

3 November 2023

Committee Secretariat  
Governance and Administration Committee  
Parliament Buildings  
Wellington 6021

By email: [ga@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:ga@parliament.govt.nz)

Tēnā koutou

## **Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee and Canterbury Mayoral Forum combined submission – Emergency Management Bill 2023**

---

1. The Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee (CDEM Group) and Canterbury Mayoral Forum (CMF) thank the Governance and Administration Committee for this opportunity to make a joint submission on the proposed Emergency Management Bill 2023 (the Bill).
2. Given the common membership and shared interests of both the CDEM Group and CMF we make this joint submission taking a regional strategic perspective to the Bill, in the interests of a shared voice for Canterbury and efficiency of the submissions process.
3. We note that individual councils within the region will be submitting on the Bill reflecting more specific viewpoints on its provisions from a constituent local authority perspective and we ask that the Committee carefully considers these.
4. This letter and the attached comments on the Bill make up our joint submission. We wish to be heard in support of this submission.

### **Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Joint Committee**

5. The Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee comprises elected representatives of local authorities within the region and was formed under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) pursuant to S.12 of the CDEM Act 2002 (the Act).

*Mayors standing together for Canterbury.*

Secretariat, E: [secretariat@canterburymayors.org.nz](mailto:secretariat@canterburymayors.org.nz) W: [www.canterburymayors.org.nz](http://www.canterburymayors.org.nz)  
C/- Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 T: 03 345 9323

6. Members of the CDEM Group Joint Committee are the mayor or chairperson (or delegated councillor) from Kaikōura, Hurunui, Waimakariri, Selwyn, Ashburton, Timaru, Mackenzie, Waimate District Councils, Christchurch City Council and Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury). In February 2019, it was agreed that Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu would be invited to a guardianship role – Kai Mataara – and is treated as a full voting member during meetings.
7. The CDEM Group exercises governance, sets regional funding, and determines CDEM policy for member authorities in relation to risk analysis, reduction, readiness, response, and recovery from emergencies.
8. The CDEM Group is supported by the Canterbury CDEM Coordinating Executive Group (CEG) established and maintained under S. 20 of the Act. Apart from statutory appointments of CEs from councils and representatives from emergency and health services, a range of representatives from partner agencies and sub-groups with roles and responsibilities in emergency management also sit on CEG. Several operational subcommittees operate below CEG.

## **Canterbury Mayoral Forum**

9. The Canterbury Mayoral Forum (CMF) comprises the mayors of the ten territorial authorities in Canterbury and the Chair of the Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury), supported by our chief executives. The purpose of the Forum is to promote collaboration across the region and increase the effectiveness of local government in meeting the needs of Canterbury's communities.
10. The eleven local authorities are: Kaikōura, Hurunui, Waimakariri, Selwyn, Ashburton, Timaru, Mackenzie, Waimate and Waitaki District Councils, the Christchurch City Council and Environment Canterbury.
11. All Canterbury councils actively participate in the Forum to promote collaboration across the region and increase the effectiveness of local government in meeting the needs of Canterbury's communities.

## **Context**

12. Canterbury is the largest region in New Zealand by land area, extending from north of the Clarence River to south of the Waitaki, and from the main divide of the Southern Alps to the South Pacific Ocean. We comprise some of the largest and fastest-growing urban areas in New Zealand. Greater Christchurch is New Zealand's second most populous urban area.
13. The low-lying Canterbury Plains and the Southern Alps are iconic natural features but are also significant factors in the wide range of natural hazards and risks the region faces, including fire, flood, wind, earthquakes, and tsunamis. As a region we have significant experience in recorded history of all of these hazards resulting in natural disaster events and giving rise to preparedness for and activation of emergency response and recovery activities.
14. Additionally, as widely reported, we face the prospect of a 75 percent probability of a vast Alpine Fault earthquake within the next 50 years with an 82 percent probability it will be above 8.0 in magnitude.

15. The devastating Canterbury earthquake sequence of 2010-2012, the Hurunui/Kaikōura earthquakes of 2016, the Port Hills fires of 2017, the mosque attacks of 2019 and the Canterbury floods of 2021 are but several recent examples. Through the CDEM Group, regional capability, and capacity to regionally coordinate larger events and support local Councils in delivery of emergency management (EM) response is well established, as are EM resources at local levels.
16. Like other CDEM Groups with regional and territorial councils, CDEM Group resourcing for EM relies on the funding that constituent local authorities agree to contribute through a targeted rate by the regional council as administering authority. This also funds the CDEM Group office that includes a range of professional EM staff and delivers a programme of work to an agreed budget. Local council rates fund local councils EM activities among many other activities.

## **Our Overview of the Bill**

17. The Bill seeks to replace the current Act in its entirety, carrying forward the purpose of the Act and broad definition of emergency management with reference to the '4Rs' (risk reduction, readiness, response, and recovery) largely unchanged. An important exception, missing from the current Act, is recognising the Crown's responsibility to give effect to the principles of te Tiriti o Waitangi by recognising the role of Māori in emergency management and seeking to enhance Māori participation throughout the emergency management system. We strongly support this objective that is reflected in a suite of specific changes in the Bill.
18. Notwithstanding the merit of many of the Bill's new provisions, we remain deeply concerned about the implications of the critical lack of consideration of and provision for funding to implement the Bill and the suite of regulations that follow from it.
19. In summary, while we regard most of the changes included in the Bill as appropriate and useful, the overall effect of the Bill is insufficient to ensure the EM system is ready for the future and foreseeable challenges we face in our region and country.
20. The Bill incorporates specific proposals that were foreshadowed in what became known as 'Trifecta' engagement in February 2022 through the '*Modernising the Emergency Management Framework*' discussion document. The CDEM Group and CEG gave feedback directly to the then Minister for EM in that regard in March 2022 which is reflected in this submission.
21. We have observed the Bill's ongoing policy development process since the 'TAG Report'<sup>1</sup> following the Kaikōura earthquake and Port Hills fires, and the Government's response to the TAG recommendations<sup>2</sup>. We note that the third tranche of changes<sup>3</sup> were adopted and Cabinet approval for its introduction<sup>4</sup> predates the widespread catastrophic North Island floods and Cyclone Gabrielle earlier in 2023.
22. The impacts of these events have become clearer in recent months, especially given the familiar experience of red zone buyouts and the billions of dollars committed post-disaster to enhancing resilience in the extended recovery phase that was the case after the earthquakes

---

<sup>1</sup> Ministerial Review - Better Responses to Natural Disaster and Other Emergencies, January 2018

<sup>2</sup> Delivering better responses to natural disasters and other emergencies - Government response to the Technical Advisory Group's recommendations, August 2018

<sup>3</sup> Cabinet Paper - Emergency Management System Reform Proposals, 24 August 2022

<sup>4</sup> Cabinet Paper - Emergency Management Bill: Approval for Introduction, 26 January 2023

in Greater Christchurch. Treasury's estimate for the bill for Cyclone Gabrielle is between \$9 billion and \$14 billion, making it New Zealand's second-largest natural disaster by cost after the Canterbury earthquakes<sup>5</sup>.

23. Environment Canterbury became the first council in New Zealand to declare a climate emergency in May 2019. Many other councils and the NZ Government have subsequently made that declaration and hastened their responses to the reality of increasing frequency, severity, and duration of recovery from adverse weather events that are exacerbated by climate change.
24. In introducing the Bill in June 2023, the then Minister for Emergency Management said "It's not designed as a fundamental transformation, but instead makes some practical improvements to ensure the system is best placed for the future."<sup>6</sup>
25. We note '*no new funding powers are proposed to be created in the legislative reforms or funding provided in any supporting package of policies to address any capacity issues in the emergency management system*'<sup>7</sup>. We are seriously concerned that no funding is provided to assist local authorities meet their additional obligations as proposed by the Bill.
26. We agree that modernisation of the EM system is important and that the Bill makes some tangible progress in this regard, although some new provisions are unnecessarily complex and prescriptive.
27. Our EM professionals across the region support modernisation and are seeking greater change that is contained in the Bill. The Act is over 21 years old and developed in the context of a 1990 hazardscape. Its policy settings in relation to the 4Rs, and structures and resourcing arrangements at regional and local levels, have largely been passed onto the Bill. Our EM professionals do not regard the Bill as adequate for the challenges of the future with more frequent and severe emergency events.
28. There is concern about the observed and experienced ad hoc approach to recovery arrangements and the insufficient resourcing and funding for recovery from major events. Establishing recovery offices or units often bypasses existing EM structures and processes. Recovery roles, responsibilities, and processes are very unclear beyond the exercise of Recovery Manager powers in formal transition periods, that is typically a small part of a large recovery.
29. From our observation and experience, setting in place quickly 'whole of affected community' recovery leadership and management to deliver on the maxim of community led recovery, is typically hurried and bespoke. Consequential delays, duplication, and inefficiencies arise but most of all effective delivery of support to affected communities is compromised.
30. The overall Group's experience, which we believe is shared with peers, is one of having responsibilities across the 4Rs, but without the necessary levers or resources to support our communities in significant emergency events.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/132501861/eqcstyle-approach-for-flooding-maybe-needed-in-future-robertson>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/emergency-management-bill-introduced>

<sup>7</sup> Regulatory Impact Statement: Emergency Management System Reforms – iwi and Māori contributions to emergency management, legal framework, and critical infrastructure (28 October 2021)

31. Indeed, the Cyclone Recovery and Finance Minister in July 2023 said “there was a 60/40 split between central and local government in funding the rebuild of essential infrastructure. Beyond that, there’s no process, it’s all ad hoc. We need to be much more systemised in how we do this ... speaking frankly, for both local and central government, if it’s just down to the resources we have today, we will run out of money”<sup>8</sup>.
32. The EM system is deeply challenged by the lack of an integrated risk management framework for risk reduction, and a disjointed approach across statutes and between central and local government responsibilities. The critical infrastructure proposals in the Bill are not integrated with the approach to wider critical infrastructure system resiliency reform<sup>9</sup>, as discussed in detail before the 2022 Cabinet<sup>10</sup>. New Zealand should have a publicly available National Risk Assessment Register enabled by the EM legislation.
33. We also do not see evidence of reform to the EM system being integrated with plans, processes and reporting requirements in other system relevant legislation, including: RMA replacement Acts and water services reforms; the proposed Climate Change Adaptation Act (including the managed retreat inquiry by the Environment Committee); enacted changes to LIMs system; the Local Government Act, and more broadly, the outcomes arising from the Future for Local Government Inquiry Panel Report; and proposed changes to improve critical infrastructure resilience.
34. We support other calls, including that from Local Government New Zealand for a more fundamental consideration of a ‘fit for the future’ EM system and legislation to give effect to it that does more to integrate risk reduction and recovery across the entire system<sup>11</sup>.
35. Thank you for your consideration of our joint Group and Forum regional submission.
36. Key contacts in relation to this submission are: James Thompson, Regional Manager/ Group Controller Canterbury CDEM Group, [James.Thompson@cdemcanterbury.govt.nz](mailto:James.Thompson@cdemcanterbury.govt.nz) (phone 027 277 1505) or Maree McNeilly Canterbury Mayoral Forum Secretariat, [secretariat@canterburymayors.org.nz](mailto:secretariat@canterburymayors.org.nz) (Phone 027 381 8924)

Nāku, iti noa, nā



Neil Brown  
Chair Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency  
Management Group Joint Committee  
Mayor, Ashburton District Council



Nigel Bowen  
Chair Canterbury Mayoral Forum  
Mayor, Timaru District Council

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/132501861/eqcstyle-approach-for-flooding-maybe-needed-in-future-robertson>

<sup>9</sup> [https://consultation.dpmc.govt.nz/national-security-group/critical-infrastructure-phase-1-public-consultation/user\\_uploads/dpmc--summary-dd--strengthening-the-resilience-of-ci.pdf](https://consultation.dpmc.govt.nz/national-security-group/critical-infrastructure-phase-1-public-consultation/user_uploads/dpmc--summary-dd--strengthening-the-resilience-of-ci.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> Cabinet Paper - Emergency Management System Reform Proposals, 24 August 2022

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/Submissions/LGNZ-draft-Submission-Emergency-Management-Bill.pdf>

# Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee and Canterbury Mayoral Forum:

## Combined Submission on the Emergency Management Bill 2023

---

### by topic/provisions

#### Roles and responsibilities at Area (regional) level

1. The Bill, through Cls. 29 and 37, provides for separate and distinct roles and duties respectively for Emergency Management Committees (EMCs - currently Groups) and member local authorities. EMCs have new explicit roles to lead, assure and coordinate in relation to local authorities EM activities, responsibilities in relation to Iwi & Māori participation in EM,<sup>12</sup> and for engagement with disproportionately impacted communities in plan making and review<sup>13</sup>.
2. Local authorities are to focus on EM resourcing. They have new explicit accountabilities to their regional (now 'Area') EMC, including input to EMC plan making and alignment of other plans with EMC Plans.<sup>14</sup> Both EMCs and Member LAs continue with risk reduction, response, and recovery; and share new 'at large' community consultation requirements in relation to hazards and risks.<sup>15</sup>
3. We comment further below on the intent of the provisions for proposed enhanced Iwi & Māori participation and recognition of communities disproportionately impacted by emergency events.
4. We support additional clarity of roles and functions between EMCs and member authorities. But to give effect to these provisions, taken together and with detailed EMC Plan content<sup>16</sup> and Review<sup>17</sup> requirements, requires significant additional resourcing and funding for EMCs. The quantum and implications of these are unassessed for EMCs in the lead up to introduction of the Bill.
5. Further, they do not address overall minimum standards of EM service delivery within and between regions (beyond the partial provision for this in relation to critical infrastructure 'planning emergency levels of service'<sup>18</sup>), as discussed below.
6. The Bill is specific on lines of accountability in emergency situations. But in the event of disagreement within the overall collaborative framework across the 4Rs, mechanisms for dispute resolution are a matter that should be provided for, both within and outside of declared emergencies. This is important for EM, given the multiplicity of agencies that need to work together.

---

<sup>12</sup> Cl. 29(1)(a)(i)(ii)(iv), (b), (d) (h), (i), (l), (m)

<sup>13</sup> Cl. 76(1)(a)

<sup>14</sup> Cl. 37(a)(ii)(v), (i)

<sup>15</sup> Cls. 29(1)(a)(iv)(B), 37(a)(v)

<sup>16</sup> Cl. 73

<sup>17</sup> Cl. 75

<sup>18</sup> Cl. 57

7. We support the provision for regulations<sup>19</sup> to be made to confirm the roles and responsibilities of lead and support agencies, and agree that current uncertainty contributes to misunderstanding of roles and responsibilities before, during, and following emergencies<sup>20</sup>.

*“Lead agency roles and responsibilities will be determined via consultation. The Bill requires the Minister for Emergency Management to consult with other relevant Ministers and agency chief executives when developing new regulations for lead and support agencies”<sup>21</sup>.*

8. We strongly believe there should be consultation with EMCs in developing the guiding regulation framework and criteria for lead and support agencies at regional level<sup>22</sup>, and EMC engagement should occur before such agencies are recognised under regulation.
9. This is to ensure existing arrangements, such as the CEG sub-committees that exist in Canterbury, can be aligned with coordination activities undertaken by Regional Public Service Commissioners. During the recent Covid-19 outbreak events the role of the regional leadership group was undertaken without any reference to the Group.
10. We think that lead and support agencies that are not critical infrastructure entities (that are subject to their own planning requirements), such as social services should be required to demonstrate at regional level their readiness for emergency response and recovery through EM processes.
11. There are two matters raised through Trifecta engagement as specific proposals that have not in our view been satisfactorily addressed in the Bill:
- undeclared emergencies – achieving effective coordination and response to adverse events not warranting declaration as emergency events can be problematic for EMCs and local authority members. The Bill in our view does not offer sufficient authority or support to EM authorised persons to deal with undeclared emergencies and to solicit appropriate response from key support agencies (we note there is some provision for this in the Bill only for transition period recovery powers in undeclared events<sup>23</sup>)
  - animal welfare - we are concerned that the Bill does not provide appropriately for animal welfare during emergencies, declared or undeclared. There are significant gaps in who is responsible for different elements of animal welfare; defining eligible versus non-eligible animals; and resourcing the care for animals.
12. Also not covered adequately in the Bill is the disadvantaged position of lifestyle properties subject to land damage through emergency events. The Group raised this with the then Minister for Emergency Management during Trifecta engagement in March 2022. It drew upon our experience in the May-June 2021 Canterbury regional flood emergency event.
13. Many lifestyle properties were significantly affected by flooding and gravel & silt deposits from major rivers forging new streams, and in the process destroyed productive activities and potential. They were ineligible for assistance afforded to commercial farming where greater than half of income was from farming activities. We believe this matter is appropriately

---

<sup>19</sup> Cl.146

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.civildefence.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/publications/emergency-management-bill/2023-06-EM-Bill-Factsheet-about-the-Bill.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> *ibid*

<sup>22</sup> Currently listed in Appendix 1 of the National Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan Order, 2015

<sup>23</sup> Cl.88(3)

addressed in the provision of regulations in relation to lead and support agencies under Cl. 146 of the Bill.

## Iwi and Māori Participation

14. The Bill provides for a new national Māori Emergency Management Advisory Group and for Māori representation on EMCs and supporting executive committees. There are multiple provisions<sup>24</sup> influencing the appointment of Māori as well as for regulations that direct the process<sup>25</sup>.
15. Explicit requirements are proposed to rest with EMCs to consult Iwi and Māori, establish systems and processes to ensure their capability/capacity to engage with and seek Iwi and Māori involvement in EM planning, have regard to feedback<sup>26</sup> as well as coordination arrangements across the 4Rs<sup>27</sup>.
16. We agree with overall intent of these provisions, and we know existing practices and levels of engagement vary widely. But those relating to participation are unduly complex and prescriptive. EMCs, together with relevant Iwi and Hapū should be afforded much greater discretion in determining engagement arrangements, including through existing mechanisms, such as Mana Whakahono ā Rohe.
17. There are many longstanding relationships for engagement between individual local authorities and iwi or hapū, as manawhenua, in developing plans and other activities. The additional requirements that rest with EMCs do not recognise these existing arrangements. We are concerned about the resourcing implications for all parties to these provisions and seek greater discretion to agree regionally with iwi and hapū about how best to achieve the outcomes being sought.
18. We support the provision for reimbursement<sup>28</sup> of Iwi and Māori organisations directly for welfare costs incurred during an emergency, rather than the present lodging claims with local authorities, who in turn, request reimbursement from the Government.
19. We acknowledge the huge contribution Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Papatipu Rūnanga and hapū have made in readiness and activation of emergency response and recovery. It is noteworthy that this has relied on these groups bearing the cost of readiness of facilities, such as maintenance of marae, that may be called upon in emergencies.

## Disproportionately Impacted Communities

20. To give effect to New Zealand's international agreement obligations, the Bill includes a requirement for EMCs to engage with representatives of '*communities that are likely to be disproportionately impacted by emergency events*' during the development of EMC Plans<sup>29</sup>. Regulations may be made setting out principles for identifying and confirming representatives and minimum engagement requirements<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> Cls.20(3)(c), 26, 33, 67(2)

<sup>25</sup> Cl.144

<sup>26</sup> Cls.29(1)(h)(i)(l)(m), 76(1)(a)(ii), (f)

<sup>27</sup> Cl.73(1)(k)

<sup>28</sup> Cl.149

<sup>29</sup> Cl.76(1)(a)

<sup>30</sup> Cl143(1)(h)



21. The Bill does not define disproportionately impacted communities, although the Bill's explanatory contains the broad definition: "*these populations may include rural communities, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, seniors, disabled people, children, and those experiencing socio-economic deprivation or isolation.*"
22. As also indicated in the explanatory note, "*emergencies can amplify existing inequalities within society and disproportionately impact some population groups during emergency events.*" In a region as large and diverse as Canterbury, and with the hazards and risk we face, we believe there are many such communities.
23. Those disproportionately impacted may, depending on circumstances, include prison populations, pregnant mothers or migrant workers, and others that are hard to reach or not organised for representation. Our COVID lockdown experience was those international visitors transitioning through the region at the time needed the same level of care as residents in disproportionately impacted communities.
24. Affected communities from the same ethnic group may be dispersed geographically, such as Pasifika in South Canterbury versus those within metropolitan Christchurch. Reaching some non-geographically defined communities may be challenging.
25. Giving practical effect to this will need a nuanced and empathetic manner, with appropriately skilled personnel. As with existing mana whenua engagement by local authority staff, it cannot be assumed that community development staff in local councils will have capacity to support this engagement. Neither can it be assumed representatives of such communities will be available to participate without funding being made available for that purpose.
26. We are concerned that expectations about emergency support and recovery delivery are unrealistically raised through such engagement. In summary we think considerable further thought needs to go into these provisions and any supporting regulations, prior to taking effect.

## **Critical Infrastructure**

27. The Bill proposes a two-year transition period for existing lifeline utilities to become critical infrastructure entities and sectors (CIEs) and includes provisions to add/remove CIEs in a more flexible way<sup>31</sup>. It introduces a new requirement for CIEs to develop, or contribute to the development of, sector-specific plans for responding to and recovering from emergencies, including 3-yearly reviews<sup>32</sup>.
28. Also new, CIEs must establish and publicly state their 'planning emergency levels of service' (PELOS) and review them every five years<sup>33</sup>. This is to be guided by regulations relating to PELOS and reporting requirements<sup>34</sup>. Annual compliance reporting by CIEs in relation to their obligations under the Act to the Director of EM, and one or more responsible public service agencies relevant to the entity is also required<sup>35</sup>.

---

<sup>31</sup> Cl.50, 52 and Schedule 1.

<sup>32</sup> Cl.54

<sup>33</sup> Cl.57

<sup>34</sup> Cl.145

<sup>35</sup> Cl.58

29. We support greater flexibility in recognition of CIEs through *Gazette* notice rather than schedule in the Act. The Minister has the decision-making discretion in CIE listing subject to criteria and guided by a series of factors in the Bill<sup>36</sup>.
30. There have been numerous calls for flood control and protection works and services to be afforded greater recognition as lifeline services due to the critical protection these provide to communities. Most recently Chair of Environment Canterbury Peter Scott set this out in an open letter<sup>37</sup>. We support calls for these community assets to be recognised as critical infrastructure in the Bill and for co-investment in them between regional councils and government.
31. Solid waste services, including refuse, recycling, and organics, are also essential to protect the wellbeing, health, and economic functioning of our communities in emergencies. They meet the criteria and factors set out in the Bill defining critical infrastructure, and debris management is a critical function in recovery from emergencies.
32. We think that the Committee's Report to Parliament should include recommendations to the Minister for EM that consideration be given to recognition of flood management and solid waste services as critical infrastructure.
33. Defining PELOS that are meaningful, reflect interdependencies (e.g., flood protection for other CIEs), and respond to community preferences will be challenging. The cost of changes to planning & reporting requirements and annual compliance assessments, which to a degree overlap with current requirements/practice, are uncertain and potentially significant.
34. We know that submissions from local authorities will address these challenges and costs in greater detail<sup>38</sup>. We support the call to integrate emergency and risk management documents required under different legislation, and the minimisation of duplicating documents or operating in an emergency from disparate documents.<sup>39</sup>

## Rules and Regulations

35. Currently, the Act Regulations under the Bill to be considered as Directors rules<sup>40</sup> are:
- form and use of EM warrants and insignia
  - provision and operation of warning systems
  - EM related standards, procedures, training systems and qualifications
36. Directors Rules are generally focused on matters of detail and procedure, and subject to consultation, but can address broader issues, including<sup>41</sup>:
- roles and responsibilities for the EM system under specific conditions
  - form and subject matter of EMC plans
  - EMC reporting requirements

---

<sup>36</sup> Cl.51

<sup>37</sup> <https://www.ecan.govt.nz/get-involved/news-and-events/stories/2023/chair-sends-open-letter-to-election-candidates/>

<sup>38</sup> e.g., Submissions on the Bill by Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*

<sup>40</sup> Cl.147

<sup>41</sup> *ibid*

37. The Bill also provides for suite of new Regulations<sup>42</sup> in relation to:

- administering authority operational requirements
- critical Infrastructure Entities' planning and reporting
- EMC engagement with disproportionately impacted communities (reps)
- management of concurrent emergencies
- a new class of infringement offences and provision for fines up to \$1,000
- Māori representation on EMCs and EMCEs
- roles of lead and support agencies (currently at national level as per National CDEM Plan and Schedule)

38. This level of provision for secondary legislation to guide implementation of the Bill is unusual. Given this, we think those that directly or indirectly affect the role and responsibilities of EMCs should be subject to mandatory consultation with these Committees in development of rules and regulations. We also believe commencement of relevant Bill provisions should be coordinated with the availability of related regulations and the Bill should be specific in this regard.

END

---

<sup>42</sup> Cls.143-146