

Report 12.103  
Date 14 March 2012  
File Z/01/04/19

Committee CDEM Group  
Author Bruce Pepperell, Regional Manager CDEM

## **Proposed structure for CDEM in the Wellington region: The case for network enabled Civil Defence**

### **1. Introduction**

The Civil Defence Act 2002 (the Act) places a number of demands on Local Authorities. This is primarily around hazard/risk management; planning and preparation for continuity during emergencies; and supporting the national CDEM effort. The challenge is to create the organisation, strategy, plans, culture and relationships that will best fulfil these needs not only during an emergency but more importantly, with a focus on building resilience in our communities.

### **2. Approach**

My initial tasking as the new Regional Manager was to “carry out a review of the existing CDEM arrangements in the region and to develop a unified structure for approval and implementation”. While this report is intended to discharge the second part of the tasking, the means of achieving this has been varied following discussion with the CEG Chair. There are already several reviews (References A and B to mention but two) that adequately highlight the deficiencies of the current arrangements. To merely address those gaps identified would likely lead to a reactive organisation that satisfies yesterday’s challenges. A preferable approach and the one adopted, was to take a top down, strategic approach, to devise an organisation and systems that will meet tomorrow’s challenges.

With this in mind, following a standard introduction to my duties, I facilitated a series of workshops comprising senior regional CDEM managers, some junior staff, selected council employees appointed to CDEM operational roles (to increase the diversity of opinion), plus representation from the Ministry. The issues and outcomes arising were then discussed and in many cases enhanced through further consultation with regional CDEM staff, CDEM managers from other regions, the Ministry, and some regional stakeholders. The workshop outcomes do not resolve all the issues identified, however they should be sufficient to define the way ahead and gain approval to move forward, outlined as follows:

- a. Phase One** – Literature search, meetings with key stakeholders, plus workshops to conduct a strategic analysis of the environment, and to derive a concept of operations and structure to best meet the challenges ahead. This included

producing draft mission, vision, and values (Attachment 1), plus a first cut at defining the identity, people, roles, locations, relationships, facilities, equipment and budget. Several of these will need to be further refined once the transition to a single team is complete to avoid “situating the appreciation” in favour of any current arrangements.

- b. Phase Two** – Approval in principle by the CEG (obtained 27 Jan 12), formal consultation with affected staff (commenced 10 Feb 12), plus further refinement of budgets and operating arrangements in preparation for final approval and transition. Approval to proceed to be sought from the Joint Committee (23 Mar 12).
- c. Phase Three** – As a single team, produce a strategic plan, annual plan, programmes, systems, processes, metrics, new budget(s), plus those requirements mandated by legislation e.g. a new Group Plan etc.

### 3. Workshop outcomes

As previously stated, prior to looking at a new structure, time was taken to discuss organisational mission, vision and values. It was not intended that these be defined down to the exact word or phrase, but certainly having a basic understanding of these concepts was essential if we were to derive a future proofed Concept of Operations. Having then determined those standard functions required of a CDEM team, this, along with the Concept of Operations, would help define the way the team should be structured.

### 4. Concept of operations

There were a number of common themes that arose as a result of discussion. Many incorporate benchmark practices used by many successful organisations (not simply in our field), and may be summarised as follows:

**Network Enabled.** There are two key aspects to this theme. Firstly, a need to harness modern technology to provide effective control and communication, a common operating picture and associated data, allow centralised planning with decentralised delivery, effective priority setting and the appropriate matching of resources. The second aspect to the theme is the establishment and maintenance of key relationships and (in some cases) partnerships with key stakeholders; inter and intra council, with emergency and support services, and most importantly, with the community. If there is one concept that defines how we should be doing business, it is Network Enabled. This places emphasis on people and their networks, and leads to a workforce being informed, connected, mobile, and flexible in the way they are tasked and work.

**Agile.** The agreed structure must focus appropriately on those tasks that will be conducted 99% of the time, i.e. readiness (and reduction) responsibilities, yet be able to quickly reconfigure to respond effectively to emergency situations, noting these may vary in type, intensity, impact, and location; with each requiring a tailored response. This will require a multi-skilled team, with good systems, trained and able to adapt quickly to changing needs.

**High Performance.** There are a number of aspects to this theme, however in short; we should aspire to be the best. This requires an organisational philosophy (e.g. both Porirua and Hutt City use the Baldrige performance excellence framework), culture, cohesion, training, and systems present in any top performing organisation, plus a willingness to search for alternative solutions to traditional challenges.

**Single Team.** A “one team” approach to conducting business is preferable to the current fragmented two tier arrangements. This is not a criticism of the current staff but of the system which has set them up to produce less than optimal results. While considerable effort has gone into creating committees to promote a common approach, the results have been slow and rely on “coalitions of the willing”. A unified approach, with clear lines of control, a single loyalty, common approaches to conducting business (although outcomes may vary depending on circumstances), with a single point of accountability is seen as the way forward. Given the networked approach outlined earlier, a single team need not be based in a single location.

## 5. Community ownership

There are a number of misconceptions of the role of Civil Defence and use of the term Emergency Management. Emergency Management is the modern phrase to describe Civil Defence, a term considered by some as synonymous with “Dad’s Army”, yet when discussing the role; it is not until you mention the words “Civil Defence” that the penny drops. The actual Emergency Management function is far wider than the role played within it by the CDEM team. True effectiveness relies on the whole community embracing the concept thereby building its own resilience and ability to respond appropriately. The role of the CDEM team therefore, is to empower, facilitate and coordinate the efforts of council and community to achieve this. The team itself is not an emergency service (like the police or fire service). This principle has some bearing on the relationship with Rural Fire (discussed later in the report).

To be successful, it will be important that CDEM maintains a strong professional profile supported by appropriate branding, complete with targeted and consistent messages. While the team would be centrally managed and directed, there is every reason to maintain an active, visible presence throughout the communities we serve.

## 6. Structure

I initially thought this would be a relatively simple task; to merely examine those features unique to the Wellington region and adapt a better practice model used by a similar CDEM group elsewhere in the country. What I have found is that there is no such benchmark structure, with most groups organised completely differently in order to meet differing circumstances and needs. Auckland is the closest in size. With its restructure at the time of establishing the super city, it reorganised largely along Coordinated Incident Management System (CIMS i.e. operations, logistics, planning and intelligence) lines, dividing the city into four zones managed from a central Emergency Operations Centre (EOC). It is in the process of being further reorganised, giving more emphasis to recovery and resilience. Canterbury too has a sizeable operation however, during the past 18 months; its focus has been diverted.

Southland has a multi-council structure that more resembles what we have in Wellington, however without the size and complexity of our local region.

There are however a number of standard organisational models that have relevance to our own situation. These are as follows:

**The Labour Pool.** Where flexibility of employment is required, staff are sometimes held in a pool and allocated as work levels and priorities demand. This model is used by IT firms and most consultants to resource projects. For CDEM, work levels will frequently fluctuate either within a functional team or location. Operating a (virtual) staff pool would enable resources to be easily redirected to meet changing priorities. This does rely, to a degree, on staff being adaptable and having the skills and willingness to be redeployed.

**Following the Value Chain.** Organisations that process-map the activities required to produce their good or service are better able to harmonise those people and actions required, leading to simplified workflow and optimal production outcomes. Most commercial organisations adopt this approach. The relevance here for CDEM is that we need to structure ourselves to best produce those products and services required by our customers.

**Effects Based Outcomes.** Where organisations exist to produce an intangible outcome rather than a set of defined outputs, resources are grouped and networked to achieve the extra levels of coordination required. An example of this might be a modern pop concert where music, celebrities, a story line, special effects etc are fused to produce an outcome. If we are to regard Community Resilience as an important outcome (or effect), then we must be structured to achieve this and not merely to produce uncoordinated outputs of public education, community engagement etc.

**Matrix Approach.** Where there are two or more dimensions to a work programme resulting in added complexity and sometimes competing demands, a matrix structure may be the best way of meeting the needs of all. The Defence Force used this as the driving concept for creating their operational Headquarters at Trentham where there was a need for a coordinated functional approach to produce “Joint” outcomes (effects), whilst still meeting the needs of the three single services. The relevance here for CDEM is that to be more effective, a functional approach is required, however the individual needs of councils who retain responsibility for CDEM activities under the Act, must continue to be met.

**The Multi-Role Team.** There are organisations that are configured to conduct certain defined roles but at the flick of a switch must instantly reconfigure to meet more pressing needs. A good example here is a Naval warship with a crew comprising, seamen, admin staff, equipment maintainers etc. When the ship goes to action stations, the crew instantly reconfigures. Routine actions like admin and maintenance cease and those staff close up in previously minimal manned activities such as first aid parties and/or supplement those crew members borne for operations. The relevance here is that 99% of the CDEM effort should be in support of readiness (and reduction) activities, but in the event of an emergency, staff must reconfigure to support the response and recovery effort. This again relies on multi-skilling of the staff concerned.

Using the principles established as part of the Concept of Operations and the organisational models outlined above, the structural frameworks proposed for adoption (one for the readiness activities and the other for response/recovery operations) are as contained at Attachments 2 and 3. Note these depict a functional structure and are not intended as organisation charts listing individual roles. They do however identify some specific roles and how I propose to organise the balance of the staff. Please note, this reflects my thoughts which were not universally agreed by all the workshop attendees (50/50 split). Following considerable discussion on the topic, the choice came down to one of two matrix structures, one giving pre-eminence to functional responsibilities with the other reversing this in favour of territorial responsibilities. While the Act specifically states individual councils retain responsibility for their patch, it is my opinion that these responsibilities during the readiness phase can best be managed through a coordinated functional approach. The territorial model represents only a marginal change from the current arrangements and in many cases cuts across the principles established in the Concept of Operations.

The proposed framework contains several defined roles, Regional Manager, Managers responsible for the three functional areas (Business and Development, Community Resilience and Operational Readiness), plus senior staff responsible for the integration of CDEM activities within the (four) area groups identified. While some specialists will be required in the wider team, greater flexibility would be achieved by employing CDEM generalists who possess some specialist skills. While a team of (approx) 20 people might sound a lot, it will continue to meet the needs of nine different councils. Changing roles, workloads and priorities will mean we cannot afford to carry one dimensional staff. Note: the new CDEM team will not operate in isolation and will continue to require expertise resident within councils for the provision of corporate services as well as during times of emergency.

Such a model would see the team centrally managed with the majority of staff “home based” in Hutt City and at WEMO; although staff would be partially dispersed according to the priorities of the day. The senior staff responsible for area groups would largely work in their assigned zone, alongside others either allocated to directly support them or operating in the area at the direction of the functional managers. This would require connectivity plus hot desk arrangements.

By way of illustration, examples of an enhanced service possible under the new arrangements might include:

- a. A training day at Kapiti, with council staff closed up in the Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) supported by 10 CDEM staff (in addition to those who would normally close up at that location) mentoring EOC participants, providing realistic exercise interjections, and in a timely manner, factoring lessons learned back into SOPs and regional CDEM plans;
- b. Intensive and coordinated public education programmes targeting all primary schools in a particular area. Education activities for young children undertaken by staff with good teaching competencies;
- c. Region CDEM staff deploying en masse to support Hutt Valley EOC(s) in the event of a localised flood;

- d. Use of the alternate ECC facility in Masterton by Wairarapa EOC staff in the event their own facility is rendered inoperable;
- e. The maintenance of a single website and blog facility promoting consistent CDEM messages and containing material vital for the promotion of community resilience; and
- f. A public display boosting CDEM awareness in a particular community with the influx of six branded cars, 15 staff members, plus display materials.

Note: a largely multi-skilled workforce would see many of the same people involved in each of these activities, creating both a multiplier effect and providing them with variety of employment. To facilitate this and provide development opportunities for the individuals concerned, the majority of staff (not identified for management roles) would be placed on flexible multi-role contracts as either Emergency Management Advisors or Senior Emergency Management Advisors. Draft job descriptions to achieve this have been developed.

## 7. EOCs

While much has been made in this paper of the unified semi-autonomous, flexible, mobile, networked CDEM team operating independent of location, there is still a very important role for the EOC. Unlike Auckland who manage their emergencies through a central EOC, the ability of our individual councils to gain traction in an emergency within their jurisdiction, will be greatly enhanced by an effective (recognised) base of operations in their area. Unlike Auckland where there is less geographic diversity and resident expertise is centrally managed; differences in Wellington sub-region demographic and risk profiles, plus the ease with which a disaster can disrupt current lines of communication (transport, infrastructure etc), community EOCs mean a disaster can be segmented and the needs of the community addressed in a coordinated, targeted and tailored manner. This might better avoid the types of situations in Christchurch where sections of the community (rightly or wrongly) believed they had been overlooked.

This need not mean a separate EOC for every council however; as for smaller councils, greater synergies may be achieved through greater critical mass and unity of effort. This would see (as required) EOCs located in Masterton (servicing the Wairarapa), Hutt City, Upper Hutt, Wellington, Porirua and Kapiti. While I have proposed in the structure at Attachment 2 to manage Porirua/Kapiti and the Hutt Valley as two combined area groups for readiness activities, size of the area/population, differing risk profiles plus the fact that individual areas can easily be cut off, mean more intensive management may be warranted during emergency operations.

In the event of a disaster requiring an emergency response, the CDEM team would reconfigure (as per Attachment 3) to support the required EOC effort with staff assigned to an EOC/Emergency Coordination Centre (ECC) either as a local controller or EOC manager (new role allowing the controller to focus on operations rather than the efficient running of the EOC itself). Questions have been raised on the value of an ECC operating in addition to local EOCs. Its impact will vary depending on the scale of the operation, the degree a common operating picture is available, and the ability of the staff concerned to work at a macro-level.

A major catastrophe in the Wellington area similar to the Christchurch situation would likely see the National Crisis Management Centre (NCMC) directed to take charge. Further discussion has been initiated to determine how the NCMC and ECC might be fused in this instance to avoid additional links in the chain of little value. In the event that only one or two EOCs are required to deal with an emergency, CDEM staff and resources could be reassigned to support this reduced effort. Indeed with flexible arrangements, the ECC to support such a localised emergency (e.g. a flood in the Hutt) could be operated from any other EOC facility.

With teams no longer operating full time from every EOC, it is important that these valuable buildings do not become empty cathedrals to disaster management. Where possible they should be utilised as multi-purpose council facilities making full use of the features and technology as appropriate, whilst guaranteeing priority use for the CDEM team. Good examples of this in practice are Kapiti where Red Cross and the District Council Call Centre share the EOC facility. Similarly, Wellington use WEMO as a conference facility and Porirua are looking to use their EOC for computer training. This will require greater levels of coordination between the CDEM team and council however this can be easily managed, particularly if it leads to more efficient utilisation of such a valuable resource.

## **8. Staff**

Under the new arrangements, it is proposed that staff in the new organisation become employees of GW on a similar basis to the Regional Manager who has separate reporting lines to the CEG Chair on operational matters. The functional structure proposed has been expanded into detailed job descriptions for the specifically identified senior roles plus a set of generic CDEM job descriptions for the remaining staff. Numbers and remuneration packages proposed will need to be accommodated within current budget levels. Discussion is well advanced with region HR managers to determine the best means of forming the new team.

Following approval in principle by the CEG on 27 Jan 12, consultation with affected staff began on 10 February. It was gratifying to find the majority of feedback was firmly in support of the proposal, some suggested enhancements while others expressed a wait and see attitude, with many of the details yet to be determined. A few were a little more guarded, believing their were risks ahead that would need to be overcome. While I agree there are risks and complexities to the approach proposed, there are practical ways those risks can be managed. The concept however, if implemented well will lead to enhanced levels of community resilience and operational readiness beyond what is possible under the current structure.

## **9. Vehicles**

The current combined fleet comprises 11, mostly 4WD, vehicles (7 utes, 1 van, and 3 SUVs; located as follows – 3 Wgtn, 1 Por, 2 GW, 1 KCDC, 4 Hutt) with only Wairarapa not having a dedicated CDEM vehicle (simply because the cost cannot be justified). Several of the vehicles come as part of a current remuneration package or have a component for home to work use. Some rationalisation of the fleet in terms of size, type, and utilisation is likely however this can best be determined with experience operating in the new environment, noting some of the current vehicles also support the rural fire effort. Certainly not all vehicles would require full 4WD capability although these vehicles would need to be suitable for a variety of employment (requiring mobility, cargo space, good people capacity, tow bars etc.)

Given the vehicles would be used almost exclusively by the new CDEM team, transfer to the new organisation (and therefore GW) is recommended. This will require council owned vehicles to be sold to GW at book value with costs apportioned across contributing councils to maintain equity as some councils currently lease their vehicles (see also paragraph 44 to 47 on funding arrangements).

## 10. Communications

The current CDEM teams operate with a variety of phones, computers, and communications devices. Considerable effort and cost has been expended in recent times to ensure interoperability during emergency situations (I am unable to comment on how successful this has been but will embark on a programme of end to end testing once the new regime is up and running). For the purpose of creating the new CDEM organisation, the staff would require enabled laptops, a couple of 3G tablets (noting I pads are particularly well suited to managing social media networks), common software, and mobile phones, with some staff requiring stand alone or vehicle mounted radios (this will require some licensing changes). Current devices used by existing staff could be transferred, where compatible with the new infrastructure, to reduce start-up costs (although there will be a need to supplement these devices and reconfigure them for wider use). To reduce costs further, all laptops should be reconfigured so they are domain agnostic (i.e. not a member of any specific domain). This of course will mean staff will have to connect through council firewalls, but it will enable them to work from any site, including local council facilities, motels or indeed from home, without the need for 3G transmission rates. For those people operating out of WEMO, WCC and GW already have a common data pipeline. There may be value in extending this link to Hutt City. With an enhanced team, there would be benefit in introducing a “duty” CDEM officer with a vehicle (from existing resources) and a dedicated phone allocated for this purpose.

A significant challenge would be accessing data and documents from existing individual archives. It is proposed that key staff have logon arrangements with the councils they service. Over time, required data and documents would be copied across to a single repository.

There was considerable discussion on the platform for hosting the CDEM computer network. The preference would be for GW to provide, frankly as it would require considerable additional corporate overhead by going alone. This would require high levels of connectivity and refresh rates. While GW maintains only a small CIT team, their level of support is supplemented by external contractors. It would be preferable however for the new CDEM website to be hosted externally, simply as the current council arrangements would not provide the resilience necessary in an emergency.

We have an opportunity to get our message across through a single simple website, hyperlinked to facilitate access through individual council sites, eliminating the current multiple and inconsistent approaches/messages employed throughout the region. Accessing and remembering [www.wcd.org.nz](http://www.wcd.org.nz) (for instance) would be considerably easier than negotiating a path comprising <http://www.wellington.govt.nz/services/emergencymgmt/index.html> to access the information sought. Only one person would be required to post environmental warnings rather than each council site being updated individually.



## 11. External support

While the new Emergency Management team will require certain dedicated organic business resources, functions such as HR, IT, Finance, legal etc will need to be supported from external sources either by one or more councils and/or private contractors. The recommendation is that these services would be provided by GW. Cost arrangements for this will need to be negotiated. By the same token, an examination of current budgets reveals current CDEM teams paying a portion of current council overheads. These costs too may need some re-apportioning to offset the corporate service increase for GW.

## 12. Identity/branding

Appropriate branding is important if the CDEM team is to be successful. The branding model however would be different from other Emergency Services with greater emphasis being placed on getting the message thru (sic). In this respect, the current vehicles operated by Porirua and Kapiti with their targeted messages are particularly effective. Branded vehicles also heighten awareness e.g. some Porirua residents believe the city has at least two CDEM vehicles simply as the WEMO manager lives in Whitby and parks his branded SUV outside his house. An analysis of current region CDEM vehicles reveals a variety of branding employed, ranging from full car decals (costing \$10k plus) to more basic CD insignia. It is my opinion that vehicles need little more than CD insignia on the bonnet, "Emergency Management Office" on the front door panels, with targeted messages/web address (using the traditional colours of yellow and blue) on the rear of the vehicle. This would achieve the required impact without an unnecessary level of expenditure. If something more comprehensive is considered required, another option would be to paint the vehicles in the manner used by the Southland Group (Attachment 4) however I just don't see this as being necessary.

Similarly some groups utilise a variety of branded props to promote the message. The "What's the Plan Stan" float appearing in the Auckland Santa Parade (also Attachment 4) is a good example and provides food for thought once new consolidated education programmes are under development.

I am not in favour of a regular uniform; however there are times when the use of appropriate branded clothing is appropriate, particularly if it again enhances the message or image. Porirua EMO has a simple but effective action rig (branded white polo shirt and grey trou). Wellington EMO has a very professional looking black vest and jacket. A standard kit comprising business shirt, polo shirts, and a light weight jacket would enhance team identity and therefore promote the message. Assuming a team of 20 people, the initial cost would be in the order of \$6000. Note: this would be in addition to any protective clothing held and utilised during operations.

The CDEM team itself requires an identity. It is perhaps unfortunate that the province is one of the few that has the same name as its largest city. This left three options:

- a. Acceptance of the term Wellington, or Wellington Region;
- b. A new descriptor such as Capital and Districts Civil Defence (CD<sub>2</sub> may appeal to some); or,

- c. Some name that is region non-specific (Manawatu/Whanganui Regional Council calls itself Horizons).

Following discussion by Chief Executives on 27 Jan 12, the term “Wellington Region” was recommended for adoption.

Similarly the CDEM team required a term to define it. Keeping it simple, “Emergency Management Office”, or more formally WREMO (Wellington Region Emergency Management Office), was considered appropriate, retaining the abbreviation CDEM as required to further define the role undertaken.

### **13. Funding**

Funding for the new organisation could be achieved by transferring the full expense to GW with costs funded through regional rates. This would be simpler to manage but might require a 4% increase in the regional rates levied. This funding model might however give the impression that local authorities had abrogated their CDEM responsibilities and would lessen their ability to influence CDEM on a regional basis. An alternative and the recommended model would see CDEM costs from 1 Jul 13, apportioned on a pro rata basis across all nine councils. This would achieve greater ownership of both CDEM within the region and the CDEM team itself by the participating councils, and would achieve best alignment with the intent of the Act.

There are a number of factors that could be used to determine pro rata apportionment including risk profile (probably difficult to convert to a simple formula), per capita, total revenue, or equivalent rateable value. Examples of how each might apply are included at Attachment 5. Of note, the pro rata ratio that most closely matches current budgets is the one based on population (this relies on GW being assigned a notional population the same as Wellington City. It is therefore recommended that from 1 Jul 13, costs for the new organisation be apportioned on a pro rata basis using population (based on the latest statistics contained in Council LTPs) with GW being assessed as having the same population as Wellington City.

The current total cost of CDEM activities (Attachment 5) is in the order of \$4,870,000. This sum fluctuates depending on in year initiatives and comprises costs related to staff, management of facilities, equipment, activities, a rural fire component (in some cases), and a share of council overheads. Further work has been undertaken to break down this expenditure, as under the regime proposed, only those costs related to staff, some equipment (vehicles, personal communications etc), plus region wide CDEM activities would transfer. Much of the cost (EOC operations, those costs associated with implementation of initiatives specific to a council, plus a share of corporate overhead etc) would remain with individual councils, albeit that these may be managed on behalf of the council by CDEM area staff. This would require appropriate delegations to be assigned. Again, as budgets for financial year 12/13 have already been set, it is proposed that activities for the coming year be kept within current allocations.

This mixed approach to funding would eventually see the CDEM team (funded on a pro rata basis) developing business case proposals (project development costs funded on a pro rata basis) for implementation separately (with direct costs attributed to the respective councils). By way of example if the CDEM team were to develop a business case recommending the installation of water tanks with

communal facilities (schools, town halls etc), the proposal would enter each council's budgetary systems for approval via normal channels. The project would then only proceed if the relevant council approved the direct costs associated with implementation in their area. Similarly each council would be responsible for the costs associated with maintaining and activating their EOC. GW would be responsible for the ECC and its costs.

## **14. Governance**

To make any organisation work requires effective governance. The mechanisms for achieving this already exist in the form of the Joint Committee of Councils, Coordinating Executive Group (CEG), and CEG Sub-Committee. The only variation to these bodies I would propose is that the CDEM Regional Manager should chair the CEG Sub-committee (to be renamed the CDEM Operations sub-committee) in lieu of the current CEG chair. This would make it a true working group focusing purely on operational matters. Improvements to these arrangements would require delegated powers for each body to be formalised.

To be effective, membership of the Operations sub-committee need to include CDEM champions from each council. These should be people who report directly to the CE, have CDEM in their span of responsibility and/or have been appointed local controllers. These champions will be expected to inform the Regional Manager on matters specific to their councils, advise on operational matters, and be a conduit for the management of activities that cross CDEM/council boundaries (e.g. EOC training for council staff)

## **15. Coordinating arrangements between Councils**

Further to any governance arrangements agreed above, there will be a requirement for a general agreement on joint CDEM services provided to the individual councils. This will need to stipulate intent; covering business planning, finance, premises, use of equipment, any staff delegations, ability to access council services, capital acquisitions, disputes etc. A draft document is being prepared. This will require considerable further input from legal advisors.

## **16. Rural Fire**

There is a mixture of Rural Fire models employed throughout the region. Wairarapa has been established as an Enlarged Rural Fire District in line with the National Rural Fire Authority strategy. This sees their Principal Rural Fire Officer (PRFO) report to a Board of Directors comprising representatives from District Councils, DOC, Forest Owners Association, NZ Fire Service, plus one independent director. In the Hutt, the CDEM Manager is the PRFO. In Wellington and Kapiti, their PRFO reports to a separate arm of council. These councils maintain rural fire teams and facilities at Wainuiomata, Upper Hutt, Tawa, and Te Horo respectively. Porirua too has a PRFO (reporting to a separate arm of council) however contract out their responsibilities to the Fire Service.

While there are synergies possible through a close association of CDEM and rural fire assets, one is an empowering/enabling organisation while the other a true emergency service (albeit with a significant administrative component - granting of permits etc). It is therefore my recommendation, agreed in principle by CEG that the remaining council controlled rural fire assets be eventually incorporated into one

or more Enlarged Rural Fire Districts. This is consistent with the recommendation contained in the Kestrel Report (Reference A) and National Rural Fire Authority strategy. Even with an affirmative decision, implementation would take time to achieve; taking account of the considerable consultation required with the many and diverse stakeholder groups. To progress this in a timely manner may warrant the creation of a separate project team to address this specific issue. In the meantime, current rural fire management arrangements will remain extant, albeit, with cost and effort to service Hutt Valley rural fire being captured and accounted for separately. Note: this differs from the Auckland approach where rural fire, harbourmaster, and pollution control is the responsibility of their Manager CDEM (as a one stop disaster shop).

## **17. Response teams**

The current four Response Teams (two in the Hutt Valley, two in Wellington) have one or more associations with local/regional council CDEM teams. The new regime would simplify the current arrangements. The importance of Response Teams was reinforced during the Christchurch quake. It is vital that the current teams remain able, motivated and resourced (noting Victoria University and Upper Hutt teams are externally funded and the other two – Tawa and Hutt City are funded by local authorities).

## **18. Massey University and the joint ECC**

The current ECC arrangements in the Greater Wellington (GW) building are adequate but only for a small to medium emergency requiring a basic level of coordination effort; provided the Greater Wellington building is not impacted in the emergency. A more significant event approaching that experienced in Christchurch would require alternative arrangements to be put in place. Initial discussions with Massey University lead me to believe there are benefits to a joint facility; however this will depend on favourable commercial arrangements. Massey originally proposed a dual ECC complex with one used for training purposes and the other for use by GW. They have been told that only one scalable ECC would be necessary, for use as a joint training facility (to be booked by all users – Massey for their tertiary studies and GW for CDEM exercises) while exclusive use would be guaranteed during a major disaster. The office accommodation offered is less beneficial. There will be synergies associated with both academic staff and professional practitioners being co-located, but again only at the right price, particularly if CDEM staff can be accommodated in the regions EOCs at little or no marginal cost. Further discussions are underway to refine requirements and produce an operating model.

## **19. Conclusions**

The concept of Network Enabled Civil Defence represents an opportunity to deliver more from existing resources by taking a more coordinated, holistic and functional approach to the design and delivery of CDEM services. This would build on the current programmes and networks, with a primary focus on developing resilient communities and providing the systems, equipment and resources to respond appropriately during emergencies. The new team would travel light; tapping into council owned facilities and resources as required. In the event of an emergency

situation, the new team would reconfigure to support emergency operations and coordination centres. These centres would continue to be staffed by appointed council employees in order to deliver an effective response effort.

Network Enabled Civil Defence presents a paradigm shift with councils required to give up direct control of their CDEM staff in return for an enhanced service across the region. To be successful, the new CDEM team must be aligned with MCDEM direction and responsive to council needs (managed through the CEG), while the councils themselves must retain ownership of CDEM outcomes. This ownership is reflected in the proposed governance and funding arrangements.

## 20. Next steps

Subject to general agreement by the Joint Committee, the next steps would be:

- a. The general proposal refined to reflect decisions and changes arising from the 23 March 2012 meeting. Checklists of actions are currently being drafted to guide transition activities;
- b. A letter is prepared to all staff confirming the new structure / decision making, confirm matching process, provide the template and JDs and the finalised submission / feedback report. It is proposed that staff meet for a briefing on 5 April where the documentation will be provided. This consultation has been and will continue to be coordinated by the Regional HR Managers Group and with involvement by CEG sub committee members.

**It should be noted that starting the consultation in February was not completely in line with the Joint Committee resolutions of May 2011 however proceeded in order to significantly reduce the period of uncertainty for staff and potentially see a new structure in place 2 months earlier.**

- c. An update will be provided to the CEG on 4 April 2012;
- d. The new arrangements would then be formalised through a General Agreement on Joint CDEM Services; and finally,
- e. Transition to the new structure. The unified team would then produce the family of documents required to conduct business; including strategic plan, annual plan, programmes, systems, processes, metrics, new budget(s), plus those requirements mandated by legislation e.g. a new Group Plan etc.

## 21. Recommendations

*It is requested that the Joint Committee **note**:*

- a. *That this paper does not, in itself, meet all the requirements identified in the MCDEM Assessment (Reference B) but should provide the foundation from which the deficiencies may be addressed during phase three of the project (paragraph 3 c) and beyond; and,*
- b. *That CEG has agreed in principle the following for final approval by the Joint Committee.*

*It is therefore recommended that the Joint Committee **approve**:*

- c. The draft mission, vision and values recorded at Attachment 1;*
- d. The proposed Concept of Operations;*
- e. The delivery of readiness (and reduction) services through three functional groups and four designated areas as proposed in Attachment 2;*
- f. The delivery of response services, as required, through up to six EOCs plus a regional ECC as proposed in Attachment 3;*
- g. The proposed division of council assets to establish the new CDEM team. This will then allow detailed inventories to be established and values produced for transfer;*
- h. The majority of the team being “home based” at Hutt City and Wellington EMOs until the issue of an enhanced ECC is resolved;*
- i. The general approach for the development of an enhanced ECC outlined in this report and delegate this to the Regional Manager for management in conjunction with the Greater Wellington Regional Council;*
- j. The new organisation being formally titled the Wellington Region Emergency Management Office;*
- k. The branding concept proposed;*
- l. Costs for the new organisation from 1 Jul 13 being apportioned on a pro rata basis using population (based on the latest statistics contained in Council LTPs) with Greater Wellington being assessed as having the same population as Wellington City;*
- m. The implementation of specific regional CDEM infrastructure projects being subject to direct funding by the relevant Council(s);*
- n. That staff be informed of the outcomes above and that formal consultation proceeds to the final phase in accordance with the process outlined in paragraph 57 b;*
- o. Confirm that Rural Fire management be eventually restructured as an Enlarged Rural Fire District(s) in line with the National Rural Fire Service strategy, however in the meantime, Hutt Valley rural fire arrangements be managed by WREMO;*
- p. Direct the Regional Manager to prepare a draft general Agreement on the provision of joint CDEM services; and,*
- q. Delegate the remaining details to the CEG for approval.*

Report prepared by:

**Bruce Pepperell**  
Regional Manager CDEM

### **Attachments**

1. Draft Mission, Vision, Values
2. Proposed Structural Framework – Readiness Operations
3. Proposed Structural Framework – Response and Recovery Operations
4. Branding Examples
5. Consolidated CDEM Budget for the region

### **References**

- A. Recommended Future Structures and Arrangements for CDEM in the Wellington Region (Kestrel Report) dated 16 Feb 10
- B. Wellington Region CDEM Capability Assessment Report (MCDEM Report) dated May 11
- C. Our Iceberg is Melting – The Eight Step Process of Successful Change, by John Kotter. (Required reading for those attending the CDEM workshops)
- D. Terms of Reference: Review of Wellington Region CDEM Structure – Schedule 5 of Regional Manager's Employment Contract