

Report **04.637**
Date 12 November 2004
File Z/1/4/1

Committee **CDEM Group**
Author **Roger Blakeley, Chairperson, CEG**

Review of Structural Arrangements for CDEM Group

1. Purpose

To inform the Group about a proposed review of the CDEM Group's structural arrangements.

2. Background

At its meeting on 8 November 2004, the Co-ordinating Executives Group (CEG) decided that it would like to undertake an independent review of the structural arrangements of the CDEM Group by the end of 2005.

The structural arrangements of the Group have been an important topic of discussion by the CEG, both before the CDEM Act was enacted in 2002 and subsequent to the CDEM Group and the CEG being formally established.

A brief summary of "what has happened to date" is outlined below:

In 1998, a group of emergency management officers in the Region was set up to investigate the formation of an Civil Defence Emergency Management Group for the Wellington Region. A Foundation Document was prepared and all local authorities in the Region agreed in principle to belong to a CDEM Group. At that time there were some discussions about Marlborough District Council joining the Wellington group.

In 1999, Stephen McArthur, Hutt City Council and Jane Bradbury, Greater Wellington, were asked by the Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) to review the Foundation Document and develop a structure for emergency management in the Region, focussing on accountability and financing. The structure they proposed was similar to the structure in the current draft CDEM Group Plan, with an option for amalgamation should member authorities so wish.

In 2000, the CEOs decided to look at an alternative model following a proposal from Howard Stone, former CEO of Wellington Regional Council. Essentially, this model involved the formation of a separate civil defence entity for the Region. A Working Party, with approved terms of reference, was set up to investigate further this proposed model. Members of this Working Party were Rachel Rogers (WCC), Kevin Murphy (WCC), Kevin Montgomerie (MDC), Max Pedersen (UHCC), Glen Innes (KCDC), Richard Waddy (WRC), Dave Benham (WRC) and Jane Bradbury (WRC, Convenor). The issue that faced this Working Party was the issue that still confronts the organisation of emergency management in the Region, that is, the question of local autonomy/responsibility versus regional or sub-regional responsibility. The Working Party was eventually disbanded when it became clear that the proposed model under discussion was not in keeping with the imminent legislation.

In 2002 the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act came into force.

In November 2002, another Working Group was set up by an interim CEG to ensure that the CDEM Group and CEG were established and able to function in accordance with the requirements of the CDEM Act 2002. Wayne Hastie (GW) was asked to convene this group. Other members were Kevin Montgomerie (MDC), Rian van Schalkwyk (GW), Roly Williams (NZ Police), Ray Kennedy (NZFS), Karen Stephens (WCC), Paul Nickalls (THCC), and Greg Phillips (DHBs). The Group was to review issues, develop options for their resolution and present the options and any preferred approaches to the CEG.

At its meeting in December 2002, the CEG requested the Working Party to look at the structural arrangements, taking into account what was happening in the rest of the country.

In March 2003, the Working Group presented its findings to the CEG, including a preferred structural model. However, after some discussion, the CEG asked the Working Party to evaluate the following models:

1. A regional entity set up with all EM staff employed by the one entity. This body would do all reduction, readiness, and management of response and recovery. Councils would continue to manage their own response to Council functions (i.e., infrastructure restoration etc). Governance would be to either the CEG or CDEM Group direct. In this model arrangements could be made for existing assets to be passed to the entity.
2. The same model as above but sitting within an existing entity (i.e. a territorial authority or regional council).

3. Retention of CDEM capability within each territorial authority supported by a CDEM Group office at the regional level. The Group Office would be housed at GWRC. There would be ability for a local authority to contract some services to the GEMO and there would be a rationalisation of local emergency operations centres (EOCs). A Group EOC would be staffed by members of the Group Office and located as an add-on to any one of the local EOCs. This was the model proposed by the working party.

In April 2003, the Working Party presented its evaluation of the three options to the CEG. The CEG decided to implement Option 3 (the model first proposed by the Working Party) and to create a Group Emergency Office with Greater Wellington Regional Council. It was recognised that the development of the CDEM Group Plan should be the main priority. There was some suggestion that the structure could be reviewed within a year from the Group Plan being approved.

3. Individual versus amalgamation

The structure agreed (Option 3) is reflected in the Proposed CDEM Group Plan, the only exception being that there has not been any rationalisation of local EOCs. The Proposed Plan provides for each local authority to operate an Emergency Management Office (EMO) and Emergency Operations Centre (EOC). The Group EMO and Group EOC is located at Greater Wellington.

In coming to this arrangement, there were discussions about grouping some of the EOCs and EMOs. For example, in the Wairarapa, there was some feeling that it could be possible for the three territorial authorities to group together under the one EOC and EMO. However, as in the western side of the Region, this has not eventuated.

The real issue here is a tension between the need for local autonomy and capacity, (especially in an emergency event when an area may be cut off from its adjacent area), vis a vis the need for cost effectiveness and efficiencies.

The CEG recognises that this is a difficult issue, but feels strongly that we should keep on working through the issues and explore further whether the outcomes we are seeking can be delivered by any other structural arrangements. CEG acknowledges that past reviews had been carried out by staff of member authorities and, therefore, is proposing that an independent person be contracted to carry out another review.

I have agreed to bring back to the CEG a range of consultants who could carry out this work.

The CEG agreed on the terms of reference for the review. These are attached.

4. Conclusion

There is no doubt that the CDEM Act requires a co-ordinated and co-operative approach to emergency management. It is important, therefore, that we

continually seek opportunities to work together to achieve the vision stated in our Group Plan which is – *The communities of the Wellington Region are resilient.*

The findings of this review will, of course, be reported to the Group.

5. Recommendation

- 1. that the CDEM Group supports the review of structural arrangements for the CDEM Group and approves the terms of reference for the review.*

Report prepared by:

Roger Blakeley
Chairperson
CEG