



If calling, please ask for Democratic Services

Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee

Friday 1 May 2026, 10.00am

Taumata Kōrero – Council Chamber, Greater Wellington Regional Council
100 Cuba St, Te Aro, Wellington

Quorum: Two Members

Members

Mayor Anita Baker (Chair)

Porirua City Council

Mayor Steve Cretney

Carterton District Council

Mayor Andrew Little

Wellington City Council

Mayor Peri Zee

Upper Hutt City Council

**Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted
by Council**

Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee Terms of Reference

Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee

(A subcommittee of the Wellington Civil Defence Emergency Management Group)

1 Purpose

To hear and consider submissions made on the draft Group Plan and recommend to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group any amendments.

2 Powers

The Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee has the power to:

- Consider both the written and oral submissions, presentations received in support of submissions, and any other consultation material on the draft Group Plan
- Seek clarification from officers on any technical matters
- Develop recommendations on amendments to the draft Group Plan for consideration by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.

3 Responsibilities

The Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee shall ensure that:

- The hearing and consideration process is carried out in a way that is effective and timely
- Submitters are provided with the best possible opportunity to be heard in support of their submission
- Hearing Subcommittee members receive submissions with an open mind and give due consideration to each submission
- The decision-making process is robust and transparent.

4 Members

The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group shall appoint four members to the Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee, and appoint one of the four members as Chair.

6 Alternate members

There are no alternate members.

7 Quorum

Two Subcommittee members.

8 Meeting procedures

- All members have equal speaking rights and a deliberative vote.

- The Chair has a deliberative vote and, in the case of an equality of votes, does not have a casting vote (and therefore the act or question is defeated, and the status quo is preserved).
- Members must be present for the substantial part of the hearing and deliberations in order to participate in the decision-making of the Hearing Subcommittee.
- Submitters may speak to their submission by remote participation.
- Members may not participate remotely.

9 Remuneration and expenses

Each member's remuneration and expenses are met by the council or body they represent.

10 Duration of Subcommittee

The Subcommittee is deemed to be dissolved at the end of the decision-making process on the Group Plan.

Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee

Friday 1 May 2026, 10.00am

Taumata Kōrero - Council Chamber, Greater Wellington Regional Council
100 Cuba Street, Te Aro, Wellington

Public Business

No.	Item	Report	Page
1.	Apologies		
2.	Declarations of conflicts of interest		
3.	Process for the hearing and deliberations for the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan	26.168	5
4.	Analysis of Submissions on the Draft Wellington Region Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan 2026-31	26.180	10

Civil Defence Emergency Management Group
1 May 2026
Report 26.168



For Decision

PROCESS FOR THE HEARING AND DELIBERATIONS ON THE CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP PLAN

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose

1. To advise the Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee (the Subcommittee) of the process for considering submissions and feedback on the CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031.

He tūtohu

Recommendation

That the Subcommittee:

- 1 **Agrees** to the hearing process as set out in this report.
- 2 **Accepts** the late submissions received on the CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031.

Te tāhū kōrero

Background

2. The CDEM Group established the Subcommittee to hear and deliberate on submissions and feedback made on the review of the CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031 (Establishment of the Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee - Report 26.74). The Terms of Reference for the Subcommittee are included in the order paper for this meeting.
3. The CDEM Group approved the draft 2026-2031 CDEM Group Plan document for consultation at its meeting on 3 March 2026.

Public consultation

4. This hearing completes the public consultation on the CDEM Group Plan. The consultation period was open from 10 March to 10 April 2026.

Principles of consultation

5. There are six principles set out the Local Government Act 2002. One of these principles is that views presented to a local authority should be accepted with an open mind and should be given due consideration by the local authority in making a decision.

6. The Subcommittee should also take into account that persons who wish to have their views on the matter for decision considered by the local authority should be provided with a reasonable opportunity to present those views to the local authority.
7. It is consistent with best practice that members should be present for the substantive duration of the hearing in order to participate in the decision-making of the Subcommittee.
8. The Regional Council's Standing Orders apply to the hearing; they do not provide for members to participate remotely when a meeting is convened to hear, consider, and deliberate on submissions received as part of a consultation process.
9. Members should be aware of any conflicts of interests that may arise. Any conflicts will need to be declared.

Te tātaritanga Analysis

Submissions and feedback received

10. Feedback from the community was obtained through Microsoft Forms, together with written submissions received via direct mail and at events across the Region. Analysis of the feedback is detailed in Analysis of Submissions to the draft CDEM Group Plan - Report 26.180.
11. The written submissions have been distributed to members of the Subcommittee separately. It is suggested that written submissions are taken as read by the Subcommittee and that members only discuss those submissions on which they want to make a particular comment.
12. Wellington Regional Emergency Management Group (WREMO) received 10 submissions from 10 unique submitters. Seven were received through Microsoft Forms and three were received via email.
13. One late submission was received. It is proposed that the Subcommittee accepts this submission for consideration.

Oral presentation process

14. The purpose of the hearing is to hear oral presentations in support of written submissions. The hearing is scheduled for Friday 24 April 2026. Deliberations will commence once the hearing of submitters has concluded. A hearing schedule will be provided to Subcommittee members.
15. Each submitter has been allocated a total time of 10 minutes, which is divided into two equal segments – five minutes for the submitter to speak and five minutes for the Subcommittee to ask the submitter questions. There is no difference in the allocation of time for individuals and those speaking on behalf of groups or organisations.

Consideration of issues raised in submissions and feedback

16. The Subcommittee must consider all written submissions regardless of whether the submitter spoke to it. The Subcommittee must also consider all feedback that was received on the consultation document.

**Ngā hua ahumoni
Financial implications**

17. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

**Ngā Take e hāngai ana te iwi Māori
Implications for Māori**

18. There are no direct implications for Māori arising from this report; however, staff engaged with mana whenua across the region during the consultation process.

**Ngā tikanga whakatau
Decision-making process**

19. Officers considered the matters requiring decision in accordance with the decision-making requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.

**Te hiranga
Significance**

20. Officers considered the significance (as defined by Part 5 of the Local Government Act 2002) of these matters, taking into account the Regional Council's *Significance and Engagement Policy* and Greater Wellington's *Decision-making Guidelines*. Officers recommend that these matters are of low significance due to their administrative nature.

**Te whakatūtakitaki
Engagement**

21. Due to the low significance of the decision sought from this report, community engagement for the preparation of this report was not considered necessary.

**Ngā tūāoma e whai ake nei
Next steps**

22. The Subcommittee Chair will prepare a report to the CDEM Group meeting scheduled for 15 May 2026 for the Group to consider the Subcommittee's recommendations on any changes to the CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031.
23. The CDEM Group will then consider the final updated CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031.
24. The updated CDEM Group Plan will then be provided to the Minister for Emergency Management and Recovery, who has 20 working days to comment.

25. The plan, with any comments from the Minister, will then return to the CDEM Group on 23 June 2026 for final approval.
26. The adopted plan will be published on WREMO's website.

Ngā kaiwaitohu

Signatories

Writer	Oliver Greig – Kaitohutohu Ratonga Manapori Democratic Services Advisor
Approvers	Priscila Firmo – Kaiwhakahaere Matua Ratonga Manapori Manager, Democratic Services Francis Ryan – Kaiwhakahaere Mana Urangi, Manapori Head of Governance and Democracy Luke Troy – Kaiwhakahaere Matua Rautaki Group Manager Strategy

He whakarāpopoto i ngā huritaonga Summary of considerations
<i>Fit with Council's roles or with Committee's terms of reference</i> The Civil Defence Emergency Management Group established the Subcommittee to consider submissions and feedback made on the draft CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031. This report supports that process.
<i>Contribution to Annual Plan / Long Term Plan / Other key strategies and policies</i> This report provides the process for the hearing and consideration of submissions and feedback made on the draft CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031.
<i>Internal consultation</i> Staff from WREMO were consulted.
<i>Risks and impacts - legal / health and safety etc.</i> There are no known risk or impacts arising from this report.

**Civil Defence Emergency Management
Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee
1 May 2026
Report 26.180**



For Decision

**ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT WELLINGTON REGION
CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP PLAN 2026-2031**

**Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose**

1. To provide the Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee (the Subcommittee) with an overview of the written submissions received on the draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031, together with initial officer advice on key topics raised in the submissions.

**He tūtohu
Recommendations**

That the Subcommittee:

- 1 **Considers** the submissions on the draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031 (Attachment 1), together with the submission analysis and officer comments ([Attachment 2](#)) in determining its findings and recommendations to the Wellington Region CDEM Group Joint Committee.
- 2 **Recommends** to the Wellington Region CDEM Group Joint Committee, following consideration of the submissions on the draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031 and officer advice, any changes to the draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031 as agreed by this Subcommittee.

Te tāhū kōrero

Background

2. Under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, every region must have an approved Group Plan. The Plan is the mechanism that ensures the Wellington Region's councils, emergency services, iwi/Māori, lifeline utilities, welfare agencies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and communities are working from the same shared framework.
3. It is one of the most important pieces of governance responsibility this Committee holds.
4. In practice, the Group Plan answers four fundamental questions:
 - a What emergencies and risks are we planning for?

- b What outcomes are we trying to achieve for our communities?
 - c What roles and responsibilities do partners have across the system?
 - d What work will we collectively prioritise over the next five years?
5. It is both:
- a a governance document (setting direction and accountability), and
 - b an operational foundation (supporting coordinated readiness, response, and recovery).
6. The Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026–2031 has been developed through a deliberate, staged process designed to ensure it is evidence-based, partner-owned, and aligned with both statutory requirements and the region’s long-term strategic direction.
7. The development process reflects the scale of change required across the emergency management system and the importance of building shared accountability across councils, iwi/Māori, emergency services, lifeline utilities, welfare agencies, NGOs, central government partners, and communities.
8. On 3 March 2026, the Committee approved the draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031 for consultation (Report 26.83). A subcommittee was appointed to hear submissions on the Group Plan - Establishment of the Group Plan Hearing subcommittee (Report 26.74).
9. The public consultation period ran from 10 March - 10 April 2026. The consultation was promoted to the public through a predominantly online campaign supported by direct promotion to identified stakeholder groups.

Scope of the Committee’s Powers

10. The Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee has the power to:
- a Consider both the written and oral submissions, presentations received in support of submissions, and any other consultation material on the draft Group Plan
 - b Seek clarification from officers on any technical matters
 - c Develop recommendations on amendments to the draft Group Plan for consideration by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Group.
11. The Group Plan Hearing Subcommittee shall ensure that:
- a The hearing and consideration process is carried out in a way that is effective and timely
 - b Submitters are provided with the best possible opportunity to be heard in support of their submission
 - c Hearing Subcommittee members receive submissions with an open mind and give due consideration to each submission
 - d The decision-making process is robust and transparent.

Te tātaritanga

Analysis

Submissions received

12. A total of 10 submissions were received, including two email submissions. These were submitted either by individuals or on behalf of a group or organisation. Of these, three indicated they would like to be heard in support of their submission.
13. Fifty-six per cent of submissions were made by individuals, and the remainder on behalf of groups or organisations. Of submitters who chose to identify in the region they live, 42 per cent live in Wellington City, 29 percent live in Upper Hutt and another 29 percent in South Wairarapa. A full copy of all submissions has been provided to members of the subcommittee and will be available for viewing at the hearings.

Submission analysis

14. Submissions covered a wide range of issues, including the integration of community in the formal response and recovery systems, engagement with Māori, and other broader feedback on both strategic and operational issues relating to emergency management.
15. Initial officer advice in response to key feedback themes is provided in [Attachment 2](#), to assist the Subcommittee with its deliberations.
16. Overall, consultation feedback indicates that the draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026–2031 is generally well supported as a strategic document. Submitters broadly endorsed the shift to a consequence-based, system-wide approach, and several comments recognised the Plan as a constructive and useful step forward for the region.
17. A consistent feature of the feedback was that some submitters sought greater detail about how particular priorities would be delivered in practice. This is best understood as a request for clearer line of sight between the strategic direction in the Group Plan and the more detailed implementation, operational, or programme planning that would sit beneath it. It does not suggest that the Plan's purpose should change from a governance and strategic document to an operational plan. Rather, it indicates that the Plan is prompting the right questions about delivery, accountability, and follow-through.
18. A high-level summary of the feedback and broad themes is set out below. These are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide a summary of common themes raised by submitters.
19. **Support for the strategic direction of the Plan** - There was broad support for the overall direction of the draft Plan, particularly the move away from a hazard-by-hazard approach toward one focused on recurring regional consequences, interdependencies, and system performance. Submitters generally considered this a sensible and credible framing for the Wellington Region.
20. **Desire for assurance on implementation, accountability, and resourcing** - A number of submitters sought greater confidence about how the Plan's priorities will

be implemented, funded, sequenced, and monitored. This included requests for clearer accountability, greater visibility of progress, and acknowledgement of current capacity and funding constraints. For governance purposes, this theme points to the importance of strong implementation oversight and supporting work programmes, rather than a need for the Group Plan itself to carry operational detail.

21. **Support for community resilience, with interest in how it will be enabled** - Submitters were generally positive about the Plan's emphasis on community resilience, neighbourhood capability, and community-led action. Some sought more practical detail on how communities would be supported through training, resources, partnerships, and ongoing engagement. This feedback reinforces the importance of community resilience as a strategic priority, while the specific delivery mechanisms would appropriately sit within implementation plans, programmes of work, and supporting guidance.
22. **Greater recognition of high-density urban communities** - Several submissions suggested that the final Plan should more clearly recognise the distinct resilience challenges associated with apartment living and other high-density urban environments. Issues raised included building-level preparedness, evacuation constraints, reliance on lifts and electricity, limited storage capacity, sanitation, and the role of body corporates or building owners. This theme suggests value in strengthening the strategic recognition of high-density communities within the final Plan, without requiring building-specific operating detail in the document itself.
23. **Equity and disproportionate impacts** - Equity was a recurring theme across the submissions. Several submitters wanted the Plan to more clearly acknowledge the different ways emergencies can affect disabled people, neurodivergent people, households with complex needs, and communities with fewer resources to prepare or recover. This feedback aligns with the Plan's strategic intent to address disproportionate impacts. Many of the more specific suggestions made by submitters would be more appropriately addressed through welfare planning, operational arrangements, and detailed guidance beneath the Plan.
24. **Lifelines and essential services** - A number of submissions emphasised the importance of lifelines and continuity of essential services, including water, medications, pharmacies, hospitals, and sanitation. These comments suggest that submitters want stronger visibility of these issues in the Plan's strategic framing, particularly where they affect vulnerable or high-density communities. The feedback does not necessarily require service-level operational detail in the Group Plan, but it does indicate the importance of these issues being clearly signalled in the region's strategic priorities.
25. **Emergency service role clarity, particularly for ambulance services** - A sector submission from Wellington Free Ambulance sought clearer and more consistent recognition of ambulance services within the regional emergency management system. This included clearer articulation of ambulance's pre-hospital and incident-scene role, realistic assumptions about representation and coordination, and stronger recognition of ambulance dependency on fuel, transport, logistics, and shared situational awareness systems. For governance, this suggests the final Plan may benefit from clearer role description and alignment across sections,

while leaving detailed operating arrangements to supporting plans and inter-agency procedures.

26. **Digital dependency as a strategic consideration** - One submission raised in detail the extent to which coordination, monitoring, situational awareness, lifeline management, and community resilience depend on digital systems and platforms. While much of the technical detail proposed sits below Group Plan level, the submission does raise a broader strategic question about whether the Plan should more clearly acknowledge digital dependency and the role of digital infrastructure in regional resilience.
27. **Emerging and localised risks** - A small number of submitters sought broader recognition of risks associated with newer technologies and localised industrial hazards, including battery energy storage systems, solar infrastructure, hazardous substances, and rural-industrial fire scenarios. This feedback does not appear to challenge the consequence-based approach itself but rather suggests that the Plan should remain sufficiently broad to encompass emerging risk sources and place-based issues.
28. **Monitoring, evaluation, and transparency** - Submitters generally supported the inclusion of indicators and monitoring arrangements, but some wanted greater assurance that these would demonstrate meaningful progress and real capability improvement rather than activity alone. This is a useful governance signal. It reinforces the importance of a monitoring framework that can provide confidence in implementation and outcomes, while recognising that the detailed systems and methods for measurement will sit beneath the Group Plan.
29. **Readability and accessibility of the document** - A small number of submissions commented on the Plan's readability, including the density of some tables and the desirability of a shorter summary or clearer navigation for public audiences. This suggests there may be value in improving presentation and accessibility in the final version, while maintaining the document's strategic purpose.

Overall conclusion

30. In summary, consultation feedback indicates that the draft Group Plan is **largely supported in its strategic intent and direction**. Where submitters sought greater detail, this generally reflected a desire for assurance about implementation and operational follow-through, rather than a view that the Group Plan itself should become an operational document.
31. For governance, the main implication is to ensure that the final Plan retains a clear strategic focus while providing sufficient confidence that key issues raised through consultation — including equity, high-density communities, lifelines, implementation oversight, and monitoring — will be carried through into supporting work programmes, operational planning, and future guidance.

Ngā hua ahumoni

Financial implications

32. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Ngā Take e hāngai ana te iwi Māori **Implications for Māori**

33. The proposed Group Plan seeks to prioritise relationships and partnership with Māori, and this has been supported in the feedback.

Ngā tikanga whakatau **Decision-making process**

34. The matters requiring decision in this report were considered by officers against the decision-making requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Te hiranga **Significance**

35. Officers considered the significance (as defined by Part 6 of the LGA) of this matter, taking into account Greater Wellington Regional Council's *Significance and Engagement Policy* and Greater Wellington's *Decision-making Guidelines*. The consideration of submissions is part of a decision-making process that will lead to making a decision of medium significance, as the decisions will shape the direction of emergency management activities across our region over the next five years.

Te whakatūtakitaki **Engagement**

36. Wellington Region Emergency Management Office (with support from councils and partner agencies) led a successful digital-forward campaign. This was supported by direct promotion with stakeholder groups.
37. Promotion centred on engagement with the WREMO.nz Group Plan consultation page which directed the public to the consultation documents and the survey itself.
38. The campaign utilised a range of different mediums and channels including radio ads, social media and online ads. These channels were chosen to engage with a broad cross section of people from across the whole of the Wellington Region.
39. Two key areas could be improved for next time - representation across different ethnicities and accessibility. Most submissions came from individuals identifying as New Zealand European which is typical of our consultations. This is an area we are looking to improve.

Ngā tūāoma e whai ake nei **Next steps**

40. Feedback from this consultation will be built into a database for consideration while developing the project scopes to implement the Group Plan.
41. The Hearings Subcommittee will report on the submissions and recommended changes to the draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 226-2031 to the Committee meeting on 15 May 2026. The draft Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan

2026-2031 will then be submitted to the Minister for Emergency Management and Recovery for his formal review.

42. The final Wellington Region CDEM Group Plan 2026-2031 will be submitted to the Wellington Region CDEM Group Joint Committee for final approval on 23 June 2026.

Ngā āpitihanga

Attachments

Number	Title
1	Submissions (circulated separately)
2	Deliberations Table with initial officer advice

Ngā kaiwaitohu

Signatories

Writer	Jess Hare – Manager Business and Development, WREMO
Approvers	Dan Neely – Regional Manager, WREMO.

He whakarāpopoto i ngā huritaonga Summary of considerations
<i>Fit with Council's roles or with Committee's terms of reference</i> The Hearing Subcommittee was established by the CDEM Group to hear and deliberate on submissions made on the draft Group Plan. The preparation, approval, implementation and review of the Group Plan is a specific delegated authority of the CDEM Group.
<i>Contribution to Annual Plan / Long Term Plan / Other key strategies and policies</i> The proposed Group Plan implements: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Wellington Region CDEM Strategy 2025–20352. National resilience priorities under the NDRS3. Legislative requirements under the CDEM Act
<i>Internal consultation</i> The draft Plan has been developed through extensive cross-sector engagement, governance direction and public consultation. No additional internal consultation is required for the purpose of releasing it for ministerial review.
<i>Risks and impacts - legal / health and safety etc.</i> There are no identified risks relating to the content or recommendations of this Report.

May 2026

For Deliberations – Matters Raised Requiring Decision

1. Matters raised by consultation submissions

A range of matters were raised during the Gorup Plan public consultation process that require a non-financial response.

Matters raised for deliberation	Officer advice	Subcommittee recommendation
<p>Whether the Group Plan should include more detail on how priorities will be implemented, funded, sequenced, and monitored.</p> <p>A number of submitters sought more practical detail on delivery, including accountability, timeframes, funding, and how outcomes will be translated into action.</p>	<p>Do not expand the Group Plan into an operational or programme delivery document.</p> <p>The feedback is best understood as a request for assurance about follow-through rather than a need to change the Plan’s purpose.</p> <p>Consider strengthening wording that clarifies implementation will occur through supporting work programmes, operational planning, and governance oversight.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should more clearly state how governance will monitor delivery and report progress.</p> <p>Submitters asked how communities will be updated on progress and whether current monitoring arrangements are sufficient to provide confidence in implementation.</p>	<p>Minor change supported.</p> <p>Consider strengthening the monitoring, evaluation, or governance sections to make clearer that delivery will be monitored and reported through established governance arrangements, with public reporting as appropriate. No need to add detailed reporting mechanisms into the Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether current priorities and timeframes are realistic given sector capacity and resourcing constraints.</p> <p>Several submitters questioned whether agencies have sufficient funding, workforce, and organisational capacity to deliver the priorities set out in the draft Plan.</p>	<p>Acknowledge this issue, but do not rewrite the Plan around funding detail.</p> <p>Consider a small amendment acknowledging that implementation will need to be prioritised over time through existing governance and planning processes. Detailed resourcing decisions should sit beneath the Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should more clearly recognise high-density urban communities, including apartment buildings and other multi-dwelling settings, as a distinct resilience context.</p> <p>Submitters raised evacuation constraints, reliance on lifts and electricity, sanitation, limited storage, body corporate issues, and the role of apartment communities in early response.</p>	<p>Change supported at a strategic level.</p> <p>Add brief acknowledgement that high-density urban communities, including multi-storey residential buildings, present distinct preparedness and early response challenges. Do not include detailed building-level requirements, technical standards, or body corporate obligations in the Group Plan.</p>	

<p>Whether the Plan should include stronger recognition of disproportionate impacts on disabled people, neurodivergent people, households with complex needs, and communities with fewer resources to prepare or recover.</p> <p>Submitters sought more explicit recognition of inequity and inclusive planning.</p>	<p>Strategic strengthening supported.</p> <p>Consider reinforcing language on disproportionate impacts, inclusive planning, and equity outcomes. Specific operational suggestions such as sensory-friendly welfare spaces, service design, or accessibility measures should be addressed in supporting welfare and operational planning rather than in the Group Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should do more to describe how communities will be supported to build resilience in practice.</p> <p>Submitters asked for more visibility of training, resources, funding, and ongoing support for community-led preparedness and resilience.</p>	<p>No major structural change recommended.</p> <p>Retain the strategic emphasis on community resilience. Consider a small refinement signalling that community resilience priorities will be supported through programmes, partnerships, and engagement over time, rather than setting out delivery detail in the Plan itself.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should strengthen its treatment of lifelines and continuity of essential services.</p> <p>Feedback highlighted water, sanitation, medication access, hospitals, fuel, supply chains, and continuity of essential services for vulnerable and high-density communities.</p>	<p>Limited strengthening supported.</p> <p>Consider whether the Plan should more clearly signal continuity of essential services within the consequence and lifelines discussion. Avoid adding service-by-service operating detail that would be more appropriately addressed in sector planning and contingency arrangements.</p>	
<p>Whether pharmacies and medication access should be explicitly recognised as a lifeline or equivalent essential service issue.</p> <p>A submitter raised medication access as a significant community resilience concern.</p>	<p>Do not redefine statutory lifelines in the Group Plan.</p> <p>The concern is valid, but the Plan should remain aligned with national and statutory frameworks. A broader reference to essential service continuity and support for vulnerable populations may be appropriate. Detailed treatment should sit with health, welfare, and contingency planning.</p>	
<p>Whether hospitals should be more visible in the Plan.</p> <p>Feedback suggested hospitals are not clearly enough referenced in relation to emergency preparedness and continuity.</p>	<p>Minor drafting review supported.</p> <p>Consider whether current health sector references sufficiently capture hospital significance. A small clarification may be helpful, but detailed hospital preparedness arrangements should not be added to the Group Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether ambulance services should be more clearly and consistently recognised in the Plan as an emergency service, rather than being inconsistently treated under the broader ‘health’ umbrella.</p> <p>Wellington Free Ambulance (WFA) identified inconsistency between definitions, glossary content, and operational role descriptions.</p>	<p>Targeted change supported.</p> <p>Review terminology, definitions, and role descriptions to ensure ambulance services are described consistently and their distinct pre-hospital and incident-scene role is recognised appropriately. This is a role-clarity issue suitable for the Plan.</p>	

<p>Whether the Plan’s assumptions about ambulance representation in ESCCs and coordination arrangements are realistic.</p> <p>WFA advised that it is not feasible to provide liaison officers to every ESCC and that regional coordination would instead occur primarily through the ECC.</p>	<p>Minor clarification may be warranted.</p> <p>Review the wording so the Plan does not imply a level of representation that may not be realistic in practice. Detailed coordination arrangements should remain in inter-agency procedures and operational doctrine.</p>	
<p>Whether ambulance dependency on fuel, transport networks, medical supplies, and shared situational awareness systems should be more visible in the Plan.</p> <p>WFA highlighted these as critical dependencies.</p>	<p>No major Plan change recommended.</p> <p>These points reinforce the broader lifelines and interoperability issues already captured. Consider reflecting them through stronger strategic references to critical dependencies, rather than adding ambulance-specific operational provisions.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should more clearly acknowledge digital dependency and the role of digital infrastructure in coordination, monitoring, situational awareness, lifeline management, and community resilience.</p> <p>One submission argued this is a foundational resilience issue.</p>	<p>Limited strategic acknowledgement may be appropriate.</p> <p>The detailed technical architecture proposed is below Group Plan level, but the broader point about digital dependency is strategically relevant. Consider light drafting changes to recognise the role of digital systems and shared information environments.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should include broader recognition of emerging or localised risks, such as battery energy storage systems, solar infrastructure, hazardous substance events, and rural-industrial fire consequences.</p>	<p>No structural change recommended.</p> <p>The consequence-based approach is intended to accommodate emerging sources of harm without continually expanding hazard-specific content. These issues may inform future risk analysis and supporting planning beneath the Group Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether hazardous substance fire and toxic smoke scenarios should be more explicitly reflected in the Plan.</p> <p>Specific examples were given in Wairarapa contexts.</p>	<p>No specific amendment recommended unless governance wishes to refine examples.</p> <p>These are valid scenario considerations, but are more appropriately addressed in consequence analysis, local risk work, and supporting operational planning.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should provide a stronger expression of Te Ao Māori, mana whenua relationships, Te Tiriti considerations, and how iwi or mana whenua were engaged in development of the Plan.</p>	<p>Strategic strengthening supported.</p> <p>This is suitable content for the Group Plan. Consider enhancing wording and adding section on Te Tiriti ensuring content continues to be strategic rather than procedural.</p>	
<p>Whether terminology, governance roles, statutory arrangements, and legal descriptions should be corrected or clarified.</p>	<p>Targeted drafting changes supported.</p> <p>These matters improve clarity, consistency, and legal accuracy and should be addressed where accepted. They do not alter the strategic nature of the document.</p>	

<p>Whether the recovery section should be strengthened to better explain recovery, operational transition, formal statutory transition, and the region's strategic recovery approach.</p>	<p>Selective strengthening supported.</p> <p>Clarifying recovery concepts and strengthening the introductory framing would improve the Plan. Detailed recovery operating procedures should remain outside the Group Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should place greater emphasis on practical exercising and interoperability across agencies.</p> <p>WFA noted exercises have tended to be theoretical rather than operational, and other feedback sought more confidence in practical capability.</p>	<p>Minor strengthening may be useful.</p> <p>Consider reinforcing the importance of exercising, interoperability, and learning at a strategic level. Do not prescribe exercise schedules or operational exercise design in the Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether volunteers and community participation should be more explicitly recognised.</p> <p>Feedback included calls for stronger volunteer management and more welcoming, progressive training approaches.</p>	<p>Minor strengthening may be appropriate.</p> <p>Consider clearer strategic recognition of volunteers and community participation as part of the resilience system. Detailed volunteer arrangements should sit in operational guidance.</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should say more about community safety, law and order, and policing needs during prolonged emergencies.</p> <p>One submitter raised crime, intimidation, and public safety risks based on prior disaster experience.</p>	<p>No substantive change recommended.</p> <p>This is a legitimate operational consideration, but it is better addressed through Police arrangements and inter-agency response planning than by expanding the Group Plan.</p>	
<p>Whether the monitoring and evaluation framework is sufficient to demonstrate real progress and capability improvement.</p> <p>Submitters questioned whether indicators measure outcomes rather than just activity, and whether systems exist to support measurement.</p>	<p>Minor refinement supported.</p> <p>Consider strengthening narrative around the purpose of monitoring and evaluation, including implementation oversight, outcomes, and continuous improvement. A wholesale redesign of indicators is not recommended through this process unless governance wishes to do that separately as the indicators had previously been approved (by governance).</p>	
<p>Whether the Plan should be made easier to navigate and read, including through a shorter summary or clearer presentation of tables.</p> <p>Some submitters found the document dense or overly wordy.</p>	<p>Presentation improvements supported and in progress.</p> <p>The document supplied was in Word format. The final version will be designed for clarity and to make the document much easier to navigate - with a particular focus on the tables. This will improve accessibility without changing the Plan's intent.</p>	

2. Additional points raised during oral hearings for discussion/deliberation.

Sub #	Matter Raised	Officer advice	Subcommittee recommendation