

**Report**            **06.145**  
Date                4 July 2006  
File                 Z/1/4/20

**Committee**        **CDEMG**  
**Author**            **Roger Blakeley, Chairperson, CEG**

## **Review of Structural Arrangements for CDEM Group**

### **1. Purpose**

To seek the CDEM Group's approval for a review of the Group's structural arrangements.

### **2. Background**

In the process leading to the formation of the CDEM Group, there was much debate and review of the Group structural arrangements.

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 for CDEM in the Region and to 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 CDEM Group Plan.

In November 2002, a Working Group was set up by the 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 Greater Wellington Regional Council (GW) was asked to convene this group. Other members were Kevin Montgomerie, Masterton District Council, Rian van Schalkwyk (GW), Roly Williams, New Zealand Police, Ray Kennedy, New Zealand Fire Service, Karen Stephens, Wellington City Council, Paul Nickalls, Hutt City Council, and Greg Phillips (District Health Board). 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 Group 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 Group to evaluate the following models:

1. A regional entity set up with all Emergency Management 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 operating 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 Group presented its evaluation of the three options to the CEG. The CEG supported Option 3 (the model first proposed by the Working Group) that created a Group Emergency Office with Greater Wellington Regional Council. At the time 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.

At its meeting on 8 November 2004, the CEG resolved that an independent review of the Group's structural arrangements should be commissioned and completed by the end of 2005. The CEG also accepted the draft 'Terms of Reference' (**attached**) for the review and invited the Chairperson of the CEG to make recommendations to the CEG regarding suitable candidates and a proposed budget to undertake the review.

However, the CDEM Group, at its meeting of 25 November 2004, decided not to accept the recommendations from CEG and resolved that the matter lie on the table for a year. It was agreed by the CDEM Group that the review of structural arrangements for the Group be reconsidered in April 2006 when the Group Plan will have been operative for 12 months.

### **3. What has happened to date**

At its meeting on 3 April 2006, CEG raised the issue of a review of the structural arrangements. The matter arose when the report on Exercise Phoenix IV was discussed, particularly in the context of the viability of the CDEM Group Emergency Operations Centre in a major earthquake.

The CEG indicated to staff that the structural review should proceed using an independent person for the work.

To date, we have approached Dave Brunson of the Kestrel Group. Mr Brunson is probably well known to you all as he has addressed the CDEM Group on several occasions. He has vast experience and knowledge of civil defence emergency management in New Zealand and he was instrumental in the structural arrangements of some of the other CDEM Groups (Nelson/Tasman and Auckland). However, I should note that Mr Brunson is named in our CDEM Group Plan as the Lifelines Co-ordinator. In this sense he is not completely independent. Nevertheless, his involvement in our work is probably a plus, as he is familiar with our strengths and weaknesses, particularly compared with other regions.

Mr Brunson has indicated Kestrel's interest to carry out the required review and has stated that he would involve his Auckland Director in the work as she was involved with the establishment of Auckland's CDEM Group.

Mr Brunson considers that several key players in the Wellington Region will need to be interviewed to ensure that a broad spectrum of emergency management agency views is incorporated in the review. To do this, and in addition to the other specific tasks outlined in the Terms of Reference, it is estimated that a timeframe of about 20 to 25 days, spread over two calendar months, will be required. Mr Brunson has signalled an indicative budget of around \$25,000 would be needed to complete the review.

Unfortunately, Mr Brunson has not been able to complete a detailed methodology for the review. However, a broad methodology should be available for discussion at the CDEM Group meeting.

#### **4. Where to from here?**

It is our understanding, that member authorities of the CDEM Group have not made any particular budgetary provision for this work. Under section 31.1.1 of the CDEM Group Plan, external assistance for projects costing more than \$10,000, is to be funded on a split basis – 50% Greater Wellington and the remaining 50% split amongst the constituent territorial authorities on a pro rata by population basis.

It is suggested that, if the CDEM Group supports the structural review going ahead - and quickly - then a detailed proposal and firm price should be obtained from Mr Brunson. The Chairpersons of the CEG and CDEM Group could be authorised by the CDEM Group to sign off the proposal.

#### **5. Conclusion**

The CDEM Group needs to consider whether it supports the concept of a structural review and whether it agrees with the approach outlined above. It is certainly important that we all have confidence that we have the best structural arrangements possible, within budgetary constraints.

## 6. Recommendation

*That the CDEM Group:*

1. **Considers** a review of structural arrangements for the CDEM Group and, if it wishes to proceed with the review, that it:
  - a. **approves** the terms of reference for the review;
  - b. **supports** Dave Brunsdon, Kestrel Group, to carry out the review, subject to the receipt of an acceptable proposal and price; and
  - c. **authorises** the Chairpersons of the CEG and CDEM Group to sign-off the proposal.

Report prepared by:

**Roger Blakeley**  
Chairperson, Co-ordinating Executive Group