



## ORDER PAPER

### CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE

**Monday, 25 February 2008 commencing at 2:00 p.m.**

#### Venue:

Council Chamber  
Environment Canterbury  
58 Kilmore Street

#### 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 Ken W P Lowe  
Cr Bob Shearing  
Cr Rik Tindall  
Mayor Garry Jackson  
Mayor Kevin Heays  
Mayor John O'Neill  
Mayor Kelvin Coe  
Mayor Janie Annear  
Cr Neil D Cruickshank  
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](http://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](http://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, 25 February 2008 at 2.00 p.m.

1. Apologies
2. Election of Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson
3. Record of Meeting Scheduled for 27 August 2007 p. 1
4. Minutes of Previous Meeting p. 2
5. Matters arising

#### MATTERS FOR DECISION

6. EMO Quarterly Report p. 9
7. Draft CDEM Group Budget 2008-2009 p. 11

#### MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

8. Community Resilience Project p. 23
9. CDEM Group Plan and Local CDEM Arrangements Development p. 25
10. Group Controller's Report p. 27
11. General Business
  - Appointment of Local CDEM Controllers
12. Next meeting – Monday, 19 May 2008

*Inquiries to:*

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

**RECORD OF THE MEETING SCHEDULED FOR 10.00 A.M.  
ON MONDAY, 27 AUGUST 2007 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,  
ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY, 58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

**PRESENT**

**Joint Committee Members:**

Cr Darryl Nelson	Ashburton District Council
Cr Elizabeth Cunningham	Environment Canterbury
Mayor Michael McEvedy	Selwyn District Council
Mayor Jim Gerard	Waimakariri District Council

**CEG Members:**

Bob Upton	CDEM Group Controller
Murray Sinclair	Christchurch City Council
Paddy Clifford	Hurunui District Council (CEG Chair)
Douglas Marshall	Selwyn District Council

**Canterbury Emergency Management Office Staff:**

John Fisher	Regional Civil Defence Manager
Jon Mitchell	Group Emergency Planner

**Environment Canterbury Staff:**

Robyn Pay	Administration Officer
-----------	------------------------

In accordance with Environment Canterbury's Standing Orders 3.5.1 and clause 23 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, the meeting was unable to commence as there were insufficient members present to make a quorum within ten minutes of the scheduled start time.

No alternative meeting date was scheduled.

**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 16<sup>th</sup>; and setting up of a CBAC (community based assessment centre) at Rolleston on the 17<sup>th</sup>.
- Paddy Clifford reported on Hurunui District Council's involvement. Their main office was closed on the morning of the 17<sup>th</sup> (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 17<sup>th</sup> 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

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: 6</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER 2007- 2008 EMO FINANCIAL REPORT</b>
<b>REPORT TO:</b> Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 25 February 2008
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b> CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b> Civil Defence Emergency Management <b>PROJECT:</b> <b>OUTPUT:</b>
<b>REPORT BY:</b> John Fisher Regional Civil Defence Manager	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b> CEG

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to review the Group Emergency Management Office (EMO) budget in regard to the Service Level Agreement between Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group for the delivery of civil defence functions for the period ending 31 December 2007.

## SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS

PROJECTS	TOTAL BUDGET	BUDGET TO 31 DEC 07	SPENT TO 31 DEC 07	DIFFERENCE
READINESS RESPONSE	\$486,793	\$229,123	\$238,151	\$9,028
INFORMATION SYSTEMS	\$144,987	\$72,214	\$67,045	(\$5,168)
TRAINING	\$333,201	\$165,600	\$196,396	\$30,796
PLANS	\$82,446	\$40,781	\$41,344	\$563
HAZARD ANALYSIS	\$65,090	\$32,263	\$ 9,404	(\$2,833)
PEPI	\$116,876	\$57,972	\$66,361	\$8,400
ENGINEERING LIFELINES	\$113,987	\$49,636	\$35,932	(\$13,703)
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,343,381</b>	<b>\$647,652</b>	<b>\$674,643</b>	<b>\$27,081</b>
REVENUE	TOTAL BUDGET	BUDGET TO 31 DEC 07	RECEIVED TO 31 DEC 07	DIFFERENCE
SUB TOTAL	(\$1,343,380)	(\$647,562)	(\$610,483)	\$37,079
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$64,160</b>
<b>GROUP RESERVE</b>			<b>\$80,607</b>	

There was a net over-expenditure for the quarter of \$64,160 comprising and over-expenditure of \$27,081 in projects and \$37,079 less in revenue than projected

The over-expenditure in readiness response principally relates to the costs involved in Exercise PANDORA which was run in mid-September. The budget will come back into line.

The Training over-spend almost all relates to the one off payment of \$28,000 for the remaining Justice Institute of British Columbia Emergency Operation Centre staff training modules that have been bought by the Group. This was budgeted for but not phased as the expected purchase date was not known when the budget was set.

The over-spend in Public Education and Public Information entirely relates to additional recoverable costs incurred during Disaster Awareness week in October. Cost recovery will occur in the current quarter.

The under-expenditure in Engineering Lifelines relates to the phasing of projects. The budget is fully committed.

There was a shortfall in revenue from training for the period with invoicing not occurring until the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter. That is now picking up.

The current outlook is for the overall budget to be on target at the end of the financial year.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

*That the EMO Second Quarter 2007 – 2008 Financial Report be adopted.*

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: 7</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: DRAFT CDEM GROUP BUDGET 2008-2009</b>
<b>REPORT TO:</b> Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 25 February 2008
<b>FILE REFERENCES:</b> CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b> Civil Defence Emergency Management <b>PROJECT:</b> <b>OUTPUT:</b>
<b>REPORT BY:</b> John Fisher Regional Civil Defence Manager	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b> CEG

## INTRODUCTION

At its earlier meeting on 4 December 2007 the Group Coordinating Executive Group reviewed the proposed Service Level Agreement for 2008/2009 that had been produced in line with the LTCCP and recommended that:

*The 2008/2009 Service Level Agreement be recommended to the Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, noting an indicative rate increase of 3.6% in line with the LTCCP.*

The draft CDEM Group budget for 2008–2009 has been produced on the basis of the LTCCP which, compared with 2007–2008, proposed an increase of \$65,987 in the gross budget, an increase of \$17,148 in revenue, with a net increase (separate rate) of \$48,839.

Compared with the LTCCP, the proposed budget is for a decrease of \$46,472 in the gross budget, a decrease of \$37,648 in revenue, with a net increase (separate rate) of \$40,015. This is a reduction in the separate rate of \$8,824 compared with the LTCCP and an increase of 3.28% on the 2007-2008 year.

It should be noted that since the budget that went to the latest CEG meeting on 11 February 2007 was prepared, there have been some small movements in the Environment Canterbury overheads. Apart from changing each of the project figures, the net result of these changes has been a reduction of \$11 in the separate rate figure from the proposed budget that was recommended to the Joint-Committee by CEG.

In the following paragraphs the budget projects are those listed in the draft Service Level Agreement (SLA) between the Group and Environment Canterbury for 2008–2009 that was recommended by CEG at its November 2007 meeting. The objectives and outputs for each project are drawn from the same document. The Group Work Programme Projects are those in the Group Plan.

At CEG's request, the CDEM Group Training project has now been split into two projects, CDEM Group Training and CDEM Private Training Establishment. Separate figures are shown for these two projects, along with combined figures to enable comparison.

## 1. 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	RESPONSIBILITY
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	EMO / Controller
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	ECan/EMO
1.3	Liaison meetings are held for all Civil Defence Officers in the Group Area	Quarterly	At least 4 meetings	EMO
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	EMO / Controller
1.5	Level 2 and above emergency events are supported	All year	As required	EMO/Controller
1.6	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/03. CDEM Group Early Warning Systems continued. Agreed recommendations are implemented.	30 Jun 09	All agreed recommendations	CEG Readiness Response Committee/EMO
1.7	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/05 continued. Emergency Support Teams' (ESTs) database is maintained	30 Jun 09	One database	CEG Readiness Response Committee/EMO
1.8	CDEM Work Programme Rea. 06/03. Rescue Review. (Subject to progress on national rescue/response review)	Oct 08 Jun 09	Draft Report Final Report	CEG Readiness Response Committee/EMO
1.9	CDEM Work Programme Res.04/03. Review of Canterbury CDEM Facilities continued. External survey conducted	30 Jun 09	One survey and report	CEG Readiness Response Committee/EMO
1.10	CDEM Work Programme Res.04/04 continued. The CDEM Group Welfare Plan is maintained	All year	One Plan	CDEM Group Welfare Advisory Group/EMO
1.11	CDEM Work Programme Res.04/05 continued. CDEM Group Communications Plan is maintained	All year	One Plan	Readiness Response Committee/EMO
1.12	Readiness Response Plans are reviewed	All year	As required	Readiness Response Committee/EMO

READINESS/RESPONSE	GROSS BUDGET	REVENUE	SEPARATE RATE
2007 - 2008	\$486,793	(\$7,500)	\$479,293
LTCCP 2008 - 2009	\$494,578	(\$9,000)	\$485,578
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009	\$492,653	(\$9,000)	\$483,653

- a. The readiness response project meets most of the costs associated with maintaining an effective Group Emergency Co-ordination Centre at ECan and an alternate at the Christchurch Art Gallery, along with the projects that are addressed by the Readiness Response Committee.
- b. Now the Group has been in place for several years a stage has been reached where, additional to the review of the CDEM Group Plan, other operational plans and processes need also to be reviewed. An allowance for this was included in the 2008-2009 LTCCP.

## 2. 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	RESPONSIBILITY
2.1	Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Civil Defence emergency communications systems are kept operational	All year	100%	EMO
2.2	CDEM Work Programmes Res.04/01 & Res 04/02. An EOC/ECC electronic information management system, including emergency management GIS is further developed	30 Jun 09	One System	Readiness Response Committee/EMO/Project Team

INFORMATION SYSTEMS	GROSS BUDGET	REVENUE	SEPARATE RATE
2007 - 2008	\$144,987	NIL	\$147,987
LTCCP 2008 - 2009	\$144,127	NIL	\$144,127
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009	\$140,087	NIL	\$140,087

- Apart from maintaining the Group emergency communications systems at their current level, the main item in this project for the coming year is continuing with the implementation of an electronic information management system in the Group ECC. The purchase of a one-off external system had originally been budgeted for but current costs now far exceed what had been budgeted for. It is now intended that much of the requirement be met by using, and building on, in-house ECan IT packages such as Microsoft SharePoint. That change in approach has enabled a small reduction in budget for the coming year. There are also considerable long-term training and budget advantages in using an in-house system that most ECC staff will be used to using on a regular basis.

### 3.a 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 ECC and CDEM organisation within the Group area.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	RESPONSIBILITY
3.1	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/01. The Group Training Plan is implemented	All year	One programme	EMO
3.2	The Annual PANDORA exercise is undertaken (including post exercise evaluation)	31 Oct 08	1 exercise conducted, debriefs conducted and disseminated	EMO
3.3	Civil Defence Emergency Management training for Group Emergency Coordination Centre staff is provided	All year	A minimum of 3 training sessions per unit	EMO
3.4	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	EMO - and other EMG member participating at own cost
3.5	A Group rescue exercise is conducted	30 Oct 09	1 exercise, debrief and follow up	EMO

### 3.b CDEM PRIVATE TRAINING ESTABLISHMENT

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 ECC and CDEM organisation within the Group area.

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	RESPONSIBILITY
3.1	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/01. The Group Training Plan is implemented	All year	One programme	EMO
3.2	The Canterbury Regional Civil Defence Private Training Establishment (EMTC) registration is maintained with the NZ Qualifications Authority **	All year	Registration maintained	EMO
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	EMO
3.4	National training courses are conducted on behalf of the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management	All year	As agreed	EMO

PTE	GROSS BUDGET	REVENUE	SEPARATE RATE
2007 - 2008	\$333,201	(\$117,000)	\$216,201
LTCCP 2008 - 2009	\$343,203	(\$127,264)	\$215,939
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009 - TRAINING	\$191,989	(\$17,000)	\$174,989
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009 - PTE	\$114,032	(\$75,000)	\$39,032
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009 – TRAINING & PTE	\$306,021	(\$92,000)	\$214,021

- The original Training budget has now been split into two, as requested at CEG, as CDEM Group Training and CDEM Private Training Establishment (PTE).
- The revenue of \$17,000 against Training is the annual MCDEM grant. The total MCDEM grant for all the CDEM Groups is \$1,000,000 and the Canterbury share of the total is dependent upon its percentage of the total expenditure by all Groups. MCDEM have advised that they are reviewing the future of the grant with the intention of switching to a contestable regime.
- Revenue from the conduct of external training has been cut by \$25,000 with a corresponding cut in PTE training expenditure. It is very difficult to forecast just what training income there will be. For example, while there is an acknowledgement from MCDEM of the need for more MCDEM funded rescue instructor training/validation to be provided and this is likely to proceed, it cannot be guaranteed to occur in this FY. Similarly with training provided to other organisations.
- The output “*Joint training is conducted with the Canterbury based Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) Task Force 2*” has been deleted from CDEM Group training. Though a very successful exercise was run with The USAR Task Force in Timaru in conjunction with Exercise PANDORA last year, the whole question of how rescue teams will work with NZ Fire Service USAR Task Forces in the future is under review.
- The main emphasis in the training area next year will be the further rolling out of the Justice Institute of British Columbia training packages for the group ECC and TA EOCs.

## 4. GROUP PLANS

Key Mission Reference No: All

### Objective:

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

	OUTPUT	TIMELINESS	QUANTITY	RESPONSIBILITY
4.1	Amendments to the Group Plan are considered.	Within 3 months of a request, identified need, or emergency event (results of debrief)	<i>Agreed amendments actioned</i>	CDEM Group Chair/EMO
4.2	Review of CDEM Group Plan commences	<i>All year</i>	Ongoing reports	EMO
4.3	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/04. Waitaki Valley cross-boundary CDEM arrangements are updated	<i>30 Jun 2009</i>	One report	EMO
4.4	CDEM Work Programme Rec.04/01 The CDEM Group Recovery Plan is maintained	Jun 09	One Plan	EMO/CEG Recovery Committee
4.5	CDEM Work Programme Rec.04/04. Work on establishment of Group-wide disaster relief fund is continued	Jun 09	One report	EMO
4.5	CDEM Group meetings and Group working parties projects are administratively supported	All year	As required	Group Chair/CEG Chair/EMO /ECan Admin
4.7	The agreed Social Resilience/Social lifelines project work programme for the 08 09 year is completed	30 Jun 09	One work programme	EMO

PLANS	GROSS BUDGET	REVENUE	SEPARATE RATE
2007 - 2008	\$82,446	NIL	\$82,446
LTCCP 2008 - 2009	\$130,280	NIL	\$130,280
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009	\$132,728	NIL	\$132,728

- As indicated in the LTCCP, a big increase in Plans for 2008-2009 to enable the formal five yearly review of the plan, as required by the CDEM Act 2002, to be implemented. The increase is mostly from the transfer of labour from other projects such as training, plus an allowance for public consultation as required by the Act

## 5. 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	RESPONSIBILITY
5.1	Maintain and progress risk treatment options and priorities	All year	1 report	EMO
5.2	Hazards section of Group Plan is reviewed and updated	30 June 09	1 updated hazards section of Group Plan	EMO
5.3	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/05. Summaries of Hazards to reflect contemporary research and experience are enhanced.	All year  All Year	Updated Summary Hazard Register  Minimum of one workshop on a specific hazard	EMO

HAZARD ANALYSIS AND REDUCTION	GROSS BUDGET	REVENUE	SEPARATE RATE
2007 - 2008	\$65,090	NIL	\$65,090
LTCCP 2008 - 2009	\$62,917	NIL	\$62,917
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009	\$64,590	NIL	\$64,590

- The main emphasis in the hazards area will be the updating of the hazards section of the Group plan as part of the five year review that is required by the CDEM Act 2002

## 6. 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	RESPONSIBILITY
6.1	CDEM Work Programme Rea.04/02 continued. Integrated Public Information relationships are maintained	All year	One Guideline and "activation tree"	CEG Public Education Public Information Committee/EMO
6.2	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/02 continued. A community-based hazard reduction/awareness programme is put in place building community resilience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influenza Pandemic Road show programme for year is completed.</li> <li>• Ongoing programme established working in with MCDEM awareness programme</li> </ul>	Ongoing  Ongoing	One programme  One programme	CEG Public Education Public Information Committee/EMO
6.3	Resource material is maintained for CDEM promotion activities	All year	At level agreed by Group	EMO/CEG PEPI Committee
6.4	A trained Public Information team is available to the Group EOC to provide an effective public information service in emergency events.	All year	2 shifts	EMO/CEG PEPI Committee
6.5	Public Information Managers training is conducted	30 June 09	1 training day	EMO/CEG PEPI Committee
6.6	A Group newsletter is sent out to stakeholders	30 June 09	At least 4 newsletters	EMO
6.7	Level 2 and above emergency events are supported	All year	As required	EMO/CEG PEPI Committee

PUBLIC EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION	GROSS BUDGET	REVENUE	SEPARATE RATE
2007 - 2008	\$116,876	NIL	\$116,876
LTCCP 2008 - 2009	\$119,821	(\$5,384)	\$114,437
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009	\$119,799	NIL	\$119,799

- a. The LTCCP shows a revenue of \$5,384. This was for the annual provision for media training on a cost recovery basis. In reality, no such training has been provided for nearly three years. Additionally, the actual costs for providing the training can vary considerably. Accordingly, the provision was removed from this year's budget and it is intended to do the same for future

years. Should a requirement to provide the training arise, it will be done on a full cost recovery basis i.e. it will have no affect on the budget.

- b. The increase in budget is due to increased staffing costs.

## 7. 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 all hazards on engineering lifelines in Canterbury to assist those agencies responsible for the provision of lifeline utilities (critical infrastructure). This will allow mitigation options to be determined and appropriate measures implemented. Such measures will contribute to meeting 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	RESPONSIBILITY
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.	Lifelines Coordinator/EMO
7.2	Maintain current Engineering Lifelines work within the Group area	30 June 09	As required	Lifelines Coordinator/EMO
7.3	Encourage the extension of Engineering Lifelines to other Territorial Authorities in the Group area	30 June 09	As required	Lifelines Coordinator/EMO
7.4	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/04. Fuel Supply Hazard Project continued. Agreed recommendations are implemented	30 Jun 09	All recommendations	ECan Hazards/EMO
7.5	CDEM Work Programme Red.04/07 continued. Canterbury Lifeline Utility disaster resilience summaries are collected and analysed.	All year	Progress reports	Lifelines Coordinator
7.6	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 3 of 3 year project)	Dec08 Jun 09	Progress report Final Report	EMO/ Lifelines Coordinator
7.8	CDEM Work Programme Red.07/01 Lifelines Interdependencies. (Year 2 of 3 year project)	Dec 08 and Jun 09	Progress reports	EMO/ Lifelines Coordinator
7.9	CDEM Work Programme Red.07/02. Manual Backup. (Year 2 of 2 year project)	Dec 08 Jun 09	Progress report Final report	EMO/ Lifelines Coordinator
7.10	CDEM Work Programme Red.07/03. Social, Cultural, Environmental and Economic Impacts. (Year 1 of 3 year project)	Dec 08 and Jun 09	Progress reports	EMO/ Lifelines Coordinator
7.11	Participate in National Engineering Lifelines work	30 June 08	As required	CEG / EMO / Lifelines Co-ordinator

<b>ENGINEERING LIFELINES</b>	<b>GROSS BUDGET</b>	<b>REVENUE</b>	<b>SEPARATE RATE</b>
2007 - 2008	\$113,987	NIL	\$113,987
LTCCP 2008 - 2009	\$114,442	NIL	\$114,442
Draft Annual Plan 2008-2009	\$107,018	(\$3,000)	\$104,018

- A decrease in gross budget as “*CDEM Work Programme Red.07/03. Social, Cultural, Environmental and Economic Impacts.*” which was to be begun in 2007 – 2008 has been delayed because of lack of progress at National level. 2008 – 2009 now becomes year 1.
- The \$3,000 revenue is a grant from EQC

## BUDGET SUMMARY

The proposed CDEM Group Budget for 2008 – 2009 is summarised in the following table:

PROJECT	ANNUAL PLAN			LTCCP			DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN		
	2007 - 2008			2008 - 2009			2008 - 2009		
	GROSS	REVENUE	SEPARATE	GROSS	REVENUE	SEPARATE	GROSS	REVENUE	SEPARATE
	BUDGET		RATE	BUDGET		RATE	BUDGET		RATE
READINESS RESPONSE	\$486,793	(\$7,500)	\$479,293	\$494,578	(\$9,000)	\$485,578	\$492,653	(\$9,000)	\$483,653
INFORMATION SYSTEMS	\$144,987	NIL	\$144,987	\$144,127	NIL	\$144,127	\$140,087	NIL	\$140,087
GROUP TRAINING	\$333,201	(\$117,000)	\$216,201	\$343,203	(\$127,264)	\$215,939	\$191,989	(\$17,000)	\$174,989
PRIVATE TRAINING ESTAB'MENT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$114,032	(\$75,000)	\$39,032
SUB-TOTAL TRAINING/PTE	\$333,201	(\$117,000)	\$216,201	\$343,203	(\$127,264)	\$215,939	\$306,021	(\$92,000)	\$214,021
GROUP PLANS	\$82,466	NIL	\$82,466	\$130,280	NIL	\$130,280	\$132,728	NIL	\$132,728
HAZARD ANALYSIS AND REDUCTION	\$65,090	NIL	\$65,090	\$62,917	NIL	\$62,917	\$64,590	NIL	\$ 64,590
PUBLIC EDUCATION and PUBLIC INFORMATION	\$116,876	NIL	\$116,876	\$119,821	(\$5,384)	\$114,437	\$119,799	NIL	\$119,799
ENGINEERING LIFELINES	\$113,987	NIL	\$113,987	\$114,442	NIL	\$114,442	\$107,018	(\$3,000)	\$104,018
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,343,381</b>	<b>(\$124,500)</b>	<b>\$1,218,881</b>	<b>\$1,409,368</b>	<b>(\$141,648)</b>	<b>\$1,267,720</b>	<b>\$1,362,896</b>	<b>(\$104,000)</b>	<b>\$1,258,896</b>

## SUMMARY

YEAR	GROSS BUDGET	1.1.1.1 REVENUE	NET BUDGET/ SEPARATE RATE
2007 - 2008	\$1,343,381	(\$124,500)	\$1,218,881
2008 – 2009 LTCCP	\$1,409,368	(\$141,648)	\$1,267,720
2008- 2009 PROPOSED	\$ 1,362,896	(\$104,000)	\$1,258,896
CHANGE FROM 07-08	\$19,515	\$20,500	\$40,015**
% CHANGE FROM 07-08	1.45%	16.47%	3.28% **
CHANGE FROM LTCCP	(\$46,472)	\$37,648	(\$8,824)**

\*\* If no change in budget and/or use of reserves.

## RECOMMENDATION

*That the Draft CDEM Group Budget 2008-2009, as amended, be adopted for inclusion in the Environment Canterbury Draft Annual Plan.*

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: 8</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: COMMUNITY RESILIENCE PROJECT</b>
<b>REPORT TO:</b> Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 25 February 2008
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b> CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b> Canterbury CDEM CEG
<b>REPORT BY:</b> CDEM Group Planner	<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>

## 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.

As only one member of the initial project team is now still involved, more complete terms of reference for this project have still to be developed. It is intended that these be completed and reported to the next meeting of the Coordinating Executive Group.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

*It is recommended that the report be received.*

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO:</b> 9	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: CDEM GROUP PLAN AND LOCAL CDEM ARRANGEMENTS DEVELOPMENT</b>
<b>REPORT TO:</b> Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 25 February 2008
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b> CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b> Canterbury CDEM CEG
<b>REPORT BY:</b> 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 for review of Local CDEM Arrangements 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.

Amended Local CDEM Arrangements were approved at the Coordinating Executive Group meeting of 11 February 2008.

## **CDEM GROUP PLAN REVIEW**

The CDEM Act 2002 s56 requires each CDEM Group Plan to commence a review of its Plan within 5 years of the Plan becoming operative. The Canterbury CDEM Group Plan became operative on 22 April 2005. The CDEM Group's part of the Environment Canterbury LTCCP has the review of the Canterbury CDEM Group Plan commencing 2008-2009.

A revised Director's Guideline for the Development of CDEM Group Plans is currently being prepared for consultation in March or April 2008. The final Director's Guideline, and its accompanying training programme, is intended to be available in mid- to late-2008.

It is not anticipated that the revised Guideline will be too different from the process that was applied in the development of the current Canterbury CDEM Group Plan, although a more robust, and nationally consistent, risk analysis process is expected to be introduced. The enhanced risk analysis process is intended to provide a more sound basis for the subsequent reduction, readiness, response and recovery components of the Group Plan, Local CDEM Arrangements and emergency plans of partner organisations.

The review of the Canterbury CDEM Group Plan should logically follow the release of the new Guideline and the completion of training for staff expected to be involved in the plan review process.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

*It is recommended that the report be received.*

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: 10</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: GROUP CONTROLLER'S REPORT</b>
<b>REPORT TO:</b> Canterbury CDEM Group Joint Committee	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 25 February 2008
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b> CDEM/CDEM/GJC/1	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b> Canterbury CDEM CEG
<b>REPORT BY:</b> CDEM Group Controller	

My annual visit programme to all the Territorial Authorities, to discuss matters of mutual interest and concern with the Mayor, CEO and Local Controllers, has been finalised. All the visits will occur this month. I will report to the next meeting on any significant matters or issues raised during these visits.

The 2008 training programme for all Sections of the ECC including Alternate Group Controllers, ECC Managers and functional managers is finalised. In fact, some training has already occurred. Most of the training will be based on the JIBC training packages modified for our use.

In the last quarter of 2008, two of my most experienced Alternate Controllers (George Griffiths and John Talbot) left the employment of Environment Canterbury. At the same time, both resigned their CDEM role but John Talbot has now agreed to remain as an Alternate Controller until I can find a replacement. To find people with the right skill set and behaviours and also willing to serve as an Alternate Controller is proving difficult.

Every year up to 500 young people (aged 18 to 26) attend the MSD sponsored Limited Service Volunteer Course (5 per year) conducted by NZDF at Burnham. I have often thought that these people may be a potential source of CDEM volunteers, not only for our Group but for other Groups throughout NZ. Late last year I approached the Courses Managers about the possibility of a CDEM presentation being included as part of the course. The response was very positive and the first presentation will occur in March. I have spoken to John Hamilton (MCDEM Director) and he fully supports the concept. He has agreed in principle to MCDEM funding the Handout/Brochure that will be issued at the conclusion of the presentation.

At Group level, pandemic planning is continuing with the CDHB, Community & Public Health and the primary health sector. Also another Justice Sector Group meeting will be held in the near future.

In November the Group Welfare Manager (Martin Maguire) and Jon Mitchell attended a National CDEM Welfare Managers Forum hosted by MCDEM and MSD. The opportunity to share ideas and discuss matters of concern with colleagues from all over NZ was beneficial. As a consequence of the Forum a working party has been formed to investigate and report back on the major concerns raised. It is hoped that this Forum will become an annual event.

The Group will host a day long Welfare Forum on Wednesday, 5 March. The main purpose of the Forum is to provide an opportunity for the CDEM Group Territorial Authorities (TA), members of the Welfare Advisory Group (WAG) and other invited parties that contribute or may contribute to the welfare response to an emergency in the Group area to:

- Share welfare related information.
- Discuss and share ideas on the likely welfare response to an emergency.
- Identify, discuss and resolve welfare issues and concerns.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

*It is recommended that this report be received.*