

Regarding the discussion document: **Strengthening New Zealand's emergency management legislation**

Submission to the National Emergency Management Agency

May 2025



Submission of Taituarā – Local Government Professionals Aotearoa

Regarding the discussion document: Strengthening New Zealand's emergency management legislation

Taituarā-Local Government Professionals Aotearoa ('Taituarā') thanks the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) for the opportunity to submit in respect of the discussion document: *Strengthening New Zealand's emergency management legislation*.

Taituarā is New Zealand's leading network for local government professionals.

A few words about us. Taituarā is Aotearoa New Zealand's leading membership network for professionals working in, and for, local government. We have a membership base of 1,019 members drawn from local authority Chief Executives, managers, and staff across all 78 local authorities.

What unites Taituarā members is our commitment to be our own professional best, supporting local government excellence through connection, collaboration, and care for the well-being of our communities.

Taituarā strengthens the local government sector as a whole by using our members' insights and experiences to influence the public policy debate. We submit on legislation and regulations to provide perspectives on what works and how to make policy work. We have worked with local government chief executives to develop this submission and we bring that perspective to the response to the proposals in the discussion document.

Taituarā supports the review of Emergency Management Legislation.

Taituarā congratulates NEMA for its work to identify necessary changes to our civil defence and emergency management system. We agree with the problems identified in the discussion document and with the objectives for reform. As such, it represents a more useful and enduring contribution to the emergency management framework. Taituarā appreciates the challenges in navigating prescription and accountability while needing to take into account the diversity of both Aotearoa New Zealand's local governments and the vulnerabilities to hazards. The differing levels of resource held by local governments across the country must be front-of-mind when any prescription is being considered. This is essential to ensure the implementability of proposals.

Our overarching comment is that the issues of *risk reduction* and *recovery* both need to be addressed as part of this consultation. The discussion document does not deal with either of these issues substantively, and we urge NEMA to consider whether, and if so how these can be strengthened within the current emergency management framework. Another critical question is where does leadership for recovery following a significant event sit, and how could new legislation enable this?

Taituarā considers that careful consideration needs to be given to whether a legislative fix is needed or whether the outcomes desired can be achieved through other means (guidance, templates, strengthening relationships, identifying and sharing best practice). We agree that in some cases, providing a regulation-making power, and leaving it to the Minister to promulgate regulations, would

provide more flexibility. Matters such as who is, and isn't, a lifeline operator commend themselves for this treatment.

Finally, this submission has identified a number of areas where we recommend working through the detail with local government chief executives. We would be happy to help facilitate this.

Objective 1: Strengthening community and iwi Māori participation

Issue 1: Meeting the diverse needs of people and communities

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: CDEM Groups are not explicitly required to identify, engage, recognise, or consider how emergencies can disproportionately affect some groups.*
2. *Develop guidance on meeting diverse needs (non-legislative).*
3. *Require CDEM Group plans to include how people and communities that may be disproportionately affected will be planned for (legislative).*
4. *Require the Director to consult with representatives of disproportionately affected communities to inform national planning (legislative).*

Taituarā considers this issue is well canvassed in the discussion document. We agree that the options presented are not mutually exclusive, and that legislative and non-legislative mechanisms can usefully exist side by side and support each other.

In terms of the legislative options, we consider that CDEM Groups should be required to identify the diverse needs in their areas and to provide opportunities for engagement with people and communities with diverse needs to inform Group plans (option 3). Providing opportunities for engagement acknowledges the difficulties associated with the resourcing of communities and competing demands.

We agree with the option that the Director is explicitly required to consult representatives of disproportionately affected communities to inform national planning (option 4). These options should mirror each other at a regional and a national level.

Issue 2: Strengthening and enabling iwi Māori participation in emergency management

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: Iwi Māori are not currently legislatively required to be represented in local government emergency management decision-making structures (but practices vary across the country).*
2. *Address the roles of iwi Māori in plans, guidance, and other policy settings (non-legislative).*
3. *Require iwi Māori representation on CDEM Group decision-making structures (legislative)*
4. *Require CDEM Groups to engage with iwi Māori during the development of CDEM Group plans (legislative).*
5. *Require the Director to seek advice on Māori interests and knowledge to inform national level planning (legislative).*

Taituarā agrees that partnering with iwi Māori is essential to building New Zealand's disaster resilience, and with the Government's intention to recognise and enable the significant contribution of iwi Māori in emergency management. We understand that CDEM groups tend to already work in this way.

In terms of the options presented, Taituarā supports updating plans, guidance, and other policy settings to ensure iwi Māori are embedded into the emergency management system at an operational level (option 2). We also support providing for iwi Māori representation on CDEM decision-making structures (option 3).

We also support explicitly requiring that CDEM Groups engage with iwi/Māori in their areas to inform CDEM Group planning before emergencies (option 4) and that this is mirrored at a national level and the Director must seek advice on Māori interests and knowledge when developing the National CDEM Strategy and the National CDEM Plan (option 5).

Issue 3: Strengthening and enabling community participation in emergency management

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: Communities' ability to connect with the "formal" emergency management system is varied.*
2. *Develop and update guidance and strengthen public education (non-legislative).*
3. *Require CDEM Group plans to state how the Group will manage offers of resources from the public (legislative).*

The discussion document has canvassed the issues regarding community participation, but greater acknowledgement should be made that community participation is constrained by resources and competing priorities.

Taituarā agrees with the option to develop and update guidance and strengthen public education (option 2); the examples given would all be useful. We note it will be very important to work with local government and CDEM groups to progress this, to identify firstly what guidance is necessary. Secondly, examples of guidance/templates already exist that can be repurposed. Taituarā would be pleased to assist with this exercise.

We agree with the submission of Te Uru Kahika, that enabling and supporting community capacity uplift rather than guidance for 'public education' as suggested by Option 2 has to be the larger goal...and that without a meaningful shift in this, securing and managing offers of assistance as indicated through Option 3 becomes a transactional fee for service proposition, open-ended in nature and one that JCs and CEGs will find hard to financially justify.

Taituarā does not consider the legislative option proposed is necessary or is the best approach i.e. *"that CDEM Group plans be required to state how the Group will manage offers of resources from the public"* (option 3). It is difficult to imagine what the legislative provisions would look like to achieve this, and how it would be enforced. Instead, the focus should be on developing guidance and templates (option 2) to develop the capacity and capability.

Issue 4: Recognising that people, businesses and communities are often the first to respond in an emergency

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: Protection from civil liability and compensation for loss or damage is not available for people who undertake actions in an emergency without direction from a Controller or constable.*
2. *Provide for protection from civil liability for loss or damage (legislative)*

3. *Require CDEM Group plans to state how the Group will manage offers of resources from the public (legislative)*

Taituarā agrees with the option to provide protection from civil liability for loss or damage and that this is provided for in legislation (option b). Specifically, people would be protected from civil liability if they caused loss or damage while undertaking reasonable and significant emergency management actions in good faith, in circumstances where they were unable to seek or be given direction by a Controller or constable (option 2).

We support further work being carried out on reimbursement of costs and on Option 3. We suggest a focus group following submissions to this discussion document to explore these matters in detail.

Objective 2: Providing for clear responsibilities and accountabilities at the national, regional, and local levels

Issue 5: Clearer direction and control during an emergency

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: The agency dealing with the specific hazard (lead agency) is responsible for managing the response to the emergency. Group Controllers (in a local emergency) and the Director (in a national emergency) are responsible for coordinating and directing resources made available for emergency management.*
2. *Require the agency dealing with the specific hazard to be the “Control Agency” (legislative): Make it explicit that the Control Agency is in charge of the overall operational response to an emergency, while the Group Controller (for a local emergency) or the Director (for a national emergency) manages the wider consequences in support of (and at the request of) the Control Agency.*
3. *Require Group Controllers (local emergency) or the Director (national emergency) to be the “Control Agency” (legislative). Make it explicit that the Group Controller or Director manages the overall operational response to an emergency, including the ability to direct the agency dealing with the specific hazard. Group Controllers would have the power to coordinate resources made available during the response to an undeclared emergency.*
4. *A unified control model between the agency dealing with the hazard and the Group Controller or Director (legislative).*

Taituarā agrees with the description of the problem as outlined in the discussion document and that this is one of the most critical matters to get right.

The options outlined seek to clarify direction and control during an emergency. Given NEMA’s identification of the risks associated with the status quo we assume you want to move beyond this to a legislative fix.

Option 2 requires the agency dealing with the specific hazard to be the “Control Agency”; Option 3 requires Group Controllers (local emergency) or the Director (national emergency) to be the “Control Agency; and Option 4 requires a unified control model between the agency dealing with the hazard and the Group Controller or Director.

Taituarā considers that option 3 [Group Controllers (local emergency) and the Director (national emergency) to be the “Control Agency] will be the clearest and most straightforward. This option builds on the existing functions of the Director and CDEM Groups and we agree it provides clarity upfront to support better planning, immediate decision-making and that it provides a single point of

accountability. However, to implement this appropriate resource for councils will need to be provided. There will be significant financial implications to be worked through. If resourcing is not proposed, Taituara considers that the options should be worked through with local government chief executives to determine what is practical and can work effectively.

Chief Executives' experience is that response and recovery is most successful where owned and delivered as close to the impacted community as possible. Even with a group CDEM structure, providing for control to be led locally where possible, should be provided for. One of the challenges that exists currently is where staff and resources have divided loyalties and multiple masters. This can fundamentally complicate and stymie an effective response.

Issue 6: Strengthening the regional tier of emergency management

Successive reviews and inquiries have supported locally led delivery of emergency management, as a strength of our system. We agree with the Discussion Document in suggesting that *"strengthening the regional tier of emergency management and having clearer roles and responsibilities in legislation would support that."*

Issue 6.1: Resolving overlapping CDEM Group and local authority roles and responsibilities

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: The CDEM Group and its member local authorities have overlapping functions and duties in emergency management.*
2. *Provide distinct responsibilities for CDEM Groups and their local authority members (legislative).*
3. *Require CDEM Group plans to state how each member will fund and deliver on the functions and decisions of the CDEM Group (legislative).*

Taituarā has considered the options put forward to address the problems NEMA has identified: overlapping CDEM Group and local authority roles and responsibilities; inconsistent organisation and lines of accountability; variable performance of Coordinating Executive Groups.

We agree that providing distinct responsibilities for CDEM Groups and their local authority members in legislation (option 2) should reduce duplication and ambiguity of roles and help in delivery.

We think that more work is needed regarding Option 3 - that CDEM Group plans should be required to state how each member will fund and deliver on the functions and decisions of the CDEM Group. We are unsure what would be a suitable basis for determining an allocation. Generally, most councils can negotiate the relative contributions that individual councils will make at Joint Committee level. We urge NEMA to engage directly with chief executives during this consultation period, to explore this option and its workability.

Issue 6.2: Providing for clear and consistent organisation and accountability for emergency management

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: CDEM Groups and local authorities can employ, manage, and organise emergency management staff and Controllers and Recovery Managers, and resources in various ways to undertake emergency management in the area.*
2. *Update guidance and provide models for how CDEM Groups and local authorities could organise emergency management in their region (non-legislative).*

3. *Make the CDEM Group responsible for organising emergency management functions (legislative).*
4. *Retain flexibility but make the chief executive of each local authority hold the role of Controller and Recovery Manager (legislative).*

The discussion document has identified that lines of accountability between the CDEM Group, local authority members, chief executives, emergency management staff, and statutory officers such as Controllers and Recovery Managers may not be in line with what the CDEM Act and guidance intended.

Taituarā supports Option 2, *that guidance should be updated and models provided, for how CDEM Groups and local authorities could organise emergency management* in their region but we agree with Te Uru Kahika's arguments that this does not go far enough. Option 3 *making the CDEM Group responsible for organising emergency management functions* has the potential to provide the clarity required.

Taituarā does not agree with option 4, that the chief executive of each local authority holds the role of Controller and Recovery Manager. The reasons why we do not support this option follow:

- In all events, a council will need to continue to operate and often backfill and support the CDEM response directly and indirectly. The chief executive focuses on providing that bridge. This enables the chief executive to remain flexible to support the more formalised response structure
- The role of the chief executive is as advisor to the mayor, who will be the face of the community's response to any crisis
- Significant professional development is required (time commitment) to be properly qualified as a Controller
- If a chief executive is at the coal face, it is harder to see (and plan for) the strategy
- A chief executive as Controller would break the command-and-control structure from Controller to Group to NEMA
- The chief executive sometimes needs to shield the EOC from political imperatives

However, we note that for a small council, the chief executive sometimes carries the Alternate Controller title because of the small number of staff, and as a "just in case". Lastly, there can be a benefit in an appropriately skilled and supported ELT member holding an Alternate Controller role. This would help to break down silos, have a senior member involved and lift visibility and status of the role and the work.

Issue 6.3: Strengthening the performance of Coordinating Executive Groups

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: CDEM Groups and local authorities can employ, manage, and organise emergency management staff and Controllers and Recovery Managers, and resources in various ways to undertake emergency management in the area.*
2. *Update guidance and provide models for how CDEM Groups and local authorities could organise emergency management in their region (non-legislative).*
3. *Make the CDEM Group responsible for organising emergency management functions (legislative).*
4. *Retain flexibility but make the chief executive of each local authority hold the role of Controller and Recovery Manager (legislative).*

The discussion document explores options to improve engagement in Coordinating Executive Groups.

Taituarā is not convinced that a legislative solution is required. The options outlined are:

- Provide more specific expectations on members of the Coordinating Executive Group supported by good practice guidance (option 2)
- Require the Coordinating Executive Group to report to the Director on how and to what extent it has delivered on its functions under the CDEM Act (option 3)
- Remove the ability for Coordinating Executive Group members to delegate membership, or require these entities to have a single, specified delegate (option 4)

We consider it important to provide flexibility to regions and further, that through guidance and a close relationship with the national agency, much progress can be made. If a legislative fix is progressed, then Taituarā would support option 2, as it is important to have clarity around expectations of members of a Coordinating Executive Group.

Issue 7: Keeping emergency management plans up to date

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: Minor amendments to the National CDEM Plan and CDEM Group plans can be made without a review. Any larger changes require a full review of the plan.*
2. *Enable targeted, “more than minor” amendments to the National CDEM Plan and CDEM Group plans (legislative).*
3. *The National CDEM Plan isn’t required to be made by Order in Council but retains its legislative status (legislative).*

Taituarā agrees that the legislative fixes outlined in option 2 (enable targeted, “more than minor” amendments to the National CDEM Plan and CDEM Group plans) and option 3 (the National CDEM Plan isn’t required to be made by Order in Council, but retains its legislative status) both make sense and we support them. This would seem essential to progress at pace.

Objective 3: Enabling a higher minimum standard of emergency management

Issue 8: Stronger national direction and assurance

Issue 8.1: Strengthening the Director’s mandate to set expectations and monitor performance

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: the Director has the function of monitoring the performance of persons with responsibilities under the CDEM Act and the power to issue guidelines, codes, or technical standards. The Act also enables certain mandatory requirements to be set through regulations.*
2. *Increased guidance and strengthened governance (non-legislative).*
3. *Enable a wider range of mandatory standards to be set through rules (legislative).*
4. *Give the Director the function of monitoring the performance of the emergency management system (legislative).*

Taituarā supports the non-legislative option of more guidance and strengthened governance and that this is achieved by working with the local government sector and agencies to determine priorities and develop material (option 2).

We also support enabling legislation to allow rules to be developed through secondary legislation, but we consider this needs to be done through working closely with local government and agencies (option 3).

Taituarā supports giving the Director the function of monitoring the performance of the emergency management system (option 4).

Issue 8.2: Strengthening the mandate to intervene and address performance issues

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: There are limited powers of intervention in the CDEM Act to ensure performance against existing responsibilities.*
2. *Provide the Director with the power to issue compliance orders (legislative).*
3. *Expand the Minister's existing powers of intervention (legislative).*

Taituarā has considered the 3 options, and we hold the view that more work is needed before making any changes that would require a new compliance framework to be established for CDEM. It is unclear what the new tools for the Director (power to issue compliance orders) or the Minister (expand existing powers of intervention) might be directed towards. With the changes being mooted through this discussion document and subsequent bill, we are hopeful that change will be made in the right direction without the need for new powers and all the costs that would be needed to implement the new framework. In the CDEM context, a Ministerial power to intervene might come 'too little too late' if accessed in a procedurally fair manner. You would need an emergency intervention power where immediate response is required. An unintended consequence might be enabling councils to be directed to fund emergency management.

Issue 9: Strengthening local hazard risk management

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: Local authorities (through CDEM Groups) are responsible for determining their approach to achieving an acceptable level of risk.*
2. *Provide clearer guidance about what it means to achieve an "acceptable" level of risk (non-legislative).*
3. *Update guidance and strengthen assurance of CDEM Group plans (non-legislative).*
4. *Enable the form and content of CDEM Group plans to be prescribed through secondary legislation (legislative).*
5. *Strengthen the Minister's role in the CDEM Group planning process (legislative).*

Taituarā is very supportive of legislative changes to strengthen hazard risk management through resource management reform and climate adaptation. It is important that the respective legislative frameworks do not duplicate or overlap, but have purposes and provisions that are aligned. It is the perfect time to achieve this, given the reviews of relevant legislation and national direction currently underway.

The Discussion Document does not provide visibility of how these reforms fit together, what the role of Groups is and how plan making for risk reduction might be expressed. The current state of legislative

change provides the perfect opportunity to grapple with these questions and how the various pieces of legislation can work better together.

We agree with Te Uru Kahika's submission that there should be an authoritative risk assessment that has standing as a common point of reference at a regional level, and also that this be framed in terms of risk reduction versus hazard management and as a system conversation.

To make gains in risk reduction Taituarā supports the non-legislative options put forward: provide clearer guidance about what it means to achieve an "acceptable" level of risk (option 2); update guidance and strengthen assurance of CDEM Group plans (option 3). Taituarā encourages NEMA to work with local government and with relevant agencies to achieve this.

Taituarā also supports secondary legislation setting mandatory requirements about the content and detail of Group Plans, including standards that must be followed (such as risk assessment processes) (option 4). To fulfil this option and develop standards it will be necessary to work closely with local government and with relevant agencies.

It will be essential to form a group at a national level comprising local government, relevant agencies and NEMA to agree priorities and oversee the development of guidance and standards across the range of matters identified in the discussion document. This will also help to achieve buy-in from parties.

Issue 10: Strengthening due consideration of taonga Māori, cultural heritage and animals during and after emergencies

10.1: Considering taonga Māori and other cultural heritage during and after emergencies

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: taonga Māori and other cultural heritage are not always considered during and after emergencies.*
2. *Develop guidance on considering taonga and other cultural heritage (non-legislative).*
3. *Strengthen planning expectations through secondary legislation (legislative).*

Taituarā supports developing guidance on considering taonga and other cultural heritage (option 2) and strengthening planning expectations to require CDEM Group plans to outline the cultural heritage of their communities and how this will be part of response and recovery planning; how mātauranga Māori-led approaches are used to consider local knowledge as part of response and recovery planning; and how cultural heritage experts have been consulted during planning and how they will be leveraged during and after emergencies.

Experience post the Canterbury Earthquakes was that recovery benefitted from a very strong and engaged response by Ngai Tahu, allowing the region's recovery to benefit from the interest and experience of local iwi. Iwi were very engaged at the system scale (and also focussed on recovery within the public realm) and this was particularly helpful. However, at the more localised and individual property level, response and recovery are driven by health and safety, property rights and insurance expectations, and district plan requirements.

Taituarā is also aware that local iwi make a significant contribution on behalf of their own communities and the wider regional community. We are wary of how this set of relationships and contributions will be achieved if turned into a set of rules or a compliance expectation. Therefore, we do not support the legislative option for this (option 3).

It will be important to develop the guidance and legislative provisions with relevant parties and to draw on practice that already exists.

Issue 10.2: Considering animals during and after emergencies

Options presented (not mutually exclusive):

1. *Status quo: Animals are not always considered during and after emergencies.*
2. *Develop guidance on considering animal impacts (non-legislative).*
3. *Strengthen planning expectations through secondary legislation (legislative).*
4. *Expand emergency powers to enable mitigation of pain or distress to animals (legislative):*

Taituarā supports this matter being addressed and considers guidance (option 2) and including an expectation in legislation will be the best way to achieve this. The emergency powers of CDEM Groups and the power to enter premises under the CDEM Act (option 4) to enable mitigation of pain or distress to animals is also supported.

Objective 4: Minimising disruption to essential services

Issue 11: Reducing disruption to the infrastructure that provides essential services

Issue 11.1: Narrow definition of “lifeline utility”

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: NEMA could continue encouraging voluntary participation by essential infrastructure providers that aren’t lifeline utilities.*
2. *Add additional entities to the CDEM Act’s Schedule of lifeline utilities (secondary legislation).*
3. *Replace the lifeline utilities framework with an expanded, principles-based definition of “essential infrastructure” (legislative).*

Taituarā agrees with the issues as described in the discussion document and considers that the best options to address these are to:

- add additional sectors to the CDEM Act’s Schedule of lifeline utilities
- replace the lifeline utilities framework with an expanded, principles-based definition of “essential infrastructure”

Issue 11.3: Barriers to cooperation and information sharing

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: NEMA promotes voluntary cooperation and joint planning between lifeline utilities, CDEM Groups, and other agencies.*
2. *Strengthen assurance and develop standards and guidance (non-legislative).*
3. *Explicitly require CDEM Groups to involve the lifeline utilities in their areas in the development of CDEM Group plans (legislative).*
4. *Require lifeline utilities to contribute to national response plans (legislative).*
5. *Strengthen information sharing protections (legislative).*
6. *Enable data standards to be prescribed through secondary legislation (legislative).*

The discussion about barriers to cooperation and information sharing in recent emergencies is helpful to illustrate and understand the issues that arose during recent emergencies. In terms of the options, Taituarā supports progressing the following:

- Strengthen assurance and develop standards and guidance - non-legislative (option 2)
- Explicitly require CDEM Groups to involve the lifeline utilities in their areas in the development of CDEM Group plans – legislative (option 3)
- Strengthen information sharing protections – legislative (option 5))
- Enable data standards to be prescribed through secondary legislation

Prescribing that lifeline utilities must contribute to national response plans as a legislative option (option 4) needs careful thought given the administrative effort associated with this and, it is assumed, some sort of compliance framework to ensure it happens.

Taituarā supports an explicit requirement on lifeline utilities to engage with CDEM groups in their operational areas in the development of CDEM group plans, rather than the onus being on CDEM groups.

Taituarā also supports non-legislative options to support business continuity.

Objective 5: Having the right powers available when an emergency happens

Issue 13: Managing access to restricted areas

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: Public service agencies have business continuity requirements under the CDEM Act.*
2. *Promote best practice business continuity practices (non-legislative).*
3. *Extend current business continuity requirements through an “opt in” model (legislative).*
4. *Extend current business continuity requirements to a broader group of central government organisations, with a mechanism to exempt specific Crown entities (legislative).*
5. *New requirement to take account of guidance issued by the Director (legislative).*

Taituarā agrees it will be useful to tidy up the access issues and considers that all of the options will work together to achieve this:

- National guidance and training on managing cordons – non-legislative (option 2)
- Prescribe the form of identification passes through regulations – secondary legislation (option 3)
- Clarify that access can be restricted to any class or group of persons – legislative (option 4)

Issue 14: Clarifying who uses emergency powers at the local level

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: The powers in section 85 of the CDEM Act sit with CDEM Groups by default. Equivalent powers in section 94H sit with Recovery Managers.*
2. *Tidy up existing functions and powers related to CDEM Groups, Controllers, and Recovery Managers (legislative).*

Taituarā agrees with the options proposed to modernise the process to enter a state of emergency or transition period;

- Enable authorised persons to use electronic signatures – legislative (option 2)

- Enable authorised persons to declare a state of emergency verbally – legislative (option 3)

Issue 16: Mayors' role in local state of emergency declarations and transition period notices

Options presented:

1. *Status quo: Both the CDEM Group and a mayor can declare a local state of emergency or give notice of a local transition period over a district or wards within the Group area.*
2. *Mayors have primary responsibility for declaring a local state of emergency or giving notice of a transition period for their district or wards (legislative).*
3. *CDEM Groups have primary responsibility for declaring a local state of emergency or giving notice of a local transition period for a single district or wards in the Group area (legislative).*

Taituarā considers that Mayors, as the local leader in their community, should continue to have primary responsibility for declaring a local state of emergency or giving notice of a transition period for their district or wards (option 2). This important role should be supported through training and guidance, and through support from the local CDEM group.



Taituarā — Local Government Professionals Aotearoa

Level 9, 85 The Terrace, Wellington

PO Box 10373, Wellington 6140

T 04 978 1280

W taituara.org.nz

E info@taituara.org.nz