



Notice is given that an extraordinary meeting of the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management will be held on:

**Date:** Wednesday 20 August 2025  
**Time:** 9.15am  
**Meeting Room:** Tasman Council Chamber  
**Venue:** 189 Queen Street, Richmond  
**Zoom conference link:** <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85794492876?pwd=IfV6yfEaiqKGDcvBNPU3dHjXmV4B4v.1>  
**Meeting ID:** 857 9449 2876  
**Meeting Passcode:** 403901

---

## **EXTRAORDINARY Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Meeting Komiti Whakahaerenga Tiwhikete Whakawhanaunga AGENDA**

---

### **MEMBERSHIP**

#### **Tasman District Council**

Mayor T King (Chairperson)

Deputy Mayor S Bryant  
(alternate)

#### **Nelson City Council**

Mayor N Smith

Deputy Mayor R O'Neill Stevens  
(alternate)

(Quorum 2 members)

Contact Telephone: 03 543 8444

Email: [tdc.governance@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:tdc.governance@tasman.govt.nz)

Website: [www.tasman.govt.nz](http://www.tasman.govt.nz)

## **AGENDA**

**1 OPENING, WELCOME, KARAKIA**

**2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Recommendation**

**That the apologies be accepted.**

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**4 LATE ITEMS**

**5 REPORTS**

5.1 Nelson Tasman CDEM Report..... 3

**6 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION**

Nil

**7 CLOSING KARAKIA**

## 5 REPORTS

### 5.1 NELSON TASMAN CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT REPORT

<b>Report To:</b>	Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	20 August 2025
<b>Report Author:</b>	Joe Kennedy, Manager Emergency Management
<b>Report Number:</b>	REMC25-08-1

#### 1. Purpose of the Report / Te Take mō te Pūrongo

- 1.1 This report seeks consideration of the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Group on decisions (below) that were discussed, but inadvertently missed in the resolution at the 30 July 2025 Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group meeting:
  - 1.1.1 To approve the amendment to the Group Plan 2025 vision statement.
  - 1.1.2 To receive the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Accounts - May 2025.
  - 1.1.3 To retrospectively approve the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group's submission on the Emergency Management Bill Discussion Document.

#### 2. Summary / Te Tuhinga Whakarāpoto

- 2.1 At the 30 July 2025 Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group meeting, three clauses were missing from resolution EMC25-07-3.
- 2.2 It was noticed after the meeting that the clauses in the attachment report (attachment 1 refers) were not included in the resolution and an extraordinary meeting is required due to urgency around the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group considering the decisions in clauses 2-4 in this report.
- 2.3 The missed clauses are essential for ensuring clarity, continuity, and alignment with Council's governance and decision-making processes. To maintain transparency and procedural integrity, these clauses are now being brought forward for formal consideration and endorsement.

#### 3. Recommendation/s / Ngā Tūtohunga






**That the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group**

1. **receives the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Report REMC25-08-01; and**
2. **approves the Group Plan 2025 vision statement be amended to:**  
**'With you, we educate, empower, and connect people to become a disaster resilient Nelson Tasman. We strive to collaborate and focus on overcoming barriers to proactively manage risks and build resilience. We win when every person understands the impact that they can make and is enabled to contribute to and build**

the resilience, wellbeing, and prosperity of themselves, their whānau, and their community.’; and

3. receives the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Accounts - May 2025 (attachment 2 to the agenda report); and
4. retrospectively, approves the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group’s submission on the Emergency Management Bill Discussion Document (attachment 3 to the agenda report).

#### 4. Attachments / Tuhinga tāpiri

- |    |   |  |    |
|----|---|--|----|
| 1. |   | Report of Nelson Tasman Emergency Management Office                                | 5  |
| 2. |   | Nelson Tasman CDEM May 2025 Financial Report                                       | 19 |
| 3. |   | NTEM Submission to the Emergency Management Bill Discussion Document - 20 May 2025 | 20 |



## Status update - Nelson Tasman Emergency Management (NTEM) Office Work Programme

*CDEM Group Joint Committee – 30 July 2025*

This NTEM work programme status update has been prepared for the CDEM Group Joint Committee meeting on Wednesday 30 July. It includes a high level summary of key current NTEM activities being undertaken to achieve the goals detailed in the NTCDEM Group Plan.

### GOAL 1: BUILD STRONG, SAFE, RESILIENT COMMUNITIES

Individuals and communities are ultimately responsible for their own safety and the security of their livelihoods. They must also be prepared to look after themselves and their immediate neighbours after an emergency depending on the size and nature of the hazard event. This will require the community to:

- Understand the risks they face and have taken practical steps to reduce them
- Be prepared, know what to do and have the confidence to help themselves and others in an emergency
- Be well informed prior to and during events to enable decision making
- Organise and participate in Community Response and Recovery Planning

### GOAL 2: REDUCE THE RISK OF HAZARDS

Reducing the impacts of hazards is an important first step towards realising a resilient Nelson Tasman region. Many impacts can be reduced through measures such as:

- Building controls and/or land use planning through the use of various plans and legislation such as the Resource Management Act, Long Term Plan, District Plans, Regional Plans, Regional Policy Statements
- Central government policy and implementation e.g. managing the effects of climate change and options such as managed retreat
- Resilient critical infrastructure
- Careful and secure location of critical services and infrastructure

### GOAL 3: ENHANCE RESPONSE AND RECOVERY CAPABILITY

Notwithstanding the effort that has gone into reducing the impacts and improving the self-reliance of the community, emergencies will occur and the region needs to be in a position to be able to respond to and recover from them. An effective response and recovery capability is one in which coordination is timely and efficient such that the community is supported and is able to recover in the best way possible.

This requires:

- Integrated planning by all agencies with a role to play in responding to and recovering from emergencies
- A high level of cooperation and information sharing between responding agencies
- A clear understanding of respective roles and responsibilities during and after an emergency
- Recognition of the increased importance attached to strategic recovery planning

<b>Goal #1 – Build strong, safe, resilient communities.....</b>	<b>3</b>
CDEM Group Plan 2018 update .....	3
Community Emergency Preparedness Planning.....	4
<b>Goal #2 – Reduce the risk of hazards .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Hazard risk assessments .....	5
Regional Exercise December 2024 .....	6
IT Improvements Project.....	7
Emergency Overarching Response Data .....	8
NTEM Group Response Personnel Capability .....	9
Cordon Management .....	10
Engagement of Professional Services during Emergency Response.....	11
<b>Emergency Management Office administration .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Emergency Management Office Financial Reporting .....	12
Submission to the Emergency Management Bill Discussion Document .....	12
Independent assessment of Nelson Tasman CDEM Group emergency management capability .....	13
<b>Workplan activity status update scale:</b>	

On track	Minor delays	Ongoing delays	No progress	Completed
----------	--------------	----------------	-------------	-----------

## Goal #1 – Build strong, safe, resilient communities

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
CDEM Group Plan 2018 update	July 2023	November 2024	Completed
Description	Notes on status		
<p>The Nelson Tasman CDEM Group Plan is required to be reviewed and updated every five years as per the requirements placed upon CDEM Groups within the CDEM Act 2002. The plan was last reviewed in 2018.</p>	<p>The Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan 2025 was adopted by the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group at it’s meeting on 2 April 2025.</p> <p>Recent consultation regarding the strengthening of New Zealand’s emergency management legislation has highlighted Central Government’s intent to strengthen and enable community, iwi Māori and agency participation in emergency management.</p> <p>As such, prior to publishing the Plan the NTEM office would like to make an amendment to the ‘Our vision’ section of the Plan. The meaning and intent of the amendment remains the same, though is presented in a different manner to better promote the enabling participation aspects referenced above.</p> <p>Legal advice relating to making an amendment post adoption has been sought and there are no issues with making the proposed amendment if we wish to do so.</p> <p>The current vision is:</p> <p>‘Nelson Tasman is a disaster-resilient region that acts proactively to manage risks and build resilience in a way that contributes to the wellbeing and prosperity of all communities, whānau and individuals.’</p> <p>The proposed amended vision endorsed by the Coordinating Executive Group for approval by the CDEM Group Joint Committee is:</p> <p>‘With you, we educate, empower, and connect people to become a disaster resilient Nelson Tasman.</p> <p>We strive to collaborate and focus on overcoming barriers to proactively manage risks and build resilience.</p> <p>We win when every person understands the impact that they can make and is enabled to contribute to and build the resilience, wellbeing, and prosperity of themselves, their whānau, and their community.’</p>		
Recommendation(s)			
<p>That the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group:</p> <p><b>Approves</b> the Group Plan 2025 vision be amended to:</p> <p>‘With you, we educate, empower, and connect people to become a disaster resilient Nelson Tasman.</p> <p>We strive to collaborate and focus on overcoming barriers to proactively manage risks and build resilience.</p> <p>We win when every person understands the impact that they can make and is enabled to contribute to and build the resilience, wellbeing, and prosperity of themselves, their whānau, and their community.’</p>			
Author / Contact: Jim Tetlow (Toa Consulting) / Joe Kennedy			

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Community Emergency Preparedness Planning	April 2023	May 2025	Completed
Description	Notes on status		
The design, development and socialisation of a Community Emergency Preparedness Plan (CEPP) template and accompanying ‘How to’ guide to empower and enable communities to prepare their own plan to support their community in the preparation for, and response to, emergency events. They will also serve to provide NTEM with valuable response information.	<p>This project has been completed and now transfers to a maintenance programme of work promoting the plan template and ultimately supporting communities to complete them.</p> <p>Widespread promotion of the CEPP has occurred. The Tasman community has completed their plan, and the following communities have indicated that they are currently working on them:</p> <p>Tapawera</p> <p>Wakefield</p> <p>Mapua</p> <p>Ligar Bay</p> <p>Onekaka</p> <p>Tata Beach</p> <p>Pākawau</p> <p>Pūponga</p> <p>Takaka Hill</p>		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
<div><div>1.</div><div>Continue to coordinate and support community leads with CEPP development</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>Continue to advocate and identify new community locations</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>Explore additional opportunities to promote CEPP</div></div> <div><div>4.</div><div>Undertake a media campaign</div></div> <div><div>5.</div><div>Support communities who show interest in developing a plan</div></div>	<div><div>1.</div><div>Community appetite and resource to put towards CEPP development and oversight</div></div>		
Output(s)			
Community Emergency Preparedness Plans are being widely used by communities across Nelson Tasman.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
<div><div>1.</div><div>Limited uptake of the plans by communities</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>Lack of agency/partner appetite</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>Lack of EM Office capacity to support demand</div></div>	<div>Regular marketing across multiple platforms to address differing demographics</div> <div>Regular communication and engagement with partners</div>		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Kathy King			

## Goal #2 – Reduce the risk of hazards

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
--------------------	--------	-----	--------

Status update - Nelson Tasman Emergency Management (NTEM) Office Work Programme – July 2025

4



Hazard risk assessments	March 2022	June 2027	No progress
Description	Notes on status		
Following the release of guidelines for undertaking risk assessments by the National Emergency Management Agency, NTEM is in the process of re-assessing our regional risk profile by undertaking a series of workshops to assess regional risk of key hazards.	Top seven hazards have been workshoped with a light touch analysis completed for the remaining hazards. Stakeholder availability and project prioritisation causing minor delays in the undertaking of further comprehensive hazard workshops.  Subject to the availability of our iwi partners, the next step is to facilitate a workshop to work in partnership with local iwi to understand the impact of hazards to whānau, hapū and iwi within the region.		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
<div>1. Secure budget and engage contractor</div> <div>2. Develop, in partnership with iwi, a workshop agenda</div> <div>3. Send out workshop placeholders</div> <div>4. Undertake workshop</div> <div>5. Collate information and populate the Risk Analysis and Summary Tool</div> <div>6. Disseminate information to partners and stakeholders</div> <div>7. Incorporate information in Group Plan 2030</div>	Ensure the opportunity for iwi māori engagement exists throughout the process.		
Output(s)			
Comprehensive risk assessments have been completed for all of the region’s hazard.  Please note: Once completed a cyclic review will be required to check and maintain the currency of the information gathered.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
<div>1. Stakeholder and partner buy in, availability and capacity</div> <div>2. EM staff capacity</div> <div>3. Project prioritisation against other ‘high profile’ projects</div>	<div>Regular communication with partners and stakeholders</div> <div>Robust EM Office work programming</div> <div>Development of a ‘workshop rhythm’</div>		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Kay Anderson			

### Goal #3 – Enhance response and recovery capability

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Regional Exercise December 2024	July 2024	December 2024	Completed
Description	Notes on status		
<p>The Nelson-Tasman Emergency Management Group is conducting a Group-wide functional exercise in early December to facilitate wider understanding of response requirements for a major cyclone and flooding event.</p> <p>The exercise will be delivered utilising injects to prompt multi-agency coordination and response planning activities. The outputs from the exercise will be utilised to inform future planning for cyclone events that occur within the region.</p>	<p>The exercise including debriefing has been completed together with a review of Exercise debrief commentary. Where appropriate action items have been factored into work scheduling activities.</p> <p>Exercise planning for the 2025/26 FY has commenced.</p>		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
1. Set the NTCDEM Exercise schedule for 2025	N/A		
Output(s)			
Nelson Tasman CDEM Group members and Group Emergency Operations Centre personnel are familiar with the requirements for cyclone response within the region.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
N/A	N/A		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Kay Anderson			

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
IT Improvements Project	July 2021	February 2025	Completed
Description	Notes on status		
The IT improvements project serves to achieve a fit for purpose NTEM technology solution to meet the demands of business as usual and response activities.	The ‘go live’ date of 12 August 2024 was achieved, with a new NTEM tenancy solution now in place. Devices have been deployed and training provided. The new NTEM tenancy was tested throughout Exercise Rosalini in December 2024 where positive feedback was received. A concurrent piece of work to formalise financial arrangements and reparation for ongoing tenancy support is expected to be completed within the next quarter.		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
1. Formalise financial arrangements and reparation for ongoing tenancy support	Continued overarching project management and project momentum.		
Output(s)			
A fit for purpose NTEM technology solution is in place with appropriate support mechanisms.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
1. Project stakeholder buy in, availability and capacity 2. EM staff capacity 3. Project prioritisation against other ‘high profile’ projects	1. Regular communication with project stakeholders. Continued advocacy and sound project management practices 2. Robust EM Office work programming 3. Continued advocacy and sound project management practices		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Luci Swatton			

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Emergency Overarching Response Data	Not yet started	N/A	Ongoing delays
Description	Notes on status		
To develop and implement a system to coordinate the response related data that multiple partners hold in their own systems. This will serve to provide a regional understanding of the impacts and needs and would track impacted residents' journeys through ‘the system’.	Lack of resourcing amongst stakeholders has attributed to project delays.  A basic Project Proposal has been completed. Nelson City Council resource has been assigned and stakeholder discussions have commenced.  As a result of concerns that NTEM had about the status of this project, representatives from NTEM and NCC GIS and IT met in May. Project barriers and challenges were discussed and actions to move forward documented.		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
<div>1. NTEM to update and resocialise project proposal documentation including refresh user requirements (Completed)</div> <div>2. Project Group to reconvene to review the amended project proposal and agree next steps.</div>	Nelson City Council appetite and resource to put towards the development and oversight of the project		
Output(s)			
A secure and trusted tool to coordinate and consolidate electronic data streams has been developed and successfully integrated, implemented and utilised across response partners and agencies.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
<div>1. Project stakeholder buy in, availability and capacity</div> <div>2. EM staff capacity</div> <div>3. Project prioritisation against other ‘high profile’ projects</div> <div>4. Availability of budget</div>	<div>1. Regular communication with project stakeholders. Continued advocacy and sound project management practices</div> <div>2. Robust EM Office work programming</div> <div>3. Continued advocacy and sound project management practices</div>		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Luci Swatton			

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
NTEM Group Response Personnel Capability	Ongoing	N/A	On track
Description	Notes on status		
In accordance with the Guide to Group Emergency Operations Centre (GEOC) staffing, enhance and maintain the number of trained staff from Nelson City Council (NCC) and Tasman District Council (TDC).	At the time of writing 136 NCC (up from 124) and 152 TDC (up from 142) staff and 37 non-council staff (up from 34) have had a minimum of ITF intermediate training or equivalent and would therefore be eligible to fill Group EOC roles during response.  Additionally, as part of a new initiative 19 CDC supervisors have been trained (up from 0) and 139 CDC staff trained (up from 127).		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
<div>1. Welfare Function Needs Assessment (August 2025)</div> <div>2. ITF Intermediate training (August 2025)</div> <div>3. Function specific training (September 2025)</div>	Continued access to budget and staff		
Output(s)			
The Nelson Tasman region has an adequate number of trained staff to maintain GEOC operations in accordance with the Guide to Group Emergency Operations Centre staffing.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
<div>1. Availability of staff to attend courses</div> <div>2. Access to NEMA approved trainers</div> <div>3. Access to budget</div> <div>4. Staff attrition/turnover</div>	<div>1. Continued liaison and advocacy with Council management</div> <div>2. Identify alternate trainers</div> <div>3. Continue to advocate to the Tertiary Education Commission fund via NEMA for an increase in our funding allocation</div>		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Kathy Solly			

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Cordon Management	July 2023	December 2023	No progress
Description	Notes on status		
Strategic/operational guidance is needed to assist response and recovery decision making regarding the implementation, management and disestablishment of cordons.	This is a joint NTCDEM and Canterbury CDEM project. A Canterbury based multi-agency working group is reviewing the initial draft.  Resourcing constraints in both CDEM Groups is resulting in ongoing project delays.		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
<div>1. Await the completion of the Canterbury based multi-agency working group review</div> <div>2. Amend draft Cordon Management SOP for the Nelson Tasman region</div> <div>3. Arrange and facilitate an Emergency Service workshop hui (inc. MPI)</div> <div>4. Socialise SOP amongst relevant stakeholders and partners for comment</div> <div>5. Review comments, amend and finalise SOP</div> <div>6. Socialise SOP with operational personnel</div> <div>7. Test, exercise and review the SOP</div>	Stakeholder engagement		
Output(s)			
A Cordon Management SOP has been developed, socialised and implemented.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
<div>1. Project scope creep</div> <div>2. Disparate approach to cordon management amongst partners and agencies</div> <div>3. Availability of human resources</div>	<div>Regular communication with partners to ensure delays and issues can be resolved in a timely manner.</div> <div>Work programme prioritisation</div> <div>Clear project parameters</div>		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Kay Anderson			

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Engagement of Professional Services during Emergency Response	July 2024	June 2025	On track
Description	Notes on status		
NTEM in partnership with Stantec are collaborating on a project supported through the NEMA resilience fund to produce an effective and coordinated professional service delivery of engineering during a CDEM response. The project will also equip the engineering profession with knowledge, and experience in emergency management to better support councils, lifelines and communities.	<p>The project is on track, in line with the NEMA Resilience Fund timeframes.</p> <p>The framework has been reviewed following feedback received from the CDEM sector, Lifeline Utilities and ACE NZ/Engineering NZ. Progress reporting to NEMA has been completed for three quarters. A guideline regarding the integration of professional services into Emergency Management systems is nearing completion. This guideline has been deliberately developed in the style of a NEMA Directors Guideline with the intent that it could be adopted as such.</p>		
Upcoming Task(s)	Critical Components		
<div><div></div><div>1. Further socialisation of the framework with partners and working groups</div><div></div><div>2. Development of Procurement Structure for Professional Services Panel</div><div></div><div>3. Finalisation of response and recovery operating policies and procedures</div><div></div><div>4. Submission of final documentation and NEMA reporting</div><div></div><div>5. Distribution and socialisation amongst NTEM partners and committee structures</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>1. Partner and stakeholder buy in/support</div><div></div><div>2. Willingness from commercial entities to engage with the project</div><div></div><div>3. NEMA resilience funding</div><div></div><div>4. Availability of Stantec resources</div></div>		
Output(s)			
A standardised structure/framework through the Response Specialist Panel and Committee to deliver a coordinated professional services response for large scale emergency events.			
Potential risk(s)	Mitigation		
The capacity for partners and stakeholders to provide contributions in time to meet project deadlines.  Project scope creep.	Regular communication with partners to ensure delays and issues can be resolved in a timely manner.  Regular checks and reporting to ensure staying within project scope.		
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Luci Swatton			

## Emergency Management Office administration

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Emergency Management Office Financial Reporting	July 2024	June 2025	On track
Notes on status			
<p>The financial report to May 2025 is attached as Attachment 2. Total Expenditure is \$230,000 below budget largely due to timing of operating expenditure, in particular Controllers fees, NZ-RT2 training and delays in obtaining additional office accommodation. Additionally, a rental saving is presently being realised due to lease renewal. A forecast of expenditure to year end was prepared before the recent weather events shows an estimated surplus of \$148,000. Base and first floor rental savings, utilisation of team leave, website programming, and delays in implementation of project delivery are key contributors. There will be an impact as a result of missing the 30 June cut off for some expenditure.</p> <p>In terms of CAPEX, a number of factors have resulted in funds not being fully spent this financial year. As a result, the Emergency Management Office sought approval to carry \$55,100 over into the 2025/26 financial year. This is comprised of \$3,900 (generators), \$3,500 (Response Team IT equipment), \$4000 (air conditioning), \$2,500 (phone systems inc. response cell phones), and \$41,200 (vehicles).</p>			
Potential risk(s)		Mitigation	
The need to respond to and recover from emergency events exceeds budget (we do not budget for response costs), and detracts the ability of the EM Office to deliver other workstream activities and associated expenditure.		N/A	
Recommendation(s)			
<b><u>Receives</u></b> the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management accounts to May 2025			
Author / Contact: Andrew Bishop / Joe Kennedy			

Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Submission to the Emergency Management Bill Discussion Document	April 2025	May 2025	Completed
Notes on status			
Following the email correspondence you received on 22 April 2025 entitled 'Update - EM Bill – April 2025' the Emergency Management Office drafted and submitted a submission on behalf of the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group. The submission is attached as Attachment 3.			
Recommendation(s)			
<u>Approves</u> that the submission to the Emergency Management Bill discussion document 'NTEM submission to the EM Bill discussion document 20 May 2025' be forwarded to members of the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group for retrospective endorsement.			
Author / Contact: Joe Kennedy			



Activity / Project	Starts	Due	Status
Independent assessment of Nelson Tasman CDEM Group emergency management capability	2024	2024	Completed
Description	Notes on status		
<p>The Ministry of Civil Defence &amp; Emergency Management (now the National Emergency Management Agency) last undertook a capability assessment of the Nelson Tasman Emergency Management Group in 2015. Since this review, professionalism of the CDEM sector has increased, driven by more regular events that are increasingly in the public eye; resultant ministerial enquiries; and subsequent increased expectation, scrutiny, and consequence at national, regional, and local levels. Numerous areas for improvement have been identified across the sector. While the NTCDEM Group undertakes regular debriefs following regional and local responses, the Group has not recently holistically reviewed emergency management performance and business practices across activities before, during, and after emergency events. Debriefs were held following the August 2022 floods, but this was more focused on response capability, and not on wider emergency management workstreams (including reduction, readiness, and recovery).</p> <p>Additionally, work has been completed in recent years to ensure NTCDEM is both people and process led (i.e. not just relying on the right people being in the right place at the right time), but regional and local responses continue to hold 'key person' risks where processes are not documented and there is a reliance on individual experience and knowledge. While response and council business-as-usual practices have worked well historically, these may not be sufficient in future emergencies where impacts could be more severe and widespread. An independent assessment of emergency management capability could provide a comprehensive gap analysis and assist in validating whether emergency management efforts and resources are being prioritised where they are most needed.</p>	<p>The independent review of the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group emergency management capability has been completed and received by the NTEM Coordinating Executive Group.</p> <p>Representatives from NTEM and senior Council management have met to start digesting the recommendations and develop initial guidance for the Coordinating Executive Group to consider regarding how best to address the recommendations.</p> <p>Noting that further analysis is underway, initial indications are that of the 19 recommendations, 11 are currently actively being worked on, 2 are paused while we await the outcome of refreshed CDEM legislation (EM Bill), and 7 may require additional resource of some form, be it from partnering agencies, the wider council teams, consultants/contractors, and/or other CDEM Groups.</p>		
Output(s)			
<p>An independent assessment of Nelson Tasman CDEM Group emergency management capability is completed comprising of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. An independent review of the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group emergency management capability aligned with the National Disaster Resilience Strategy, rather than the previous CDEM Capability Assessment tool.</li><li>2. A high level analysis of recent emergency management reviews in order to provide reflections on the emergency management capability of the NTCDEM Group against key themes from these reviews.</li><li>3. Support the NTCDEM Group with the development of a Strategic Road Map to integrate existing work programmes with findings/recommendations from the Capability Assessment and high-level findings from recent reviews.</li></ol>			
Recommendation(s)			
Nil.			
Author / Contact: Joe Kennedy			

### Recommendation(s)

**That the Nelson Tasman CDEM Coordinating Executive Group**

**Receives** the Report of the Nelson Tasman Emergency Management Office and its attachments; and

**Approves** the Group Plan 2025 vision be amended to:

‘With you, we educate, empower, and connect people to become a disaster resilient Nelson Tasman.

We strive to collaborate and focus on overcoming barriers to proactively manage risks and build resilience. We win when every person understands the impact that they can make and is enabled to contribute to and build the resilience, wellbeing, and prosperity of themselves, their whānau, and their community.’

**Receives** the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management accounts to May 2025

**Approves** that the submission to the Emergency Management Bill discussion document ‘NTEM submission to the EM Bill discussion document 20 May 2025’ be forwarded to members of the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group for retrospective endorsement.

### Nelson Tasman Emergency Management

#### Statement of Income and Expenditure

For Period to

May-25

	Current Month		Year to Date		Variance	Full Year Budget	Jun-25 Forecast
	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget			
<b>Income</b>							
Levies	116,833	116,834	1,285,167	1,285,166	(1)	1,402,000	1,402,000
Other Income	-	-	22,550	-	(22,550)	-	22,550
Interest	273	-	3,005	-	(3,005)	-	2,732
	<u>117,107</u>	<u>116,834</u>	<u>1,310,722</u>	<u>1,285,166</u>	<u>(25,556)</u>	<u>1,402,000</u>	<u>1,427,282</u>
<b>Less Expenditure</b>							
Staffing Costs	52,480	55,338	577,241	608,713	31,472	664,050	645,479
Operational Costs	40,369	31,719	236,575	348,881	112,306	380,600	318,795
Maintenance	651	788	13,457	8,662	(4,795)	9,450	9,030
Public Engagement	130	1,133	6,915	12,467	5,552	13,600	16,109
Consultancy	-	3,333	40,214	36,667	(3,547)	40,000	48,838
Fixed Overheads	3,148	12,500	83,170	137,500	54,330	150,000	107,000
Depreciation	5,842	6,750	64,261	74,250	9,989	81,000	71,000
NZRT-2	15,245	4,999	33,047	55,001	21,954	60,000	60,000
Event Costs	0	275	-	3,025	3,025	3,300	3,300
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<u>117,867</u>	<u>116,835</u>	<u>1,054,880</u>	<u>1,285,166</u>	<u>230,286</u>	<u>1,402,000</u>	<u>1,279,551</u>
<b>Net Income (Deficit)</b>	<u>(760)</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>255,841</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>255,841</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>147,731</u>

#### Statement of Financial Position

As At

May-25

Apr-25

Jun-24

Opening Equity	177,951	177,951	259,747
Plus YTD Surplus (deficit)	<u>255,841</u>	<u>256,601</u>	<u>(81,797)</u>
<b>Equity</b>	<u><u>433,792</u></u>	<u><u>434,552</u></u>	<u><u>177,951</u></u>
<b>Which was invested as follows -</b>			
<b>Assets</b>			
Prepayments	7,820	7,820	6,937
Accounts Receivable	7,738	7,738	7,738
Accrued Income	-	-	2,400
Fixed Assets	255,478	254,147	278,297
Intangibles	125	250	1,500
NCC Reserve Account	<u>218,647</u>	<u>279,030</u>	<u>(118,922)</u>
	<u>489,808</u>	<u>548,985</u>	<u>177,951</u>
<b>Liabilities</b>			
Income in Advance	<u>56,017</u>	<u>114,433</u>	-
	<u>56,017</u>	<u>114,433</u>	0
	<u><u>433,792</u></u>	<u><u>434,552</u></u>	<u><u>177,951</u></u>

#### Capital Expenditure Summary

May-25

YTD Actuals

Full Year Budget

EOC and Office	25,360	46,000
Vehicles	24,771	61,200
Communications	-	22,372
NZRT2	4,470	26,600
Generators	-	5,600
Tsunami info/signage project	-	10,000
	<u>54,601</u>	<u>171,772</u>



Policy Unit

National Emergency Management Agency

Wellington 6140

Via email to: [EmergencyManagementBill@nema.govt.nz](mailto:EmergencyManagementBill@nema.govt.nz)

**Discussion Document: Strengthening New Zealand's Emergency Management Legislation - Submission from Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Group**

This submission is provided by the Nelson Tasman Emergency Management (NTEM) Office on behalf of the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group in relation to the content of the Strengthening New Zealand's emergency management legislation discussion document April 2025.

This submission has been reviewed by senior management within Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council and submitted by the Nelson Tasman Emergency Management Office on behalf of both the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management Coordinating Executive Group (CEG) and the membership of the Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management CDEM Group. Retrospective approvals will be sought during the next round of Group meetings in July 2025.

The Nelson Tasman CDEM Group welcomes and is grateful for the opportunity to provide this submission

Position statement

In general, the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group is supportive of the need for change to modernise New Zealand's emergency management system. The requirement for this change was evident with the outcomes from the review of the response and recovery to the Canterbury earthquakes of 2011, and further endorsed in the many subsequent reviews including the 2017/18 Ministerial Review: Better Responses to Natural Disasters and Other Emergencies in New Zealand, and more recently the Auckland Flood Response Review undertaken by Bush International Consulting and review findings pertaining to the 2023 responses to and recovery from Cyclones Hale and Gabrielle.

Whilst the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group is generally supportive of many of the proposals within the discussion document, it believes that a) more work is needed to deliver an integrated, fit-for-purpose emergency management framework that possesses the capacity, capability and competency to respond to the increased frequency and severity of emergency events; b) Better support regarding the integration and practical implementation of both reduction and recovery activities is required; c) Further consideration should be given to checking that definitions used within the discussion document are integrated and aligned with terminology within other legislation to avoid ambiguity or conflict in actions; and d) the scale of work required is greater than the current emergency management sector capability and capacity. As a result, increased funding, support and resourcing will be required to achieve the uplift required. Such resource is not currently budgeted for and may be challenging to fund given current fiscal pressures. Moreover, the existing potential for wider Local Government system reforms may further impact the ability of local authorities to give effect to and support the intent of the changes contained within the discussion document.

CDEM Group offices, via administering authorities annual and long-term planning processes, are routinely seeking resources from CDEM Group Joint Committees and subsequent administering



authorities to fund Emergency Management activities. Funding comes from rates and there is continued pressure in a cost of living crisis to manage rates increases. We consider the provisions within the discussion document are likely to require significant additional resourcing and funding to give effect to the intent and thus further draw on funding. To date, resourcing has not visibly been considered and discussed in detail in the legislative review process and thus we advocate that this takes place with some urgency. We do want to stress that there is very real situation present, that while everyone desires consistency nationally, there is a genuine ability to pay issue between those regions with larger ratepayer bases, versus the smaller Regions/Unitary Councils.

Given the Nelson Tasman CDEM Group is broadly aligned with the content of the submission from the CDEM Special Interest Group (comprising of the 16 CDEM Group Managers), this submission is structured in a manner that seeks to support and highlight a number of overarching themes for consideration.

## **1. Overarching themes**

### *Funding and resourcing*

- 1.1 To implement the necessary system changes and enable improvement will require an uplift in capacity and capability, and thus a question exists as to where the funding for this uplift will come from.
- 1.2 There will likely be a limit to the additional (if any) capacity and capability that local government can contribute, and while there remain significant differences in local authorities, CDEM Groups, and funding, the lack of consistency in delivering outcomes will remain. Local government and public sector entities all appear to prioritise emergency management activities differently.
- 1.3 As already noted, insufficient capacity and capability appear to be the single largest issue for most councils. This has been a core theme of reviews and features prominently in the review undertaken by the National Emergency Management Agency 'Review of Reviews – 2023 North Island Weather Events'. Consequently, it is prudent to ascertain how an enhancement in local delivery will be supported.
- 1.4 Additionally, resourcing CDEM alone may not suffice in delivering the intent of the discussion document. An uplift may be required within council resources to enable councils to meet their obligations to provide infrastructure and intelligence to support the CDEM effort. Intelligence streams, such as hydrological, form a key aspect in the delivery of sound and informed decision making and the resourcing of these structures should not be overlooked. Given the financial pressures being experienced by both central and local government, any proposals that impose costs should be subject to a robust cost and benefit business case.

### *Responsibility and accountability*

- 1.5 As CDEM Groups cannot determine local authority and elected official's investment decisions, there is a question if CDEM Groups should be held responsible/accountable.



#### *CEG representation*

NTEM supports consideration being given to strengthening the seniority of agency and partner representation and the amending of current legislative terminology accordingly. It is understood that the intent of the Executive is that, in order to adequately fulfil its purpose, it comprises of the most senior strategic representatives from across partners and agencies and thus wording to the effect of 'a senior employee, volunteer, or contractor' is detrimental to achieving this purpose. Wording akin to 'the Regional Chief Executive or equivalent' may be better placed across all Emergency Management Co-ordinating Executive attendees. Additionally, NTEM suggests the option for NEMA to have a voting member on the CDEM Group Joint Committee is worthy of consideration.

#### *Coordinated Incident Management System*

- 1.6 The lack of consistent application of the Coordinated Incident Management System (CIMS) across agencies and partners has been identified in previous reviews as an issue. In its present form, we do not perceive the discussion document adequately addresses this issue. As such, NTEM advocates that this be addressed, and a statutory mandate be outlined.

#### *Controller liability /Protection for CDEM responders*

- 1.7 The issue of liability protections for both authorised and community persons in the circumstances of an undeclared emergency warrants further consideration. A fundamental question remains regarding the protection of authorised persons fulfilling their mandated roles within a lead agency construct in situations where the thresholds for a declaration have not been met.
- 1.8 We strongly advocate that this item be given consideration, with a particular focus on Controllers that are external to council undertaking their appointed duties in circumstances where CDEM is the lead agency though the need to access powers under the CDEM legislation and therefore declare doesn't exist i.e. the threshold for a declaration has not been met.
- 1.9 The current Act only offers legal protection for these people during a declared state of emergency. There is no protection for CDEM staff operating in good faith either before or after the formal declaration period. The lack of protection for staff and decision-makers is a significant and important issue that should be addressed.
- 1.10 Additionally, the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 may benefit from review and alignment to ensure that it does not penalise or disincentivise volunteers from responding, especially in the immediate aftermath of an emergency event occurring.

#### *Incentives for delivery*

- 1.11 We agree that local government and the public sector prioritise emergency management activities differently. As such, ensuring mechanisms exist to encourage the desired levels of engagement and investment across the system are required to truly deliver the intent of the discussion document.



- 1.12 A consequence feedback loop within an assurance reporting pathway may be an avenue to achieve this. This, coupled with the development of standards reporting to Coordinating Executive Groups and CDEM Group Joint Committees, may serve as a constructive step forward across the sector whilst also supporting assurance reporting to the Director.

*Risk reduction and planning*

- 1.13 We generally favour national consistency for both natural hazard management within the resource management system, and consequence management within the emergency management system. A prescribed national framework/methodology that allows for some local and regional flexibility would be beneficial
- 1.14 Additionally, we note the increasing expectation for the undertaking of planning activity and associated workstreams, the increasing scrutiny that said planning is subject to following emergency events and the consequence if that planning is either a) substandard; or b) nonexistent. Given the CDEM mandate covers all hazards across all four Rs (Reductions, Readiness, Response and Recovery) this is understandable. However, it is prudent to highlight the nuances and differentiation between strategic planning and operational planning and the role of Group Plans within that spectrum.
- 1.15 As previously alluded to, a continuing limitation in this space is having the planning resource to undertake the work required. The growing demand on planning time presently has to be balanced against other time and costs associated with other equally important activities, some of which are contained within this consultation. Nationally developed planning templates or draft planning documents that CDEM Groups can then regionalise would assist, especially in the likes of fuel, fast moving consumer goods or cordon management.
- 1.16 NTEM also advocates that terminology be included in the Bill that highlights the continued responsibilities outside of formal CDEM planning (i.e. private sector planning, whānau planning) to plan and prepare for emergency events.
- 1.17 NTEM notes and supports the need for a framework to enable greater information sharing with local government before, during and after emergency events. As an example, lifeline and critical infrastructure providers engage with the emergency management system to varying degrees. There is often a reluctance to share information not only for response and recovery, but also for risk reduction and readiness activities. This presents a significant barrier to the ability of CDEM Groups to gain situational awareness across the four Rs, and implement subsequent planning arrangements.

*Barriers to cooperation and information sharing*

- 1.18 Challenges currently exist where legislative reform would significantly help councils in their recovery work.
- 1.19 Presently the Local Government Act (LGA) has very specific requirements for consultation on any proposed new areas of activity or expenditure. We have received clear advice from our lawyers that proposals to buy-out homeowners whose



properties are uneconomic to repair, triggers the LGA requirements for changes to Long Term Plans.

- 1.20 The practical consequence of this is that it adds tens of thousands of dollars of costs and many months of delays often, from our experience, resulting in additional anguish and uncertainty for the families concerned.
- 1.21 The previous Government overcame this problem from Cyclone Gabrielle by passing special legislation that bypassed the LGA consultation requirements.
- 1.22 As such, it would be appreciated if future Emergency Management legislation include clauses to enable the Minister for Emergency Management on the request of a Council to be exempted from specific LGA requirements for recovery activities. The provision could be limited to events where a local state of emergency was declared. This would save the need for special legislation and enable Councils and communities to get on with recovery work. The benefit of the Minister exercising the power is that it would act as a check on Councils stretching the definition of recovery works.
- 1.23 Potentially the Resource Management Act and/or any replacement legislation may benefit from being amended in a similar way. Emergency works are ok, the problem is in the recovery phase where it delays work and adds costs.

#### *Health and safety*

- 1.24 While there is unquestionable value in community involvement in response to emergencies, there is also an accompanying risk and liability for CDEM: As soon as we 'task' a community group, we assume Health and Safety liability for them. This puts unreasonable accountability on CDEM decision makers and could have the perverse consequence of reducing community engagement with CDEM because of the increased level of risk controllers become exposed to.

#### *Role of CDEM Group offices in general*

- 1.25 In order to ensure a consistent approach across the motu, NTEM notes that narrative exists to address the functions and duties of local authorities. However, we note that it does not reference the function and roles of CDEM Group offices. This is a gap that would benefit from the inclusion and definition.

#### *Definitions and Scope – in general*

- 1.26 Furthermore, further clarity is required regarding the term 'engage'. This can be interpreted in different ways. Regardless, it is foreseen that this clause has the scope to place significant additional responsibility on CDEM Groups and will have associated resource implications.





*Unitary Authorities*

- 1.27 The delivery of CDEM within a unitary authority construct appears to work well. To that end, we would not be in favour of or support legislative changes that would be to the detriment of this model to continue effectively.

*Enabling Multi-agency and partner collaboration*

- 1.28 Lastly, noting that legislative reform is only a part of the solution to achieving the desired end state, NTEM promotes a collaborative lens be cast across proposed future legislation. Namely, regardless of legislation the EM system needs to collaborate and work together across all hazards and across the 4Rs. As such, the manner in which the legislations is applied is key, and thus we would advocate that enabling and incentivising clauses and language are used to give effect to this.

- 1.29 For example, “Emergency Management - Engaging Professional Services”, is a project aimed at improving coordination between Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM), organisations, and professional services. There have been numerous emergency events and subsequent reviews outlining common threads akin to:

- Events are increasingly frequent and with greater severity.
- There are a limited number of civil engineers trained in Emergency Management and available to respond during an event, particularly with national events.
- There is limited collaboration across private and public collaboration for preparedness.
- There are limited established relationships between Civil Defence and private sector specialists (Infrastructure, lifelines, and logistics)

- 1.30 The project provides recommendations for CDEM groups, organisations, and professional services during the readiness and response phases to improve coordination, integration, and allow for prioritisation and scalability during the response. The project does not replace any existing agreements or legislative requirements, though projects such as this would benefit from the presence of enabling and incentivising language within future legislation. A consequence feedback loop within an assurance reporting pathway across emergency management partners and agencies may be an avenue to achieve this.