilience was about leadership and facilitation, not about delivering. It would traverse many areas including building controls, the UDS, district plans, asset management plans etc. He considered it would be a two-way process, that it would be necessary to listen to the community to see what the risks are and how well prepared the community is. There would need to be good KPIs for both the community and the Group.

The wording of both the recommendations from CEG was amended and simplified by the Joint Committee.

Resolved

- (a) *That a further report be prepared for the next meeting on the process for the review of the Canterbury CDEM Group Plan and local arrangements.*
Cr Wells – Cr Burke
- (b) *That the Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee endorses the development of a social resilience/social lifelines project and ask CEG to report to the next meeting with terms of reference for the project.*

- (c) *That the Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee be represented on the working party looking at the social resilience/social lifelines project by the Chairperson and the Deputy Chairperson*

Cr Burke – Cr Lyon

In concluding, the Chairperson said that the strategy workshop had been both helpful and frustrating. She congratulated staff on the work done since the workshop to produce the report and conclusions.

7. CDEM GROUP BUDGET 2007-2008

John Fisher presented this report. He noted that there were no submissions received on the Canterbury CDEM Group section of Environment Canterbury's Annual Plan. The budget before the committee for adoption was the same as that considered by the Joint Committee in February 2007.

The Manager reminded the committee of an earlier resolution to maintain the Group's reserve at approximately \$100,000.

Resolved

That the Canterbury CDEM Group Budget 2007-2008 be approved for inclusion in the Environment Canterbury Annual Plan.

Cr Wells – Cr Lyon

8. DRAFT SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT 2007-2008

The Draft Service Level Agreement (SLA) was presented to the committee by the Regional Civil Defence Manager. The proposed SLA continues with the same levels of service provided by the current agreement, but updated to reflect the completion of projects during the year and inclusion of new agreed projects that have been budgeted for in the coming year.

Two new outputs under Plans (4.6 and 4.7) and one under PEPI (6.2) have also been included in the SLA to reflect the resolution regarding the new social resilience/social lifelines project (item 6 above).

Points raised during discussion of this item included:

- The value in linking hazards in local arrangements with those in the Group Plan.
- The possibility of each territorial having a local hazards register. There was discussion about the differing requirements of the Resource Management Act (natural hazards) and the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act (broader, all hazards) in regard to recording of hazards, and about the different methods currently used by various authorities (eg GIS, LIMs, spreadsheets). Mark Chubb referred to some disturbing research he had done that indicated that many territorial and regional authorities throughout the country do not know what a hazards register is; he suggested there is no uniformity in understanding or execution.
- Two amendments were made to the proposed SLA: under 4.7 (CDEM Group Plans) the timeliness was amended to read 30 June 2008, and the quantity of 6.4 (PEPI) was amended to read "At level agreed by Group".

- John Lovell reported that he had received several comments suggesting that the content of the SLA was too detailed, that most of the included detail can be found in other places (ie the budget and work programme), and that perhaps in future the SLA could be more specific and include costs. The CEG Chair said he had not received any such comments, and he considered the SLA was appropriate as it is. Murray Sinclair (Christchurch City Council CEG member) said he would like to see future SLAs cover three distinct areas: administration (as required by the Act), the cost of running the EMO, and the cost of running the PTE. The CEG Chair noted that detailed administration costs have been provided at an earlier meeting, and an indication had been received that PTE costs would be identified separately in future (when the accounting system allowed). It was suggested that these issues could be discussed further later this year prior to preparation of the next SLA.

Resolved

That the Service Level Agreement for 2007-2008 be adopted.

Cr Wells – Cr Lyon

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

9. UPDATE ON EXERCISE CRUICKSHANK – INFLUENZA PANDEMIC EXERCISE 2007

The Group Controller and the Dr Alastair Humphrey provided updates on this exercise.

The exercise consists of four phases:

10 May	Keep it out – lead by CPH and Customs
16 May	Stamp it out – lead by CPH, looking at procedures
17 May	Managing it
23 May	Recovery

The first three phases had been completed at the time of this update.

The Group Controller reported that Group involvement had included operation of the EOC with the Canterbury District Health Board. The Chief Medical Officers of Health were the incident controllers in North and South Canterbury. Joint intelligence and joint public information organisations were in place.

The EM Team (team heads) was brought together during phase 2, and the WAG worked with government departments and agencies. The EM Team was brought together again during phase 3, and two useful workshops were conducted as part of this phase: public information, and death management. The National Controller held a conference call with all Group Controllers during phase 3.

The two areas of concern identified by the Group Controller were:

- Fast moving commodity group (ie supermarkets)
- Fuel

He has sought some national guidelines/agreement on these two issues.

Dr Humphrey said the most important lesson learnt was the value of working together in a joint EOC during all three phases. He noted that most DHBs did not do this and they did not do so well. He recommended that border control should have representation in the joint EOC. He noted that CPH border and cluster control is working well, and he identified the main gap in the Health area as the issue of communication with primary care.

Others reported on the involvement of their various authorities:

- Selwyn District Council had a big involvement practising their business continuity plan on 10 May; involvement of the emergency management organisation and Pandemic Planning Committee on the 16th; and setting up of a CBAC (community based assessment centre) at Rolleston on the 17th.
- Paddy Clifford reported on Hurunui District Council's involvement. Their main office was closed on the morning of the 17th (which prior advice to the public), with essential business arrangements put in place. The Crisis Management Team was brought together, and internal staff communications practised. It was noted that remote business operation by staff from their homes is likely to overload the telecommunications system. In an attempt to circumvent this possibility, satellite communication facilities have been installed in the home of Hurunui's wastewater systems manager so he can still operate if normal lines of telecommunications are unavailable.
- Christchurch City Council (CCC) had involvement through a CBAC, and some staff management teams at the EOC. CCC was also represented at some of the discussions and workshops.
- Les Pester reported that Waimakariri District Council took the opportunity to carry out some forward planning. A valuable meeting was held with neighbouring Hurunui and Kaikoura District Councils. Also on the 17th CD and welfare personnel were taken to the CBAC at Rolleston.
- Jon Mitchell reported that Environment Canterbury workshopped its business continuity plan, and identified some changes required to the plan. The two key issues he identified were in the area of reactivity management – fuel (eg priority on supply) and death management. He noted that the national approach is to wait until there is a problem and then respond. However he felt it was important to manage it early so that it becomes less of a problem.

10. GROUP CONTROLLER'S REPORT

Bob Upton spoke to his report relating to training, MOUs with WAG members, a Controllers' workshop, pandemic planning, and the Recovery Subcommittee.

Resolved

That the information in items 9 and 10 be received.

Cr Burke – Cr Nelson

11. GENERAL BUSINESS

11.1 Hazard Analysis Work at Environment Canterbury

Helen Grant, Environment Canterbury's recently-appointed Hazards Analyst, presented an outline of a public education booklet being produced on tsunamis. It is the most recent in a series of booklets being produced by

Environment Canterbury on hazards. Further booklets on flooding and landslides may follow. She sought feedback on the tsunami booklet.

She also advised that Environment Canterbury is reviewing its work on natural hazards investigation, looking at what has been done in the past and where it might go in the future. There is a focus on working partnerships with territorial authorities looking at more local hazards (eg work is being done with Christchurch City Council on Akaroa Harbour Basin Settlement Study) There is a move to make more information available to the public and consultants, and to get more hazard information onto Environment Canterbury's website. Ms Grant said she is hoping to visit all territorial authorities to have discussions with appropriate staff about their needs and how authorities can work together.

Helen Grant also referred to a workshop she had attended recently in Wellington which had touched on hazards registers. She reported that Ministry for the Environment had commissioned consultants to put together some guidelines on risk reduction measures for territorial authority planners.

She concluded by saying that she is keen to integrate Environment Canterbury's hazard reduction role with territorial authorities and the CDEM Group.

11.2 Training Organisation

Paddy Clifford reported briefly on a presentation at the recent CEG meeting on the rebranding of the PTE. It will now be known as EMTEC (Emergency Management Training Centre). Mr Clifford noted that the first JBIC-based training is to be conducted in approximately 4-6 weeks.

11.3 Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management

John Lovell reported that a representative from the Ministry will be presenting its submission to Waimate District Council's LTCCP this week. The Ministry's submission focuses on the proposed reduction in levels of service rather than the actual reduction in budget allocation. He noted that the council had received submissions both for and against the planned reduction in its CDEM budget.

12. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee is scheduled for Monday, 13 August 2007.

13. CLOSURE

The meeting concluded at 12.30 p.m. In closing the meeting, the Chairperson thanked those present for their attendance, and invited everyone to go through the pandemic roadshow after lunch.

CONFIRMED

Date _____

_____ Chairperson

Agenda Item No: 4	Subject Matter: EMO Annual Report
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Canterbury CDEM CEG
Report By: Regional Civil Defence Manager	Attachments: EMO Annual Report

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to review the performance and achievements of the Group Emergency Management Office (EMO) in regard to the Service Level Agreement between ECan and the Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group for the delivery of Civil Defence Emergency Management functions in the 2006-2007 financial year.

RECOMMENDATION

That the annual report be adopted.

ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY

CIVIL DEFENCE

ANNUAL REPORT TO

CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

GROUP

2007-2008

Report prepared by: John Fisher
Regional Civil Defence Manager

6 August 2007



READINESS RESPONSE

Key Mission Reference No:

3. Encourage our communities and emergency response agencies to be prepared for emergency events (readiness)
4. Respond effectively to emergency events through co-operation and co-ordination (response)
5. Enable our communities to rebuild and restore after emergencies (recovery)

Objective

To maintain an effective Group readiness response organisation

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	REPORT
1.1	An effective Group Emergency Coordination Centre (ECC) at Kilmore St, with the ability to activate an alternate ECC	24 hrs a day, 7 days a week	1 ECC + 1 Alternate ECC	ECC was maintained and was practiced over one shift on Exercise PANDORA. See Note 1.
1.2	ECan will provide the core Plans, Intelligence, Operations, Logistics and Communications staffing required to operate an effective Group ECC and the core recovery staffing post an event	24 hrs a day, 7 days a week	Core staffing for 1 ECC + 1 Alternate ECC	One shift of staff was practiced during Exercise PANDORA. Regular training is being provided and more staff are being recruited. See Note 1
1.3	Liaison meetings are held for all Civil Defence Officers in the Group Area	Quarterly	At least 4 meetings	Quarterly meetings were held
1.4	Contact and liaison is maintained with all Government Departments, SOEs, key agencies and organisations who are involved with the emergency response organisation	All year	At least one visit/contact annually	All contacted as part of process of setting up and running Exercise PANDORA. Pandemic planning work throughout the year has led to an even greater degree of inter-agency co-operation than existed in the past.
1.5	Level 2 and above emergency events are supported	All year	As required	The EMO assisted ECan flood personnel during the November minor flooding event
1.6	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/03. CDEM Group early warning systems are reviewed	31 Mar 07	One report	An initial report was produced and further work is on going. See Readiness Response Committee Report and Note 2
1.7	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/05. Mutual support arrangements are planned and resourced with Emergency Support Teams (ESTs) in place	1 Dec 06 Dec 06 – Dec 07	One EST Plan ESTs established	A Plan has been produced and approved. And a data base is being established to list EST resources available.
1.8	CDEM Work Programme Res.04/03. Review of Canterbury CDEM facilities completed	Sep 06 Mar 07	One Inventory One analysis	Analysis report completed and referred to August CEG
1.9	CDEM Work Programme Res.04/05. CDEM Group	Jun 07	One Plan	Plan has been completed and is updated quarterly

	Communications Plan is reviewed and updated			
1.10	CDEM Work Programme Res.04/04. The CDEM Group Welfare Plan is maintained	All year	One Plan	Approved plan is in place and being maintained.
1.11	Rescue Registered Response Team registrations are maintained	All year	5 Teams	All registrations remain current.
1.12	CDEM Work Programme Rea. 06/03. Rescue Review	Dec 06 March 07	Draft Report Final Report	See Note 3

PROJECT	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
Readiness Response	\$ 510,988	\$ 671,802	\$ 160,814 (see Note 4)

Notes:

1. The Headquarters and staff were also used for the annual oil spill exercise, two National exercises, one in relation to Tsunami and the other focusing on an Earthquake in Wellington, and the Flu Pandemic series of national exercises that were run during the year.
2. Murray Sinclair from Christchurch City is representing the Group on a National Tsunami Working Group that has been established to consider a range of issues around developing a public alerting system for tsunami in New Zealand. The Working Group has met twice to date.
3. Work on this project has been delayed pending the results of a National review of USAR and where that is going. The results of the review are now expected to be confirmed in September/October. Following that review, MCDEM is leading a review of emergency response requirements nationally. That ties in very well with Canterbury's proposed project and the Group has indicated to MCDEM a wish to be the "trial" Group for that review. Current indications are that that will occur.
4. Overspend entirely due to unbudgeted for expenditure in relation to recovery from June 2006 snow event and response to potential flooding situation in November 2006. Additional to the individual Territorial Authority claims, the Government paid out a Group claim of \$167,187 for expenses incurred during the Jun 06 snow event.

CDEM GROUP INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Key Mission Reference No:

3. **Encourage our communities and emergency response agencies to be prepared for emergency events** (readiness)
4. **Respond effectively to emergency events through co-operation and co-ordination** (response)

Objective:

To maintain an effective CDEM Group emergency communications system.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	REPORT
2.1	Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Civil Defence Emergency communications systems are kept operational	All year	100%	System has remained operational throughout period
2.2	CDEM Work Programmes Res.04/01 & Res 04/02. An EOC/ECC electronic information management system, including emergency management GIS is developed	E-systems Project plan developed 28 Feb 07	One Project Plan	See Note 1
2.3	Participate in development of National Crisis Management System	All year	As required	See Note 1.

PROJECT	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
Information Systems	\$ 107,988	\$ 95,645	(\$ 12,343)

Notes:

1. No progress has been made at MCDEM level regarding the development of a National Crisis Management System (output 2.3) and this has impacted on the Group's ability to progress its own electronic information management requirements (output 2.2). Other CDEM Groups are being similarly affected and the EMO is working with the local MCDEM office to try and get some co-ordination between CDEM Groups on a way forward.
2. The underspend for the year relates primarily to the lack of progress around an electronic information management system (\$5,000) and reduced charges (\$6,900) for the ECC's "Survivable PABX".
3. The installation of rooftop aerials and cabling to the alternate ECC in the Christchurch Art Gallery was completed.

CDEM GROUP TRAINING

Key Mission Reference No:

- 3. Encourage our communities and emergency response agencies to be prepared for emergency events** (readiness)
- 4. Respond effectively to emergency events through co-operation and co-ordination** (response)

Objective

To provide or arrange for the training courses and exercises necessary to attain and then maintain an effective Group EOC and CDEM organisation within the Group area.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	REPORT
3.1	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/01. The Group Training Plan is implemented	All year	One programme	See note 1
3.2	The Canterbury Regional Civil Defence Private Training Establishment registration is maintained with the NZ Qualifications Authority*	All year	Registration maintained	Registration remains current
3.3	NZ Qualification Authority, Local Government Industry Training Organisation and Fire and Rescue Services Training Organisation training accreditations are maintained*	All year	All accreditations	Current accreditations are being maintained.
3.4	The Annual PANDORA exercise is undertaken (including post exercise evaluation)	31 Oct 06	1 series of exercises conducted, debriefs conducted and disseminated	The annual exercise was held and was separately reported on.
3.5	CDEM Work Programme Rec04/03. Scoping report completed for conduct of recovery exercise in 07-08 to test recovery organisations relationships and arrangements	Nov 06	One scoping report	See separate Group Work Programme report.
3.6	CDEM training for Group Emergency Coordination Centre staff is provided	3 times per year	A minimum of 3 training sessions per unit	A series of training sessions were held leading up to Exercise PANDORA and Incident Management Team training has been conducted on a regular basis
3.7	Emergency Management Office coordinates EMO staff and other Canterbury TAs and emergency response agencies participation in Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management and Local Government Industry Training Organisation training committees	All year	As requested	Representation on LGITO CD advisory Committee maintained and Group Training Coordinator is also MCDEM representative on FRSITO committee.
3.8	National training courses are conducted on behalf of the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management	All year	As agreed	The Group EMO did not conduct any training for the Ministry this financial year.

3.9	A Group rescue exercise is conducted (including post exercise evaluation)	30 Nov 06	1 exercise, debrief and follow up	After consultation with affected TAs, the exercise will now be held in conjunction with Exercise PANDORA in September. EMO staff have assisted with the conduct of two Christchurch exercises that have also involved outside teams.
3.10	Joint training is conducted with the Canterbury based Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) Task Force 2.	All year	1 programme	See note 2

PROJECT	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
Training	\$ 331,474	\$ 347,499	\$ 16,024

Notes:

1. As separately reported, an agreement has been reached with the Justice Institute of British Columbia for the use of a number of their training packages for EOC staff. The first of those packages has been obtained, modified to meet the Group's requirements and the first training sessions conducted. The training has been very well received. The overspend for the year relates to the additional staff time involved to progress this high priority activity.
2. A planned exercise in September did not eventuate and no joint training occurred during the FY. The Christchurch based USAR Task Force 2 has committed to participate in Exercise PANDORA 2007 and EMO staff are working with Task Force representatives in preparing for that. . Proposals being made under the current USAR review, if accepted, should lead to a more constructive working relationship between the Task Force and local rescue teams in the future.

CDEM GROUP PLANS**Key Mission Reference No: All****Objective:**

To maintain CDEM Plans and progress the development of a Canterbury CDEM Group Plan, involving all stakeholders, in accordance with the agreed Group timelines.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	REPORT
4.1	Amendments to the Group Plan are approved.	Within 3 months of a request, identified need, or emergency event (results of debrief)	<i>Agreed amendments actioned</i>	One set of amendments were approved during the year
4.2	CDEM Work Programme Rec.04/01 Sustainable Group-level Recovery arrangements and structures are in place	Draft Plan Jul 06 Plan Dec 06	One CDEM Group Recovery Plan	Amendments to the Recovery Section of the Group Plan have been proposed. The draft Group Recovery Plan will be finalised once the amendments are approved
4.3	CDEM Work Programme Rec.04/04. Feasibility of Group-wide disaster relief fund is investigated	31 Mar 07	One report (following Group Recovery Plan)	A draft has been produced but is on hold until the Group Recovery Plan is finalised.
4.4	CDEM Group meetings and Group working parties projects are administratively supported	All year	As required	Ongoing
4.6	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/04. Waitaki Valley cross-boundary CDEM arrangements are reviewed	Table top Exercise Aug 06 Nov 06	One report	The August tabletop exercise was conducted and followed by very successful visit to the Meridian control centre and alternate. Further work has been delayed, as there has been no one in The Otago CDEM Group EMO. An appointment has now been made and a follow up will occur later in 2007.

PROJECT	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
Plans	\$ 81,005	\$ 82,201	\$ 1,196

HAZARD ANALYSIS AND REDUCTION

Key Mission Reference No:

1. **Identify and understand the hazards that our communities face** (hazard analysis)
2. **Reduce the impact and likelihood of emergency events** (reduction)

Objective:

To provide an "all hazards" risk analysis foundation for civil defence emergency management reduction, readiness, response and recovery planning.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	REPORT
5.1	Maintain and progress risk treatment options and priorities	All year	1 report	Workshops conducted as part of output 5.3
5.2	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/01 Review of organisational and regulatory hazard reduction measures is carried out (Linked to Red.04/05)	All year	Progress Reports	Initial report completed. Follow up in proposed budget for 07/08 year.
5.3	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/05. Summaries of Hazards to reflect contemporary research and experience are enhanced. (Linked to Red 04/01)	All year All Year	Updated Summary Hazard Register Minimum of two workshops on specific hazards	Two workshops post the June snow event have enhanced understanding of snow, electricity and telecommunications failure hazards. GNS are currently conducting a "Snow Impact Assessment" study. The results of this are expected to better inform future CDEM planning in relation to that hazard. Two workshops in relation to the Influenza Pandemic hazard were held in conjunction with Exercise Cruickshank in May and the very useful findings from these will be fed back into future CDEM planning

PROJECT	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
Hazard Analysis	\$ 59,431	\$ 60,328	\$ 897

PUBLIC EDUCATION PUBLIC INFORMATION

Key Mission Reference No:

3. encourage our communities and emergency response agencies to be prepared for emergency events (readiness)
4. respond effectively to emergency events through co-operation and co-ordination (response)
6. Educate our communities in preparation for emergencies and inform our communities during emergencies (public education/public information)

Objectives:

- To develop a satisfactory working relationship between Group public information and public education stakeholder agencies and the Group
- To establish a sound region-wide research base to use for planning public information and public education activities.
- To identify opportunities for integrating public information and public education between the Group and stakeholder agencies.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	REPORT
6.1	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/02. Integrated Public Information relationships are in place.	Sep 06 Dec 06	Initial report. One CDEM Group Public Information Plan	A Public Information Section Guideline is now in place, along with an "activation tree".
6.2	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/02. A community-based hazard reduction/awareness. programme is put in place. Earth's Fury Roadshow completed. Ongoing programme established working in with MCDEM awareness programme	Ongoing	One programme	Earth's Fury Road show was completed as scheduled and has been separately reported on. An Influenza Pandemic Road show was launched at Waikari on 15 May. See Note 1
6.3	Market research into civil defence preparedness and perceptions in the Group area is undertaken	30 June 07	1 research programme and report	Ongoing
6.4	Resource material is maintained for CDEM promotion activities	All year	Qty	A good range of material is now available for use across the Group area and in consultation with partner agencies has been further extended.
6.5	A trained Public Information team is available to the Group EOC to provide an effective public information service in emergency events.	All year	3 shifts	Team exercised during Exercise PANDORA. And was further practiced during National Exercises.
6.6	Public Information Managers training is conducted	30 June 07	1 training day	A training day was conducted in March for 15 personnel
6.7	Spokesperson training is conducted	30 June 07	2 sessions	There was no demand for this training and it was not conducted.
6.8	A Group newsletter is sent out to stakeholders	30 June 07	At least 3 newsletters	5 newsletters were sent out
6.9	Level 2 and above emergency events are supported	All year	As required	Staff were actively involved during the November minor flooding event.

PROJECT	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
PEPI	\$ 115,100	\$ 126,948	\$ 11,848 (see note 2)

Notes:

1. As separately reported, the Influenza Pandemic Road show has been very well received. Following a demonstration of the show in Wellington the Ministry of Health have made a contribution of \$36,440 toward the road show and this will be used to further develop and support the show in the coming year. Additionally, the Ministry is intending to use the road show as the model for a nation wide roll out of an influenza pandemic campaign.
2. Overspend all related to roll out of road show and its support.

CDEM GROUP ENGINEERING LIFELINES

KEY MISSION REFERENCE NO:

1. Identify and understand the hazards and risks that our communities face (hazard analysis)
2. Reduce the impact and likelihood of emergency events (reduction)
3. Encourage our communities and emergency response agencies to be prepared for emergency events (readiness)
4. Respond effectively to emergency events through co-operation and co-ordination (response)
5. Enable our communities to rebuild and recover after emergencies (recovery)

Objectives:

- To identify the impact of earthquakes, tsunamis, slope stability and meteorological hazard on engineering lifelines in Canterbury to assist those agencies responsible for the provision of lifeline utilities (critical infrastructure). This will enable them to meet the requirements of the CDEM Act 2002 in being able to function to the fullest possible extent during and after an emergency.
- To extend the work of the Christchurch Engineering Lifelines Project to assist National Utilities and Territorial Local Authorities to undertake Engineering Lifelines work for the services under their control.
- To develop a satisfactory working relationship between Engineering Lifelines organisations and the CDEM Group.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	REPORT
7.1	The Engineering Lifelines Group maintains a link with the CDEM Group in accordance with its terms of reference	All Year	Regular reports (minimum of quarterly) on past and intended activities.	Regular contact was maintained for all current projects with support being provided where required. Opportunity was taken to participate in workshops in Christchurch, Rangiora, Ashburton and Timaru regarding priority sites and routes for that project. Lifelines participated in Exercise Cruickshank and related workshops in May.
7.2	Maintain current Engineering Lifelines work within the Group area	30 June 07	As required	Engineering Lifelines continued to act as a conduit for forwarding information to utilities.
7.3	Encourage the extension of Engineering Lifelines to other Territorial Authorities in the Group area	30 June 07	As required	Regular contact continues
7.4	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/04. Fuel Supply Hazard Project continued	Jun 07	Final Report	Stage 1 of project is complete and A draft Stage 2 report, which focuses on the hazards associated with petroleum transportation and the effect on supply within the Canterbury Region and makes overall recommendations, has been received. See Note 2
7.5	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/07. Canterbury Lifeline Utility disaster resilience summaries are collected and analysed.	Dec 06 Jun 07	One draft statement Final statement	Following the Waimate workshop in October and the wider South Canterbury workshop in Timaru in December it was intended that workshops be held in other TAs. There has been no interest in that

				but a District has now engaged a consultant, in conjunction with other work, to produce DRSS. As previously advised the TA DRSS will not be completed in the 06/07 year. Until these are completed it will not be possible to produce the draft Group Regional statement.
7.6	CDEM Work Programme Red.06/01. Lifelines Inventory. Critical gaps in inventory level are identified along with options to redress these for utilities to action. (Year 1 of 3 year project)	Sep 06 Dec 06 Mar 07	Scoping Report Project Plan approved Project underway	See note 1.
7.7	CDEM Work Programme Red.06/02. Priority sites for recovery. A Canterbury wide priority route network is determined for access to important sites in the event of disaster. (Year 1 of 3 year project)	Sep 06 Dec 06 Mar 07	Scoping Report Project Plan approved Project underway	A project plan was approved and stage one of the project began in late January 07. Following discussions with MCDEM, MCDEM provided some additional finance this FY and work was accelerated with the workshops noted in output 7.1
7.8	Participate in National Engineering Lifelines work	30 June 07	As required	John Lamb has regularly been in contact with the National Lifelines Coordinator and other Lifeline Groups.

PROJECT	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
Engineering Lifelines	\$ 116,180	\$ 112,386	(\$3,794)

Notes:

- The report on a high level survey across a number of utility functions showed there is some cause to be concerned about the level of spare parts carried by or available to Territorial Authorities. The report was followed up by a workshop concentrating on just the one utility function of Potable Water Supply as it is the top priority in an emergency to get reinstated in some form. The workshop concluded that:
 - While there was reason to be concerned about the level of spare parts available to lifeline utilities following a major event, it was not feasible to hold spare for all emergencies.
 - People needed to be prepared to look after themselves for a while following a major disaster.
 - Generally suppliers are relied on as a source of spare parts. Suppliers are able to access parts from overseas and within New Zealand.
 - The production of Disaster Resilience Summaries, providing a risk-based assessment and identifying critical infrastructure should be promoted and the information used to assess supply chains, ascertain the availability of critical parts and determine stock needs to be held.
 - Mitigation is important and should be encouraged during all design and detailing processes.
 - Mutual Aid Agreements can assist with the provision of spare parts and resources.

The production of Disaster Resilience Summaries is already in hand (output 7.5) and further work will be encouraged with those and Asset Management Plans to identify critical infrastructure and have plans and MOUs in place. To assist with this the EMO is working with a consultant to produce a form of words, covering those key issues that can be inserted into asset Management Plans.

2. A draft Auckland Lifelines report on Fuel Supply has been received. This raises similar issues to those in the Canterbury report and both reports reflect issues identified in Exercise Capital Quake last year. The Auckland CDEM Group has recommended a meeting with MCDEM and MED to address the issues. The EMO has endorsed such a meeting and recommended to MCDEM that it be extended to include, at a minimum, Wellington and Canterbury representation.
3. To be noted that ECan has appointed a consultant to undertake an investigation into the earthquake hazards in South Canterbury including consideration of the hazards affecting the Waitaki River. The consultant is working with Meridian Energy on the Waitaki River aspects.

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS

REVENUE	Total Budget	Received to 30 June 07	Difference
MCDEM SUBSIDY	(\$ 17,000)	(\$ 61,408)	(\$ 44,408)
Fees etc	(\$ 110,125)	(\$ 116,100)	(\$ 5,975)
Interest	(\$ 9,000)	(\$ 7,262)	\$ 1,738
Separate Rate	(\$ 1,186,041)	(\$ 1,193,838)	(\$ 7,797)
Snow Claim	\$ 0	(\$ 167,187)	(\$ 167,187)
Sub-Total	(\$ 1,322,166)	(\$ 1,545,795)	(\$ 223,629)
PROJECTS	Total Budget	Spent to 30 June 07	Difference
Readiness Response	\$ 510,988	\$ 671,802	\$ 160,814
Information systems	\$ 107,988	\$ 95,645	(\$ 12,343)
Training	\$ 331,474	\$ 347,499	\$ 16,024
Plans	\$ 81,005	\$ 82,201	\$ 1,196
Hazard Analysis	\$ 59,431	\$ 60,328	\$ 897
PEPI	\$ 115,100	\$ 126,948	\$ 11,848
Engineering Lifelines	\$ 116,180	\$ 112,386	(\$ 3,794)
SUB-TOTAL	\$ 1,322,166	\$ 1,496,809	\$ 174,643
NET EXPENDITURE			(\$ 48,986)
GROUP RESERVE		\$152,000	

There was an over spend of \$174,463 in the budget for the year. Most of this arose from the response and recovery associated with the June 2006 snow event.

Revenue from the MCDEM subsidy was well ahead of budget as payment was based on the previous year's expenditure which included the Christchurch City contract. Additionally, as nationally the subsidy is a fixed sum it had been expected that, as in previous years, the amount received would continue to decrease as CDEM Groups spent more. In the event, that was not the case.

Other revenue exceeded budget and, including the snow event claim as revenue, there was a net under spend at the end of the year of \$ 48,986. (An overspend of \$32,298 in 2005-2006).

Assets

The CDEM Group owns no assets as such but is paying interest and depreciation on the following:

	ACQUISITION COST	BOOK VALUE AS AT 30 JUNE 07
Communications Equipment	\$ 166,727	\$ 102,442
PEPI Display Items	\$ 15,548	\$ 11,229
Group ECC	\$ 8,050	\$ 6,067
Training	\$ 24,176	\$ 17,003
Rescue	\$ 18,518	\$ 8,052
TOTAL	\$ 233,020	\$ 144,793

Agenda Item No: 5	Subject Matter: Appointment of Local Controllers – Christchurch City
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Christchurch City Council
Report By: Murray Sinclair CDEM & Rural Fire Manager Christchurch City Council	Attachments:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek ratification of the Local Controller appointments made by the Christchurch City Council.

BACKGROUND

The Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee, at its meeting held on 30 March 2005, resolved that:

“Local Controllers be appointed by territorial authorities, subject to ratification by the Joint Committee.”

PROPOSAL

At a meeting of the Christchurch City Council, held on 19 July 2007, the Council resolved that it:

- (a) reconfirm the General Manager City Environment and the General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services as Local Controller and Alternate Local Controller respectively.
- (b) appoint the General Manager Capital Programme, the Customer Services Manager, and the Transport & Greenspace Manager as Alternate CDEM Local Controllers.
- (c) reconfirm the General Manager Community Services as CDEM Recovery Manager.
- (d) appoint the General Manager Strategy & Planning also as a CDEM Recovery Manager with the Strategy Support Manager, the Programme Manager Liveable City, the Programme Manager Strong Communities, and the Programme Manager Healthy Environment appointed as Alternate Recovery Managers.
- (e) request ratification of these appointments from the Canterbury CDEM Group at its next meeting.

Accordingly, the Christchurch City Council request that the following persons be ratified by this Committee as Local Controllers for Christchurch City:

- Jane Parfitt (General Manager City Environment)
- Peter Mitchell (General Manager Regulation & Democracy Services)
- Kevin Mara (General Manager Capital Programme)
- Michael Aitken (Transport & Greenspace Manager)
- David Dally (Customer Services Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Local Controller appointments made by the Christchurch City Council at its meeting held on 19 July 2007 be ratified.

Agenda Item No: 6	Subject Matter: Draft National CDEM Strategy 2007
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Canterbury CDEM CEG
Report By: CDEM Group Planner	Attachments: Appendix 1 to Item 6 – Draft Submission to Draft National CDEM Strategy

BACKGROUND

The first National CDEM Strategy to be developed under the CDEM Act 2002 was adopted by the Government in 2006, with a three year period before a review would occur - rather than the 10 year life provided for within s31 of the Act.

An initial consultative Proposed National CDEM Strategy was shared with the wider CDEM community in March 2007. Following email discussion on that document, the Canterbury EMO submitted a set of recommendations on behalf of the Canterbury CDEM Group. The central themes of the set of recommendations revolved around the lack of specific targets and actions against which timeliness, quality, fitness-to-purpose measures could be assessed, and the continued inclusion of outmoded language and approached throughout the document.

DISCUSSION

Numerous valuable and constructive alterations have been introduced to the Draft Strategy following suggestions made to the initial Proposed Strategy. However, although the Canterbury EMO is aware that a large proportion of CDEM Groups made recommendations on the Proposed National CDEM Strategy that echoed the key concerns of the Canterbury recommendations, it is apparent from the Draft National CDEM Strategy that several critical concerns have not been taken into account. The continued lack of “measurable targets” results in the Draft Strategy becoming a high-level document that will be unlikely to elicit the comprehensive, collaborative and consistent approach to emergency management in New Zealand that the CDEM Act 2002 envisaged.

The attached draft submission (Appendix 1 to Item 6) outlines the concerns identified by the Canterbury EMO and partner organisations to date.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report be received.
2. That Appendix 1 to Item 6 be adopted as the basis for a submission from the Canterbury CDEM Group to the Draft National CDEM Strategy.

Subject: Submission to Draft National CDEM Strategy

Thank for the opportunity to make submissions on what should one of the most pivotal documents in the New Zealand's Civil Defence Emergency Management structure.

The Canterbury CDEM Group has treated development of its submission on the Draft Strategy seriously, encouraging wide regional involvement in development of the submission, consideration by all members of the Canterbury CDEM Coordinating Executive Group, and final consideration by the CDEM Group Joint Committee.

Approach

Two questions key we asked while reviewing the Draft Strategy were:

1. *Is the approach proposed in the Draft Strategy going to be focused enough to bring about the kind of strategic change necessary to achieve the purpose of the CDEM Act?*
2. *Are the objectives specific enough for progress against the Strategy to be meaningfully measured?*

Our overall conclusion in relation to both of these questions was largely "no". The reasons for that conclusion are outlined in our submission below.

Although our submission is largely directed at enhancing and clarifying aspects of the Draft Strategy, we will first address issues we have with the underlying premise of the change of approach outlined in Part A: Background Material, and reflected in the structure of the Draft Strategy.

Lack of "measurable targets"

Part A to the Draft Strategy outlines the shift from the widely accepted vision, goals, objectives, outcomes, and actions approach, to a "high level" approach that excludes outcomes and actions altogether. Part A goes on to suggest that the Strategy should not "be a substitute for individual agency work plans". Although we agree that specific actions are the responsibility of individual agencies and organisations, it is our firm belief that those agencies and organisations require clear, measurable targets, collectively agreed and mutually supportive, that they are required to achieve.

We believe that the "high level" approach, as proposed, would render the Strategy virtually impotent as a guiding document in the strategic enhancement of CDEM and resilience in New Zealand, as it provides nothing for agencies and other key partners to aim for or be measured against.

We also believe that the proposed approach is inconsistent with section 31(2) of the CDEM Act 2002, which outlines the intended content of the Strategy. Parliament clearly intended that Strategy not include just goals and objectives, but also, at s31(2)(c) "the measurable targets to be met to achieve those objectives" – unless there is a persuasive reason to do otherwise. We do not believe that the reasons for not including measurable targets are at all convincing.

We do not believe that the review process outlined in Part A, p 3, had a mandate to alter Parliament's intention by omitting or re-interpreting otherwise clear and unambiguous concepts such as this. If the proposed approach is to be adhered to a much more persuasive argument for diverging from s31(2)(c) will have to be provided within the Strategy.

The more coordinated approach to enhancing CDEM required by CDEM Act 3(f) is unlikely to be achieved in a timely or effective manner without an agreed set of strategic responsibilities and targets for specified individual or collectives of agencies and organisations to work toward together.

For the Strategy to be at all effective and for it to meet the, at least implicit, intent of the CDEM Act, it has to include "measurable targets" for central government agencies, local government, CDEM Groups, emergency services, emergency response organisations, lifeline utilities and other partner organisations to aspire to, plan to achieve and work toward.

We share the view of the Department of Internal Affairs that detailed work programme information should not be included in the National CDEM Strategy, but we are firmly of the view that higher-level measurable targets do need to be included.

One of our main concerns in this regard is that most work programmes of central government organisations are not readily available to CDEM Groups or other organisations. Inclusion of measurable targets, attributed to the respective organisations would ensure a degree of accountability, as well as an opportunity for consistency across the wider-CDEM sector.

The basis for numerous measurable targets is, in fact, already included in the Draft Strategy, as Part C: National Level Initiatives. For the Strategy to meet to be consistent with and support the purpose of the CDEM Act 2002, aspects of Part C could and should be incorporated into the body of the Strategy - linking each of the initiatives with specific objectives of the Strategy.

Vision and Principles

The Vision and Principles clauses are useful aspects of the current Strategy. We are pleased to see that the Vision and Principles clauses have been re-introduced, when they did not feature in the initial Proposed Strategy. We would prefer that these clauses be retained in the final Strategy.

Explanatory Notes

We are concerned that the inclusion of explanatory notes in the Draft Strategy serves to make the document appear poorly constructed and incomplete. In some cases the explanatory notes appear to be narrow examples of vague outcomes or actions.

It is not entirely clear to us whether it is intended that the explanatory notes be retained in the final Strategy. We would prefer that the explanatory notes be retained, but reconfigured as examples of current best-practice actions, where appropriate and if deemed necessary. These would most productively precede "measurable targets" for each objective.

"Civil Defence Emergency"

The replacement of the term "emergency", used in the parent legislation and in the original CDEM Strategy, with the term "Civil Defence Emergency" in some parts of the Proposed Strategy is inconsistent, confusing and unnecessary.

The only current definition of "Civil Defence Emergency" is that found in Appendix 3 to The Guide to the National CDEM Plan, where it is said to mean the same as "Emergency", as defined in the CDEM Act.

Although "Civil Defence Emergency" may still be in limited vernacular use, it has not had any statutory or practical status since 2002. Use of the term implies the need a "declaration of a state of emergency" under the CDEM Act, which is not what the purpose of the CDEM Act envisages at all, nor is the usage in the Draft Strategy consistent with the broad definition of an emergency within the CDEM Act s4.

All involved can readily understand "Emergency" - including the subtle nuances of meaning it carries depending on the context within which it is used.

We recommend that the Strategy retain consistency with CDEM Act and use the term "Emergency" throughout.

Submissions on Specific Parts

Clause 3 - page 6

We are pleased to see that this clause is now consistent with CDEM Act s3 and support retention of this clause in its current form.

Explanatory note – page 13

We are pleased to see that this explanatory note has been amended in line with submissions to the initial Proposed Strategy and would support its retention.

However, in the interests of offering solutions, this is one area in which a “measurable target” could be usefully introduced. Possible targets might go something like:

All CDEM Group Plans will include reference and linkages to local and regional LTCCPs and all partner agencies business plans by 31 April 2010.

All local authority LTCCPs will include reference and linkages to CDEM Group Plans by 31 April 2012.

Clause 42 – page 17

We are pleased to see that submissions made to modify this clauses to reflect the reality that the “emergency services” are not the only first-line responders. We support this clause being retained in its current form.

Clause 43 – page 17

We support the broad approach that this clause takes to include emergency services in all levels of emergency management.

Clause 44 to 46 – page 17

We support the broad approach that these clauses now take to including lifeline utilities within emergency management processes and activities.

Clause 44 would benefit from being broadened further to include “broadcasters”, with a modification such as:

“... petroleum, telecommunications [and broadcasters.]”

Clause 46 – page 17

Perhaps a “measurable target” here might be:

All national and local lifeline utilities are actively involved in national, regional or local CDEM exercises by 31 June 2010.

Clause 55 – page 19

We support the inclusive and succinct approach taken in this clause and would support its retention in this form.

Conclusion

The success of the continuing enhancement of emergency management in New Zealand and the resilience of our communities depends to a large degree on decisions made on the content of the National CDEM Strategy. We would, therefore, encourage Ministry of CDEM and Department of Internal Affairs staff analysing submissions to the Draft Strategy, and making subsequent recommendations to the Minister, to do so with the purpose of the CDEM Act 2002 clearly in mind.

Thank you again for the opportunity to make this submission.

Yours, etc.

Agenda Item No: 7	Subject Matter: Facilities Review Project
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Canterbury CDEM CEG
Report By: CDEM Group Controller	Attachments:

INTRODUCTION

One of the agreed projects in the Canterbury CDEM Group Work Programme relates to a review of CDEM Facilities in the Group area. The outcome of this project is for “more resilient, effective and efficient CDEM facilities”. This project not only applies to the Local Authority Emergency Operation Centres (EOC) but also the EOCs of our Emergency Response Organisation (ERO) partners.

This was originally project initiated in 2006, however, the survey form used at that stage was found to not be as effective as intended. A new survey form based on that used by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was developed, with peculiarities of the USA context removed. This form asked questions about the physical features of the facility housing the EOC and Alternate EOC, and then addressed the characteristics of Survivability, Security and Sustainability.

EOC ‘STANDARD’

It has been suggested that a minimum ‘standard’ for an EOC be identified and documented. In a FEMA survey to be graded ‘No’ on any of the major questions generally means that the EOC has not achieved a standard considered acceptable. Therefore, in a de facto sense, the contents of this survey could be deemed as the basis for minimum ‘standards’ for EOCs in Canterbury.

SURVEY SUMMARY

Except for Waimate (currently recruiting for a Civil Defence Coordinator) all Local Authorities (LAs) have submitted a completed Survey Form to the Group EMO. Not all ERO partners have yet completed their Survey Forms, although Canterbury Police, Fire and SCDHB have.

A consolidated summary of the results of the was reported to CEG.

The results should of the survey provide us with a ‘base line’ from which to inform future enhancements of our respective EOC facilities, and enable those involved to better understand the limitations of existing EOCs. Further, the results could be used to justify a submission for additional expenditure, resources, etc, so that identified areas of concern can be addressed.

SURVEY FINDINGS

Overall no significant problems were identified in the Survey. Most certainly there are matters in all the LA Survey Forms that should be rectified/improved over time. In the short term it is suggested that the following matters be accorded priority:

- Timaru District Council identify an Alternate EOC location.
- All LAs look at improving the “Sustainability” of their Alternate EOC
- All equipment in EOCs and Alternate EOCs be secured by restraining straps or like
- Telecommunications equipment in EOCs and Alternate EOCs is provided with surge and lightening protection.
- All LAs explore options for increasing the number of staff available to work in the EOC.

FUTURE ACTIONS

It is envisaged that this project will be ongoing over a number of years. In most LAs it will take time, finance and resources to rectify some of the identified shortcomings and/or limitations in the EOCs/Alternate EOCs.

In May/June 2008 it is intended to resurvey all the EOCs and Alternate EOCs to note the progress made to rectify those matters classified “No” or equivalent in the 2007 Survey Form.

Funding has been included in the Group Budget for FY 2008/2009 to undertake an independent review of EOCs and Alternate EOCs in the May/June 2009 period. This review will include an assessment of the ability of Local Authority and ERO partners to adequately staff their EOC over a sustained period.

CEG DECISION

CEG discussed the Facilities Review at its meeting of 13 August 2007 and resolved to:

- (a) Endorse the report.
- (b) Encourage all Canterbury Emergency Response Organisations to complete survey forms for their major EOC-type facilities as soon as possible.
- (c) Request the local authorities and the ERO partners to report back to CEG regarding their plans, to address matters identified in the survey, where it is practicable to do so.
- (d) Based on the responses received, develop guidelines for the establishment and maintenance of Emergency Operations Centres.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the report be received.

Agenda Item No: 8	Subject Matter: Social Resilience Project
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Canterbury CDEM CEG
Report By: CDEM Group Planner	Attachments:

PURPOSE

This report is intended to provide an update of progress on development of "Social Resilience Project".

BACKGROUND

Enhancing social resilience is feature of the CDEM Groups vision and objectives, however, the initiation of a specific social resilience project assumed to be adequately encompassed in ongoing Public Education activities carried out by the CDEM Group and its partner agencies. The Canterbury CDEM strategic workshop conducted in March this year highlighted the need for a comprehensive project, or set of mutually supportive projects, with specific objectives of enhancing the social resilience of Canterbury's communities.

The CDEM Group Joint Committee at its meeting on 21 May 2007 resolved, within Item 6 of that meeting's agenda, that:

- (b) *That the Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee endorses the development of a social resilience/social lifelines project and ask CEG to report to the next meeting with terms of reference for the project.*
- (c) *That the Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee be represented on the working party looking at the social resilience/social lifelines project by the Chairperson and the Deputy Chairperson*

Staff involvement in the project were initially to be the CDEM Group Emergency Management Planner, Jon Mitchell, and the NZ Fire Service Area Commander, Christchurch Metro, Mark Chubb.

PROGRESS

Following initial scoping discussions a draft terms of reference was developed and reported to the Coordinating Executive Group meeting of 13 August 2007.

The following excerpt from the draft terms of reference sums up the initial approach:

"... the project incorporates the following work streams:

- *Identify organisations and institutions instrumental to promoting the capacity of individuals and groups within the community to absorb and adapt to the effects of disaster.*
- *Identify a set of social indicators that characterise the qualitative and quantitative capacity of communities to absorb and adapt to the impacts of disaster.*

- *Apply the social indicators by conducting a detailed vulnerability assessment to evaluate the Canterbury community's social resilience.*
- *Develop resources to support the efforts of community-based organisations and other institutions to promote social resilience across all four elements of comprehensive emergency management.*
- *Recommend targets and actions for the Canterbury CDEM Group to pursue to achieve improvements in social resilience.*

CEG discussed the matter and resolved:

- (a) That the report be received.
- (b) That the CDEM Group Joint Committee be advised that work is progressing on scoping this project, and that CEG will consider further information (including budget implications) at its November 2007 meeting.

More complete terms of reference or a project scope for this project will be developed by the project team and a report made to the Coordinating Executive Group as resolved.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the report be received.

Agenda Item No: 9	Subject Matter: Exercise Cruickshank Report
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Canterbury CDEM CEG
Report By: CDEM Group Planner, DHB Emergency Planners, and Timaru DC CDEM Manager	

GENERAL COMMENTS

A joint CDHB/Canterbury CDEM Group Emergency Coordination Centre (ECC) was established in the Emergency Management Office at ECAN for the first three exercise days of Ex Cruickshank.

Functions delivered jointly within the ECC were:

- Coordination (DHB Coordination with CDEM Group Controller)
- Public Information Management
- Intelligence (Health and CDEM)
- Operations (Multi-agency coordination), and, following lessons learnt from the exercise,
- Logistics (Regionally Critical Resources)

The consensus was that this arrangement worked very well and, while there may be some staffing implications for CDHB if multiple levels of control teams are still considered necessary, we feel the benefits of working closely and sharing information and staff resources outweigh the disadvantages.

Several scenario-based workshops were conducted during the exercise. These were some of the most effective and valuable aspects of the entire exercise, bringing together a wide range of participating organisations with more of a focus than had generally been able to be achieved in the more removed planning processes. These workshops included:

- 10 May ECC EMT “ECC Support to Keep It Out”
- 16 May “Emergency Welfare Support to Stamp It Out”
- 17 May ECC EMT “ECC Support to Manage It”
- 17 May Public Information Management In Pandemic Response
- 17 May “Death Management”
- 23 May “Recovery Workshop”

The fact that very few local authorities took an active part in the exercise resulted Health-related issues to remain unrealistically dominant throughout virtually all of the exercise. This is of most concern in some local areas, where the complex process of planning for the management of emergency welfare in the event of a pandemic is in its early stages. Although there are several examples of exemplary involvement and leadership in the primary health sector in relation to pandemic response, there is still not sufficient involvement for it to be confidently said that a seamless response could be delivered. Achieving such a goal cannot be realised overnight, however, and will require ongoing planning, relationship building and, at a later date, exercising.

South Canterbury DHB exercised its EOC, in conjunction with Timaru District Council. Although that aspect of the exercise is beyond the scope of this report, it is worth noting that communication between Canterbury DHB EOC functions and Timaru District Council EOC, on the one hand, and the Joint Canterbury DHB-CDEM ECC, on the other, could have been more effective. That communication would have been more effective and realistic if a higher level of activation and a more realistic range of exercise injects had been provided.

GROUP ECC MEMBERSHIP

- There was some confusion on Day 1 (10 May) over who was the CDHB Pandemic Coordinator, this was resolved for Days 2 & 3 when a combined CDEM/CDHB Organisation was re-introduced and maintained, with refinements, for the rest of the exercise.
- C+PH staff provided the Health Intelligence function, alongside EMO staff who provided the CDEM Intelligence function.
- The critical Joint PIM function, using both CDHB and ECan staff, proved particularly successful.
- Team members must be able to speak for, and commit the resources of, their respective organisations, with delegations of authority appropriate to their role.
- Full team coverage on a 24/7 basis for the duration of a pandemic is unlikely to be sustainable, or warranted, during any emergency event, with a skeleton staff provided overnight in most cases.
- Most team discussions can be virtual or by conference call, with a minimum to be face to face. The CDEM Duty Officer concept may be a useful model for an extended CDHB presence.
- There are strong synergies resulting from occasional face-to-face meetings and the full team should be assembled for regular briefings – using pandemic-safe meeting practices.

COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE

- CDHB Staff without laptops and wireless Internet access were at a disadvantage; more robust infrastructure is needed if this joint EOC is to be fully effective as they were isolated from their usual working resources. The ECC is set up for fewer networked PCs than the joint facility demanded.
- WebEOC¹ is proved well suited to this application and the ECC has facilities to use this to advantage.

SOUTH CANTERBURY

South Canterbury DHB in conjunction with Timaru District Council, took full advantage of the opportunities that Exercise Cruickshank offered to prepare and exercise as many variables as possible.

The concept of a joint DHB/CDEM EOC was considered in early discussions as well as CDEM EOC personnel supporting Health EOC personnel. SCDHB preferring instead to

¹ WebEOC is an Internet (server) based emergency information management application, which is expected to be the primary emergency information management tool for health organisations in New Zealand and is being developed by the Ministry of Health for this purpose.

nurture new staff while still work together in two EOCs. Welfare and Communication were high priorities to test, leaving activation of physical Community-Based Assessment Centre(s) for another exercise.

Planning meetings were held with the Welfare Management Committee to gain the level of commitment and scenario modelling. From these sessions, the level of 'play' was established; SCDHB facilitator dropping in regular scenarios to Timaru CDEM EOC.

Representatives from Community & Public Health, CDEM and SCDHB communication teams met and developed a draft Public Information Management Plan with a strong emphasis on co-ordination and consistency within the South Canterbury catchment. This required Timaru CDEM Communications to liaise with their two peer CDEMs to ensure the true catchment approach was maintained and each rep responsible for information collection/dissemination to their regional structures (i.e. DHB to South Island Regional Health, CPH Timaru to CPH Christchurch and Timaru CDEM to CDEM Group).

For the SCDHB, 32 EOC personnel were involved, delivering:

- Coordination (CDEM coordination with DHB Controller)^[1]
- Public Information Management
- Intelligence (DHB & CPH)
- Operations
- Logistics
- Liaison

Operations in the community involving all health providers:

- Timaru Hospital
- Public Health Nursing supporting Community & Public Health
- Residential Care (Rest Homes)
- GPs via the Aoraki PHO
- Home-based Support Services (e.g. Nurse Maude)
- Community Pharmacies
- Health NGOs
- CBACs (table-top)
- St John Ambulance

With Day One scheduled as a quiet day for South Canterbury (out of Wellington) the opportunity was taken to convene a meeting at PrimePort with representatives from MAF, CDEM, DHB, CPH, Port Authority and St John Ambulance. Good discussion on Border control resulting in planning changes and future meetings planned. Days Two and Three providing the opportunity to test planning expectations with South Canterbury chosen to have notional cases (cluster control) then assume the manage-it phase. National injects (scenarios) were never going to be enough to keep the momentum alive for 12 hours so it was thankful our Facilitator had prepared multiple opportunities to add incidents at appropriate times. Day Four was a three hour meeting involving all agencies with a Recovery Objective action plan developed following the CDEM model of recovery; providing the vehicle for future planning meetings.

Welfare in the home or more importantly healthcare management in the home remains the biggest unknown as to the period of self-sustainability in the absence of health capacity/capability. The welfare element was the subject of a whole day CDEM workshop on day 3 where many of the assumptions and arrangements were tested discussed and either confirmed or changed. The concept of hotel management was excluded in the early stages of planning due to lack of personnel and population spread; timely, consistent and appropriate information seen as the key to self management.

Day 2 saw a CDEM lead engineering lifelines workshop held. The Ministry of Health scenario DVD was invaluable in setting the scene for discussion. It was generally agreed by those present that while having an impact, it unlikely that the Cruickshank scenario would have major and lasting impact on the lifelines. The exception would be if some other event that departs from "business as usual" occurred at the same time.

It was unfortunate then that communication strategies for this region (by outside reporting lines) were forgotten across all days of the exercise and is the only criticism. Work continues to signal the importance of seeking clarification and support of South Canterbury for regional and national PIMs. Communication and operational response strategies are significantly different from CDHB. The CBAC concept staffed by Timaru Hospital as a separate facility from a GP Practice, whereas in Canterbury staffed by the Primary Sector (GP's, Practice Nurses) as a separate or joint facility.

The ability for a two-DHB/CDEM Group to coordinate a response needs further work to establish a clear understanding of the functions that the joint CDHB/Canterbury CDEM ECC will undertake realising both have different boundaries complicated by Community & Public Health contracted to South Canterbury and West Coast. SCDHB is in favour of an ECC subset when Health is the lead agency which would see Waimate, Mackenzie and Timaru CDEM work together supporting the SCDHB in the response phase. Whether this remains as a loose pragmatic arrangement or documented would need appropriate discussion. It is unfortunate that in South Canterbury, like most of the rest of Canterbury, CDEM EOCs were not fully activated to test the relationship with the DHB EOC. Future exercises may present an opportunity to do further testing.

Exercise Cruickshank enabled multiple agencies to work together knowing each others capacity and capability. Work continues but the experience provides the foundation for a coordinated response in the region.

MOVING FORWARD

- The EOC/ECC training currently being launched by the Emergency Management Training Centre (EMTC) should enhance the capability of the Group ECC, Local EOCs, and staff from their contributing organisations to deliver a more consistent level of emergency coordination.
- It would be advantageous if the Ministry of CDEM invested in an online emergency information management system, at least compatible with MoH's WebEOC, to enhance data information collection, sharing, analysis and dissemination.
- Momentum within primary health to be more involved in emergency readiness response should be taken advantage of and included in future planning, training and exercises.
- The ECC will have several more PCs installed this financial year, but the need for agency representatives to be able operate independently of that should perhaps be give more emphasis.

CEG DECISION

The Coordinating Executive Group discussed this report at its meeting of 13 August 2007 and resolved:

- (a) That the report be received.
- (b) That pandemic planning meetings continue between the organisations, including the District Health Boards, member local authorities and emergency response organisations.
- (c) That pandemic response co-ordination across the CDEM Group area, inclusive of both Canterbury and South Canterbury DHB's, be further developed to ensure that consistent and mutually supportive responses are able to be achieved in future.
- (d) That pandemic planning, capability and preparedness become an aspect of regular reporting within the CDEM Group, including the district health boards and member local authorities.
- (e) That the close working relationships established between local authority CDEM staff and local primary health providers in the preparation for and conduct of Exercise Cruickshank be used as a catalyst for further close working and capability development.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the report be received.

Agenda Item No: 10	Subject Matter: CDEM Group Plan and Local CDEM Arrangements Development Programme
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Canterbury CDEM CEG
Report By: CDEM Group Controller	

BACKGROUND

The CDEM Group Joint Committee meeting of 21 May 2007, resolved at item 5 of the agenda for that meeting, that:

- (a) *That a further report be prepared for the next meeting on the process for the review of the Canterbury CDEM Group Plan and local arrangements.*

This report is intended to meet that request.

TIMELINES

The Readiness Response Committee of CEG agreed to the following timeline at its meeting of 12 June 2007.

- Final draft of each Local Arrangements completed by each CDEMO by Fri 24 August 2007, with copy provided to Group EMO by the same date
- CDEMO peer review of drafts completed by Clusters by Fri 14 September
- Changes to draft as a result of peer reviews actioned by respective CDEMO by Mon 1 October
- If necessary approved/cleared by local Council before Fri 26 October
- Final proof read, ready for printing and delivered to Group EMO by Wed 31 October
- Distributed to CEG members by Mon 5 November for the 12 November CEG meeting
- CEG recommendations to CDEM Group Joint Committee meeting 26 November

CEG DECISION

The Coordinating Executive Group discussed this subject at its meeting of 13 August 2007 and resolved:

- (a) That the report be received.
- (b) That each member authority ensures that the timelines for the review of Local CDEM Arrangements are being adhered to.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the report be received.

Agenda Item No: 11	Subject Matter: Group Controller's Report
Report To: Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	Date Of Meeting: 27 August 2007
File Reference: CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	Endorsed By: Canterbury CDEM CEG
Report By: CDEM Group Controller	

Since my last report to the GEC meeting on 7 May 2007 I have visited Kaikoura District Council. This visit completed my annual visit programme to all the Territorial Authorities to discuss matters of mutual interest and concern with the Mayor, CEO and Local Controllers.

On 28 May John Lamb, Mark Gordon and I attended a meeting of all the South Island Power Line Company CEOs. I was given the opportunity to provide an overall view of the CDEM organisation in the South Island, and the authorities and responsibilities of all parties, including Lifeline Utilities, under the CDEM Act. The electricity lines companies in our CDEM Group area also agreed at this meeting that Orion would act as their single point of contact with the Group ECC during an emergency.

John Lovell and I were invited by the Mayor of Waimate District Council to brief his Councillors on the responsibilities, etc., of Local Authorities under the CDEM Act, the benefits of appointing a local Emergency Management Officer (EMO), and how this may best be achieved. The briefing and subsequent discussion lasted 2 hours. I note that Waimate has now advertised for a 3 days per week "Civil Defence Coordinator".

The 2007 training programme for all Sections of the ECC, including Alternate Group Controllers and ECC Managers, is on going. This programme will gain momentum as we both approach Exercise Pandora and refine the JIBC-based training packages for our use. James Thompson and I were recently involved in a half-day training session for the Christchurch City Controllers.

I attended a Workshop hosted by MCDEM in late June, along with a number of other Group and Local Controllers who have been directly involved in emergencies somewhere in NZ over the last 4 year,. The purpose of the Workshop was to discuss the development of Controller training, updating the Controllers Manual, and other Controller related concerns. In my opinion lots of excellent ideas were tabled and discussed. I also left the Workshop with the distinct impression that the MCDEM staff who facilitated the Workshop overall accepted the views expressed and these views will be the basis of the new Controller Course and other material.

Elements of the ECC participated in the Ministry of Health lead Pandemic Exercise Cruickshank on 10, 16, 17 and 23 May. A report on this exercise is a separate Agenda item.

Planning and preparation for Exercise Pandora 2007 is on going. Meetings have been held with the other South Island CDEM Groups, MCDEM Staff and our territorial authorities. The CEG meeting of 14 August 2006 endorsed a 24-hour exercise commencing about 1200 hours Friday 14 September 2007. I acknowledge that for all our territorial authorities conducting a 24-hour exercise will be a real challenge. However, in my view, for a territorial authority not to take the opportunity presented by this event to further develop and enhance the overall functioning of their EOC would be a wasted opportunity.

I would particularly encourage elected members to take the opportunity to be involved in the exercise by taking an active role in your organisations' EOC, observing at your own or a neighbouring EOC, or by assisting with "Exercise Control" at the Exercise Control Centre in Christchurch.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that this report be received and its contents noted.