



MINUTES

Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting

Monday, 22 June 2026

Order Of Business

1	Karakia Timatanga	4
2	Apologies	4
3	Confirmation of Agenda	4
4	Disclosures of Interest	4
5	Minutes for Confirmation or Receipt	5
	Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting – 30 March 2026.....	5
6	General Items	5
6.1	Coordinating Executive Group - 5 June 2026 Meeting Summary	5
7	Public Excluded Items	5
7.1	Appointment of Tier 1 Group Controllers	6
7.2	Statutory Appointments.....	7
7.3	Long Term Plan 2027-2037 - Investment Proposals - Targeted Rates Increase	8
6	General Items	9
6.2	Response and Recovery Costs - January, February & April 2026 - Group Controller/Recovery Manager Recommendation.....	9
6.3	Amendment to the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controllers Policy.....	10
6.4	Group Plan Actions – Report for the Period 1 October 2025 to 30 April 2026.....	10
6.5	Group Plan Actions - Year 2 Review	11
6.6	Government Reforms.....	11
6.7	Group Finances 1 July to 31 March 2026	11
6.8	National Emergency Management Agency Quarterly Update	12
8	Karakia Whakamutunga	12
	Appendices	13
7.1	Appointment of Tier 1 Group Controller.....	13
7.2	Statutory Appointments.....	17
7.3	Long Term Plan 2027-2037 - Investment Proposals - Targeted Rates Increase	22

Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting

OPEN MINUTES

Date: Monday 22 June 2026, 10.00am
Location: Council Chambers
Waikato Regional Council
Level 1, 160 Ward Street, Hamilton

Members Present: Cr Emma Pike – *Committee Chair* – Hamilton City Council
Deputy-Mayor John Grant – *Committee Deputy-Chair* – Thames-Coromandel District Council
Cr Marcus Gower– Waipā District Council
Cr Steve Manunui – Taupō District Council (virtually via Teams)
Cr Andrew McGiven – Matamata Piako District Council (from 10.09am until 12.40pm, back at 12.45pm)
Cr Gary McGuire – Waikato Regional Council
Deputy-Mayor Eugene Patterson – Waikato District Council
Cr Michael Thomas – South Waikato District Council

Staff Present: Brent Sinclair – Director, Resource Use, Waikato Regional Council
Julian Snowball – Group Manager/Controller, Civil Defence and Emergency Management
Shona Morgan – Senior Regional Emergency Management Advisor, National Emergency Management Agency
Brooke Roebeck – Democracy Advisor

The contents of these minutes meet all legal requirements and include a full set of decisions.

An audio-visual recording of the open session of the meeting is available on Waikato Regional Council's public website.

Recording	Document ID #	YouTube Link
Open Recording 1	36904783	https://youtu.be/SMP2cCkiog8
Public Excluded Recording 1	36926204	–
Public Excluded Recording 2	36926208	–
Open Recording 2	36923988	https://youtu.be/m74M0qt6yZg

1 KARAKIA TIMATANGA

Item commenced in open recording 1, at start.

The Chair (Cr Emma Pike) opened the meeting with a karakia.

2 APOLOGIES

ITEM COMMENCED IN OPEN RECORDING 1, AT 29 SECONDS.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/15

MOVED: CR EMMA PIKE

SECONDED: CR GARY MCGUIRE

THAT THE APOLOGIES OF CR ANNE MARIE SPICER, MAYOR AKSEL BECH, MAYOR TOBY ADAMS AND

CR TENNILLE KETE FOR ABSENCE BE ACCEPTED

CARRIED

3 CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

Item commenced in open recording 1, at 2 minutes 13 seconds.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/16

Moved: Cr Emma Pike

Seconded: Deputy-Mayor John Grant

1. That the agenda of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting of 22 June 2026, as circulated, be confirmed as the business of the meeting.

2. That the order of items follows the order set out in the minutes.

CARRIED

4 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Item commenced in open recording 1, at 2 minutes 42 seconds.

Cr Emma Pike and Cr Marcus Gower declared non-conflicting interests in *Item 7.1 – Appointment of Tier 1 Group Controller*, advising that they had working relationships with one of the appointees and that this did not impact their decision-making.

5 MINUTES FOR CONFIRMATION OR RECEIPT

WAIKATO CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING – 30 MARCH 2026

Item commenced in open recording 1, at 3 minutes 53 seconds.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/17

Moved: Cr Michael Thomas

Seconded: Deputy-Mayor John Grant

That the minutes of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting held on 30 March 2026 be confirmed as a correct record.

CARRIED

6 GENERAL ITEMS

6.1 COORDINATING EXECUTIVE GROUP - 5 JUNE 2026 MEETING SUMMARY

Item commenced in open recording 1, at 4 minutes 29 seconds.

Presented by the Director, Resource Use (Brent Sinclair) on behalf of the Chair, Coordinating Executive Group (Susan Law) who requested the report be taken as read.

10.09am – Cr Andrew McGiven entered the meeting.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/18

Moved: Cr Marcus Gower

Seconded: Deputy-Mayor Eugene Patterson

That the report *Coordinating Executive Group - 5 June 2026 Meeting Summary* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.

CARRIED

The Chair (Cr Emma Pike) acknowledged, on behalf of the Joint Committee, Wayne Allan's long-standing service and his significant contribution to Civil Defence over more than 20 years, including his role as Deputy Coordinating Executive Group Chair.

7 PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEMS

Item commenced in open recording 1, at 19 minutes 10 seconds.

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/19

Moved: Cr Emma Pike

Seconded: Cr Andrew McGiven

That in accordance with section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (Act) and the interests protected by section 6 or 7 of that Act, the public is excluded from the following parts of this meeting. The general subject of the matters to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds for excluding the public are set out below:

Meeting item no. and subject	Grounds for excluding the public	Reason for excluding the public
7.1 - Appointment of Tier 1 Group Controllers	s7(2)(a) of the Act - To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	section 48(1)(a)(i) of the Act - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
7.2 - Statutory Appointments	s7(2)(a) of the Act - To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	section 48(1)(a)(i) of the Act - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
7.3 - Long Term Plan 2027-2037 - Investment Proposals - Targeted Rates Increase	s7(2)(h) of the Act - To enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities	section 48(1)(a)(i) of the Act - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7

CARRIED

10.20am – The meeting moved into public excluded session.

7.1 APPOINTMENT OF TIER 1 GROUP CONTROLLERS

Item commenced in public excluded recording 1, at 22 seconds.

Presented by the Team Leader, Operational Readiness (Aaron Tregoweth).

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/20

Moved: Deputy-Mayor Eugene Patterson

Seconded: Cr Emma Pike

- 1. That the report *Appointment of Tier 1 Group Controllers (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026)* be received.**
- 2. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2025, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following as Tier 1 Group Controllers:**
 - a. Kelvin Powell, Hamilton City Council; and**
 - b. David Simes, Waipa District Council; and**
 - c. Andrew BuBear, Matamata-Piako District Council.**
- 3. That the report and decision are made public, while the attachments remain public excluded.**

CARRIED

7.2 STATUTORY APPOINTMENTS

Item commenced in public excluded recording 1, at 5 minutes 24 seconds.

Presented by the Team Leader, Operational Readiness (Aaron Tregoweth).

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/21

Moved: Cr Andrew McGiven

Seconded: Cr Marcus Gower

- 1. That the report *Statutory Appointments (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026)* be received.**
- 2. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2022, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following people as Tier 3 Local Controllers for the stated local appointment areas:**
 - (a) Ryan Johnston, Matamata-Piako District Council, for the Waikato East Sub-Region CDEM Services Agreement Area, comprising Matamata-Piako, Hauraki and South Waikato District Councils (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Public Excluded Agenda, 22 June 2026 at page 24); and**
 - (b) Mark Bang, Waitomo District Council, for the Western Waikato Shared Service area, comprising Waitomo, Ōtorohanga and Waipā District Councils (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Public Excluded Agenda, 22 June 2026 at page 25).**
- 3. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Recovery Manager Policy dated 11 November 2022, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following person as a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager:**

- (a) **Mark Bang, Waitomo District Council, for the Waitomo District Council area (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Public Excluded Agenda, 22 June 2026 at page 25).**

4. **That the report and decision are made public, while the attachments remain public excluded.**

CARRIED

7.3 LONG TERM PLAN 2027-2037 - INVESTMENT PROPOSALS - TARGETED RATES INCREASE

Item commenced in public excluded recording 1, at 8 minutes 34 seconds.

Presented by the Strategic Planning Advisor (Vicky Cowley), Team Leader, Operational Readiness (Aaron Tregoweth) and Team Leader, Resilience and Recovery (Irving Young). The report was taken as read.

11.25am – The meeting adjourned.

11.45am – The meeting reconvened.

Item continued in public excluding recording 2, at start.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/22

Moved: Cr Emma Pike

Seconded: Cr Marcus Gower

1. **That the report *Long Term Plan 2027-2037 - Investment Proposals - Targeted Rates Increase* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.**
2. **That the Joint Committee endorse operational cost pressures increase of \$147,000 per annum (operational budgets are adjusted annually for Consumer Price Index) for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate.**
3. **That the Joint Committee confirm the Tier 1 (Critical) investment proposals for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including the level of investment for:**
 - (a) **Research Hazards by Risk and Knowledge Gaps,**
 - (b) **Statutory Function.**
4. **That the Joint Committee confirm the Tier 2 (Priority) investment proposals for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including the level of investment for:**
 - (a) **Strategic Planning,**
 - (b) **New Zealand Response Team,**
 - (c) **Community Engagement Advisor,**
 - (d) **Co-location,**
 - (e) **Operational Response System.**

5. That the Joint Committee provide direction on the inclusion and level of investment for Tier 3 (Enhancement/Future focused) proposals within the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including:
 - (a) Business Support,
 - (b) After Action Review and Coronial Costs,
 - (c) Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Contingency Fund.
6. That Joint Committee confirm the total targeted rate budget increase to be requested from Waikato Regional Council for inclusion in their Long Term Plan 2027-2037, being:
 - (a) \$1,944,995 for Year 1 of the Long Term Plan 2027–2037; and
 - (b) \$2,184,237 as the agreed amount from Year 2 of the Long Term Plan 2027-2037 onward.
7. That the Joint Committee agree to actively monitor and review the Contingency Fund at the three year mark.
8. That the report, decision and attachment are made public, with redaction to the contractual areas.

CARRIED

Item commenced in public excluded recording, at 36 minutes 5 seconds..

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/23

Moved: Cr Emma Pike

Seconded: Cr Marcus Gower

That the meeting return to the open session.

CARRIED

12.22pm – The meeting moved back to open session.

6 GENERAL ITEMS

6.2 RESPONSE AND RECOVERY COSTS - JANUARY, FEBRUARY & APRIL 2026 - GROUP CONTROLLER/RECOVERY MANAGER RECOMMENDATION

Item commenced in open recording 2, at start.

Presented by the Group Manager/ Group Controller (Julian Snowball).

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/24

Moved: Deputy-Mayor Eugene Patterson

Seconded: Deputy-Mayor John Grant

1. That the report *Response and Recovery Costs – January, February & April 2026 – Group Controller/Recovery Manager Recommendation* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.
2. That the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approves the Group Controller and Group Recovery Manager’s recommendation that response and recovery costs associated with the January, February and April 2026 severe weather events are not redistributed across the Group, but instead lie where they fall, with Group Emergency Coordination Centre costs met from existing Group Emergency Management Office regional Civil Defence Emergency Management budgets.

CARRIED

6.3 AMENDMENT TO THE WAIKATO CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT GROUP CONTROLLERS POLICY

Item commenced in open recording 2, at 4 minutes 20 seconds.

Presented by the Team Leader, Operational Readiness (Aaron Tregoweth).

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/25

Moved: Cr Emma Pike

Seconded: Cr Andrew McGiven

1. That the report *Amendment to the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controllers Policy* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.
2. That the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group approves the amendments to the Group Controller Policy (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting Agenda, 22 June 2026, at page 31-41).

CARRIED

6.4 GROUP PLAN ACTIONS – REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 1 OCTOBER 2025 TO 30 APRIL 2026

Item commenced in open recording 2, at 6 minutes 43 seconds.

Presented by the Strategic Planning Advisor (Vicky Cowley) who requested the report be taken as read.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/26

Moved: Deputy-Mayor Eugene Patterson

Seconded: Cr Marcus Gower

That the *Group Plan Actions – Report for the Period 1 October 2025 to 30 April 2026* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.

CARRIED

6.5 GROUP PLAN ACTIONS - YEAR 2 REVIEW

Item commenced in open recording 2, at 15 minutes 35 seconds.

Presented by the Team Leader, Resilience and Recovery (Irving Young).

12.40pm – Cr Andrew McGiven left the meeting.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/27

Moved: Cr Emma Pike

Seconded: Cr Gary McGuire

1. That the report *Group Plan Actions - Year 2 Review (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026)* be received.
2. That the Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee approves the Year 2 amendments, as set out in *Attachment 1*, being the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Draft Group Plan Action (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Meeting Agenda, 22 June 2026, at page 66-105).

CARRIED

6.6 GOVERNMENT REFORMS

Item commenced in open recording 2, at 20 minutes 5 seconds.

Presented by the Strategic Planning Advisor (Vicky Cowley) who requested the report be taken as read.

12.45pm – Cr Andrew McGiven entered the meeting.

Action: A letter outlining the preferred Civil Defence operating model in response to government reforms was to be co-signed by the Coordinating Executive Group Chair (Susan Law) and the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee Chair (Cr Emma Pike), or formally endorsed by the Joint Committee.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/28

Moved: Cr Andrew McGiven

Seconded: Deputy-Mayor John Grant

That the report *Government Reforms (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026)* be received.

CARRIED

6.7 GROUP FINANCES 1 JULY TO 31 MARCH 2026

Item commenced in open recording 2, at 31 minutes 40 seconds.

Presented by the Strategic Planning Advisor (Vicky Cowley).

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/29

Moved: Cr Michael Thomas

Seconded: Cr Andrew McGiven

That the report *Group Finances 1 July to 31 March 2026* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.

CARRIED

6.8 NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY QUARTERLY UPDATE

Item commenced in open recording 2, at 35 minutes 40 seconds.

Presented by the Senior Regional Emergency Management Advisor, National Emergency Management Agency (Shona Morgan) who requested the report be taken as read.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/30

Moved: Cr Gary McGuire

Seconded: Cr Andrew McGiven

That the report *National Emergency Management Agency Quarterly Update* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.

CARRIED

8 KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA

Item commenced in open recording 2, at 43 minutes 4 seconds.

The Chair (Cr Emma Pike) closed the meeting with a karakia.

1.05pm – The meeting closed.

APPENDICES

7.1 APPOINTMENT OF TIER 1 GROUP CONTROLLER

7 PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEMS

7.1 APPOINTMENT OF TIER 1 GROUP CONTROLLERS

Rā Date:	22 June 2026
Kaituhi Author:	Aaron Tregoweth, Team Leader, Operational Readiness
Kaituku Authoriser:	Irving Young, Team Leader, Resilience And Recovery
Mana whakatau Delegation Status:	Committee has delegated authority to make the recommended decision

TĀMATAITI | PUBLIC EXCLUDED

The following good reasons to withhold this report from the public exist under section 6 or 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, in accordance with section 48(1)(a)(i):

- s7(2)(a) To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons.

TE ARONGA | PURPOSE

1. To provide the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Group Joint Committee an opportunity to consider and decide on appointments as per Waikato CDEM Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2025, version 7.
2. The purpose of this report is to request the Waikato Joint Committee (JC) appoint Tier 1 Group Controllers.

KŌRERO WHAKATAKI | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. Following the Group Emergency Management Office restructure in 2025 the Waikato CDEM Group has reduced to two appointed Tier 1 (Group) Controllers, creating a risk to sustained coverage during prolonged events or periods of absence.
4. To address this, the Statutory Roles Advisory and Appointment Committee (STRAAC) assessed three Tier 2 Controllers against its approved competency and experience matrix and determined that all three are suitable for appointment as Tier 1 Controllers, strengthening resilience and depth within the Group Controller pool.
5. The Coordinating Executive Group have endorsed the Tier 1 Group Controller appointments of the named individuals to strengthen the Group's overall operational resilience.

TAUNAKITANGA KAIMAHI | STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the report *Appointment of Tier 1 Group Controllers* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.
2. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2025, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following as Tier 1 Group Controllers:
 - i. Kelvin Powell, Hamilton City Council; and
 - ii. David Simes, Waipa District Council; and
 - iii. Andrew BuBear, Matamata-Piako District Council.
3. That the report and decision are made public, while the attachments remain public excluded.

HOROPAKI | BACKGROUND

6. The Waikato CDEM Group currently has two appointed Tier 1 (Group) Controllers, creating a risk to sustained leadership coverage during prolonged events or periods of leave, absence, or staff turnover.
7. To strengthen resilience and provide greater redundancy within the controller pool, three individuals have been identified as meeting the competency and experience requirements set out in the STRAAC approved matrix.

TE TAKE | ISSUE

8. The need to appoint additional Tier 1 (Group) Controllers has arisen following the 2025 Group Emergency Management Office restructure, which disestablished the Team Leader Partnerships role that previously held a statutory appointment of Alternate Group Controller for the Waikato CDEM Group. As a result, the Group now has two appointed Tier 1 Controllers creating a vulnerability in its ability to sustain command capacity during prolonged responses, concurrent incidents, or periods of leave, absence, or staff turnover.
9. To address this risk, STRAAC assessed three current Tier 2 Controllers against the approved competency and experience matrix and determined that each person demonstrated the capability, experience, and readiness required to undertake the Tier 1 Controller function. The following Tier 2 Controllers were assessed for suitability:
 - (a) Kelvin Powell (Hamilton City Council)
 - (b) David Simes (Waipa District Council)
 - (c) Andrew Bubeare (Matamata-Piako District Council)

TE AROMATAWAI | TE HIRANGA | ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

10. Having regard to the decision-making provisions in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, Local Government Act 2002 and Waikato Regional Council's

Significance and Engagement Policy, a decision in accordance with the recommendation is not considered to have a high degree of significance.

TE HOROPAKI Ā-TURE | LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

11. The CDEM Act 2002 requires the appointment of a Group Controller and permits the appointment of additional Group Controllers who can perform the functions and duties and exercise the powers of the Group Controller on the occurrence of a vacancy, for any reason.

KŌWHIRINGA I MANAKOHIA | PREFERRED OPTION

12. The preferred option is for the Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee to approve the appointments, as endorsed by CEG.

NGĀ WHAIWHAKAARO KAUPAPAHERE | POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

13. Recommendations are consistent with the Joint Committee adopted Waikato CDEM Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2025.
14. To the best of the writer's knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with, nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with, any other policy adopted by the Joint Committee, or any plan required by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002¹, LGA or any other enactment.

TE TIRITI O WAITANGI | THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

15. Interview of controller nominees/candidates includes a panel member (identified by the relevant local authority) who is qualified to consider the needs of local Māori. Enhanced response capability enables improved Parenga/protection for Māori.

WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION

16. The appointment of three additional Tier 1 (Group) Controllers will address the current gap in statutory command capacity and improve the Waikato CDEM Group's ability to maintain effective leadership during prolonged or concurrent emergency events.
17. STRAAC has assessed the proposed appointees against the approved competency and experience matrix and determined that each meets the requirements for appointment.
18. The Coordinating Executive Group have endorsed the Tier 1 Group Controller appointments of the named individuals to strengthen the Group's overall operational resilience.

¹ [Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 | New Zealand Legislation](#)

7.2 STATUTORY APPOINTMENTS

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/31

Moved: Cr Andrew McGiven

Seconded: Cr Marcus Gower

- 1. That the report *Statutory Appointments (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026)* be received.**
- 2. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2022, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following people as Tier 3 Local Controllers for the stated local appointment areas:**
 - (a) Ryan Johnston, Matamata-Piako District Council, for the Waikato East Sub-Region CDEM Services Agreement Area, comprising Matamata-Piako, Hauraki and South Waikato District Councils (refer *attachment 1*); and**
 - (b) Mark Bang, Waitomo District Council, for the Western Waikato Shared Service area, comprising Waitomo, Ōtorohanga and Waipā District Councils (refer *attachment 2*).**
- 3. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Recovery Manager Policy dated 11 November 2022, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following person as a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager:**
 - (a) Mark Bang, Waitomo District Council, for the Waitomo District Council area (refer *attachment 2*).**
- 4. That the report and decision are made public, while the attachments remain public excluded.**

CARRIED

7.2 STATUTORY APPOINTMENTS

Rā Date:	22 June 2026
Kaituhi Author:	Aaron Tregoweth, Team Leader, Operational Readiness
Kaituku Authoriser:	Irving Young, Team Leader, Resilience And Recovery
Mana whakatau Delegation Status:	Committee has delegated authority to make the recommended decision

TĀMATAITI | PUBLIC EXCLUDED

The following good reasons to withhold this report from the public exist under section 6 or 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, in accordance with section 48(1)(a)(i):

- s7(2)(a) To protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons.

TE ARONGA | PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this report is to ask the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Group Joint Committee to approve the appointment of Tier 3 Local Controllers and a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager, in accordance with the Waikato CDEM Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2022, the Waikato CDEM Group Recovery Manager Policy dated 11 November 2022.

KŌRERO WHAKATAKI | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Nominations were received from Matamata-Piako District Council and Waitomo District Council for the appointment of Tier 3 Local Controllers as per the Waikato CDEM Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2022.
3. A nomination was received from Waitomo District Council for the appointment of a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager as per Waikato CDEM Recovery Manager Policy.
4. These appointments support CDEM readiness by maintaining local response and recovery capability across the Waikato CDEM Group area.
5. In accordance with the Waikato CDEM Group Controller and Recovery Manager policies, the Coordinating Executive Group (CEG) Subcommittee, Statutory Roles Advisory and Appointment Committee (STRAAC), assessed the nominees.
6. STRAAC recommends the appointment of Ryan Johnston of Matamata-Piako District Council, and Mark Bang of Waitomo District Council, as Tier 3 Local Controllers for the specified local appointment areas.
7. STRAAC recommends the appointment of Mark Bang, Waitomo District Council, as a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager.

TAUNAKITANGA KAIMAHI | STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the report *Statutory Appointments* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.
2. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy dated 30 May 2022, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following people as Tier 3 Local Controllers for the stated local appointment areas:
 - (a) Ryan Johnston, Matamata-Piako District Council, for the Waikato East Sub-Region CDEM Services Agreement Area, comprising Matamata-Piako, Hauraki and South Waikato District Councils (refer *attachment 1*); and
 - (b) Mark Bang, Waitomo District Council, for the Western Waikato Shared Service area, comprising Waitomo, Ōtorohanga and Waipā District Councils (refer *attachment 2*).
3. That, in accordance with the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Recovery Manager Policy dated 11 November 2022, the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee approve the appointment of the following person as a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager:
 - (a) Mark Bang, Waitomo District Council, for the Waitomo District Council area (refer *attachment 2*).
4. That the report and decision are made public, while the attachments remain public excluded.

HOROPAKI | BACKGROUND

8. Tier 3 Local Controllers and Tier 3 Local Recovery Managers provide local response and recovery leadership for specified local authority areas within the Waikato CDEM Group.
9. Nominations for appointment to Local CDEM Controller roles were received from Matamata-Piako District Council and Waitomo District Council. The nominees were assessed in line with the Waikato CDEM Group Controller Policy. The CEG Subcommittee, STRAAC, recommends the appointment of the following people as Tier 3 Local Controllers:
 - (a) Ryan Johnston for the Waikato East Sub-Region CDEM Services Agreement Area, comprising Matamata-Piako, Hauraki and South Waikato District Councils; and
 - (b) Mark Bang for the Western Waikato Shared Service area, comprising Waitomo, Ōtorohanga and Waipā District Councils.
10. A nomination for appointment to the Local Recovery Manager role was received from Waitomo District Council. The nominee was assessed in line with the Waikato CDEM Group Recovery Manager Policy. The CEG Subcommittee, STRAAC, recommends the appointment of the following person as a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager:
 - (a) Mark Bang for the Waitomo District Council area.

TE TAKE | ISSUE

11. The Waikato CDEM Group has resolved to develop, appoint, and retain an appropriate cadre of CDEM Local Controllers and Recovery Managers to provide coverage across a large geographic area. The Waikato CDEM Group Controller and Recovery Manager Policies provide for different tiers of Controllers and Recovery Managers; the tiers relate to the geographic scope of appointment.
12. The issue for the Joint Committee is whether to approve the recommended appointments so that local response and recovery coverage is maintained across the relevant local authority areas.

TE AROMATAWAI | TE HIRANGA | ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

13. Having regard to the decision-making provisions in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002², Local Government Act 2002³ and Waikato Regional Council's Significance and Engagement Policy⁴, a decision in accordance with the recommendations is not considered to have a high degree of significance.

TE HOROPAKI Ā-TURE | LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

14. The Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 requires the appointment of a Group Controller and Recovery Manager and permits the appointment of Local Controllers and Local Recovery Managers at the discretion of CDEM Joint Committees.

KŌWHIRINGA | MANAKOHIA | PREFERRED OPTION

15. The preferred option is for the Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee to approve the appointments recommended by the CEG Subcommittee, STRAAC. This option is preferred because the nominees have been assessed under the relevant Waikato CDEM Group policies and endorsed through the established advisory and appointment process.

NGĀ WHAIWHAKAARO KAUPAPAHĒRE | POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

16. The recommendations are consistent with the Waikato CDEM Group Controller and Recovery Manager Policies adopted by the Joint Committee.
17. To the best of the writer's knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with, nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with, any other policy adopted by the Joint Committee, or any plan required by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, LGA or any other enactment.

² [Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 | New Zealand Legislation](#)

³ [Local Government Act 2002 | New Zealand Legislation](#)

⁴ [Waikato Regional Council Significance and Engagement Policy.pdf](#)

TE TIRITI O WAITANGI | THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

18. Interviews of nominees included a panel member, identified by the relevant local authority, who was qualified to consider the needs of local Māori. The appointments support Parenga/protection by strengthening local emergency response and recovery capability for Māori communities.

WHAKAKAPINGA | CONCLUSION

19. All Waikato CDEM Group Controller Policy prerequisites for the named nominees have been met. STRAAC has endorsed the nominations received from Matamata-Piako District Council and Waitomo District Council for appointment as Tier 3 Local Controllers.
20. All Waikato CDEM Group Recovery Manager Policy prerequisites for the named nominee have been met. STRAAC has endorsed the nomination received from Waitomo District Council for appointment as a Tier 3 Local Recovery Manager.

NGĀ TOHUTORO | REFERENCES

1. [Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy](#)
2. [Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Recovery Manager Policy](#)
3. [Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002](#)

ĀPITIHINGA | ATTACHMENTS

1. **Nomination of Ryan Johnson for Appointment as Local Controller – Matamata-Piako District Council (Doc #36346079)** [↓](#)
2. **Nomination of Mark Bang for Appointment as Local Controller and Local Recovery Manager – Waitomo District Council (Doc #36255306)** [↓](#)

**7.3 LONG TERM PLAN 2027-2037 - INVESTMENT PROPOSALS - TARGETED RATES INCREASE
COMMITTEE RESOLUTION WCDEM26/32**

Moved: Cr Emma Pike

Seconded: Cr Marcus Gower

- 9. That the report *Long Term Plan 2027-2037 - Investment Proposals - Targeted Rates Increase* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.**
- 10. That the Joint Committee endorse operational cost pressures increase of \$147,000 per annum (operational budgets are adjusted annually for Consumer Price Index) for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate.**
- 11. That the Joint Committee confirm the Tier 1 (Critical) investment proposals for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including the level of investment for:**
 - (a) Research Hazards by Risk and Knowledge Gaps,**
 - (b) Statutory Function.**
- 12. That the Joint Committee confirm the Tier 2 (Priority) investment proposals for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including the level of investment for:**
 - (a) Strategic Planning,**
 - (b) New Zealand Response Team,**
 - (c) Community Engagement Advisor,**
 - (d) Co-location,**
 - (e) Operational Response System.**
- 13. That the Joint Committee provide direction on the inclusion and level of investment for Tier 3 (Enhancement/Future focused) proposals within the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including:**
 - (a) Business Support,**
 - (b) After Action Review and Coronial Costs,**
 - (c) Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Contingency Fund.**
- 14. That Joint Committee confirm the total targeted rate budget increase to be requested from Waikato Regional Council for inclusion in their Long Term Plan 2027-2037, being:**
 - (a) \$1,797,995 for Year 1 of the Long Term Plan 2027–2037**
 - (b) Any variation for any subsequent years of the Long Term Plan 2027-2037**
- 15. That the Joint Committee agree to actively monitor and review the Contingency Fund at the three year mark.**
- 16. That the report, decision and attachment are made public, with redaction to the contractual areas.**

CARRIED

7.3 LONG TERM PLAN 2027-2037 - INVESTMENT PROPOSALS - TARGETED RATES INCREASE

Rā Date:	22 June 2026
Kaituhi Author:	Vicky Cowley, Strategic Planning Advisor
Kaituku Authoriser:	Irving Young, Team Leader, Resilience And Recovery
Mana whakatau Delegation Status:	Committee has delegated authority to make the recommended decision

TĀMATAITI | PUBLIC EXCLUDED

The following good reasons to withhold this report from the public exist under section 6 or 7 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, in accordance with section 48(1)(a)(i):

- s7(2)(h) To enable Council to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.

TE ARONGA | PURPOSE

1. To seek Waikato CDEM Group Joint Committee decision on determining the level of investment required to achieve the desired level of assurance that the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) system can manage its highest priority risks.
2. To confirm the value of increase to be requested from Waikato Regional Council (WRC) for inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2027-2037 for the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group targeted rates.

KŌRERO WHAKATAKI | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. Since the March 2026 Coordinating Executive Meeting (CEG) meeting, the proposed Long Term Plan (LTP) investments have been further developed and assessed using a structured prioritisation framework, alongside insights received from the Joint Committee workshop discussions on system-level risk and resilience.
4. Investment proposals have been assessed against a weighting criterion of legislative responsibility, criticality and risk reduction, and community benefit. To support decision-making, the results have been translated into three investment tiers as follows:
 - (a) **Tier 1 – Critical investments** - represent essential investments required to address key system risks and significantly improve the system's ability to respond to and manage emergency events.
 - (b) **Tier 2 – Priority investments** - include initiatives which were identified as key contributors to improving performance under stress and reducing system-level risk.
 - (c) **Tier 3 – Enhancement and future-focused investments** - provide longer-term benefits, including strengthening organisational and strategic capacity. These initiatives support ongoing system development.

5. This tiered approach provides a clear line of sight between the Strategic Group Plan, identified system risks, and the level of investment required to manage those risks. Further the tiered approach enables comparison of options based on differing levels of system assurance and risk tolerance. All tier options are in addition to operational cost pressures required to maintain current service levels.
6. Detailed analysis of each investment proposal, including options, costs, risks, and assessment scores, is provided in the attached 'Cost Analysis for LTP 2027-2037' (Attachment 1), which remains publicly excluded due to commercially sensitive information.
7. The options reflect the relative scale and composition of the proposed investment, enabling informed decision-making ahead of final cost confirmation. The striking of the final targeted rate per rating unit is yet to be confirmed by WRC as costs are finalised (i.e. KiwiSaver new rates).
8. Benchmarking the Waikato CDEM Group's targeted rate against comparable CDEM groups by population, Wellington (above) and Bay of Plenty (below), shows that Waikato's targeted rate is significantly lower, at \$12.00 and \$29.03 less per rating unit respectively; noting that those CDEM Groups are still to approve LTP 2027-2037 investments. This indicates that Waikato has a comparatively lower baseline investment, reinforcing the need to consider increased funding to align with system risk and service expectations.

TAUNAKITANGA KAIMAHI | STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the report *Long Term Plan 2027-2037 - Investment Proposals - Targeted Rates Increase* (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee, 22 June 2026) be received.
2. That the Joint Committee endorse operational cost pressures increase of \$147,000 per annum (operational budgets are adjusted annually for Consumer Price Index) for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate.
3. That the Joint Committee confirm the Tier 1 (Critical) investment proposals for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including the level of investment for:
 - (a) Research Hazards by Risk and Knowledge Gaps
 - (b) Statutory Function
4. That the Joint Committee confirm the Tier 2 (Priority) investment proposals for inclusion in the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including the level of investment for:
 - (a) Strategic Planning
 - (b) New Zealand Response Team
 - (c) Community Engagement Advisor
 - (d) Co-location
 - (e) Operational Response System
5. That the Joint Committee provide direction on the inclusion and level of investment for Tier 3 (Enhancement/Future focused) proposals within the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037 targeted rate, including:

- (a) Business Support
 - (b) After Action Review and Coronial Costs
 - (c) Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Contingency Fund
6. That Joint Committee confirm the total targeted rate budget increase to be requested from Waikato Regional Council for inclusion in their Long Term Plan 2027-2037, being:
- (a) Total amount for year 1 inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2027-2037
 - (b) Any variation for any subsequent years of the Long Term Plan 2027-2037
7. That the report and decision are made public, while the attachment remain public excluded.

HOROPAKI | BACKGROUND

- 9. Waikato Regional Council (WRC) is progressing the development of its Long Term Plan 2027-2037. Waikato CDEM Group must advise the required targeted rate budget by August 2026, for inclusion into the WRC required processes.
- 10. Since November 2025, the Coordinating Executive Group (CEG) have provided guidance and approved initiatives for business case development.
- 11. At the March 2026 CEG meeting, proposals, aligned with the Strategic Group Plan 2025-2030, were presented. CEG subsequently requested that Group Emergency Management Office develop a prioritisation matrix and apply it across all proposed investments.
- 12. The 15 May 2026 Joint Committee workshop confirmed investment decisions should be assessed based on whether they provide sufficient assurance that the system can manage its most significant risks and deliver the Strategic Group Plan under stress.
- 13. At the 5 June 2026 CEG meeting, CEG endorsed the application of the prioritisation framework and supported progressing a tiered investment approach. A further refinement of the matrix and clarification of investment scope, costs, and interdependencies was requested to support Joint Committee decision-making.
- 14. Benchmarking of the Waikato CDEM Group’s targeted rate against comparable CDEM groups by population indicates that Waikato’s current targeted rate is significantly lower. Wellington CDEM Group’s targeted rate is \$12.00 higher per rating unit, while Bay of Plenty is \$29.03 higher per rating unit. This comparison is based on current rates and does not include any additional investment those groups may approve through their Long Term Plan 2027-2037 process.

CDEM Group	2025/26 Targeted rate \$ per rating unit (inc. GST)	No of Rating Units 2025-26	Population	Area KMs ²
Wellington	27.96	216,483	520,971	8,049
Waikato	15.96	224,387	498,771	25,000
Bay of Plenty*	44.99	136,292	334,140	27,072

**Medium range - variance by local authority*

TE TAKE | ISSUE

15. A structured prioritisation framework has been applied to all proposed investments weighted against legislative responsibility (40%), criticality and risk reduction (30%), and community benefit (30%). This is consistent with public sector decision-making principles (transparency, evidence-based, fairness and consistency, accountability, value for money, alignment with statutory obligations, long-term and system thinking).
16. The prioritisation framework has been used to translate identified investment needs into three tiers which form the basis for the investment options presented in this report. These tiers reflect the relative importance of each proposal, based on legislative alignment, criticality/risk reduction, and community benefit, providing a clear and consistent framework for considering funding options.

Tier	Meaning	Source
Tier 1 – Critical	Must fund (legislation + core risk)	Matrix high scores (4.5 to 5.0)
Tier 2 – Priority	Strongly recommended	Matrix high–moderate (4.0 to 4.4)
Tier 3 – Enhancement/ Future focused	Value-add	Matrix lower (3.0 to 3.9)

17. The results of this prioritisation, including supporting financial and risk analysis for each initiative, are detailed in “Cost Analysis for LTP 2027–2037” (Attachment 1), with the attachment including commercially sensitive financial and operational detail remaining publicly excluded.
18. The application of the prioritisation framework confirms that the proposed investments can be grouped into three tiers based on their contribution to system resilience through statutory obligations, risk reduction and enhancement.
 - (a) **Tier 1 – Critical investments** represent those required to meet statutory obligations to address fundamental system risks, such as being ready to respond effectively, and understanding our hazards and risks through research. This is consistent with recent national and regional response reviews, such as the North Island Severe Weather Events 2023, and further, findings from the 2026 National Climate Change Risk Assessment which identifies increasing exposure to natural hazards across New Zealand, highlighting the need for improved risk information to support decision-making and reduce long-term impacts. Additionally, maintaining sufficient statutory leadership capacity and capability to deliver the Group’s functions under the CDEM Act 2002 (including sections 17 and 59), and to meet emerging expectations under the Emergency Management Bill.
 - (b) **Tier 2 – Priority investments** include initiatives such as a Strategic Planning role, New Zealand Response Team (NZRT), co-location with partner/s, Community Engagement role and an Operational Response System. These significantly improve the system’s ability to respond to and manage emergency events, including strengthening of community readiness and resilience.

- (c) **Tier 3 – Enhancement and future-focused investments** provide longer-term value, which includes initiatives such as business support, After Action Review/Coronial cost, and contingency funding arrangements.
- 19. This tiered approach ensures that investment decisions remain aligned to statutory requirements and system risk while providing flexibility to stage lower-priority investments.
- 20. The Joint Committee is therefore being asked to determine the level of investment required to achieve its desired level of assurance that the Waikato CDEM system can manage its highest priority risks.

NGĀ KŌWHIRINGA | OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

Waikato CDEM Group – Investment Proposals - Long Term Plan 2027-2030

Initiative	Tier	Prioritisation Score	Cost Analysis for Long Term Plan 2027-2037		
			Out of 5	Status Quo	Annual Cost Options
				Functional	Optimal
Hazard Research	Tier 1	5.0	\$0	\$ 50,000	\$100,000
Statutory Function	Critical	5.0	\$0	\$ 73,003	*\$ 32,073
Tier 1 Sub-total			\$0	\$123,003	\$132,073
Strategic Planning		4.3	\$0	\$150,000	\$239,914
New Zealand Response Team		4.3	\$0	\$480,000	\$800,000
Community Engagement	Tier 2 Priority	4.3	\$0	**Not available under functional option	\$180,138
Co-location		4.3	\$0	**Not available under functional option	S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987
Operational Response System		4.0	\$0	S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1...	S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1...
Tier 2 Sub-total			\$0	\$780,000	\$1,639,294
Business Support	Tier 3	3.8	\$0	\$ 52,000	\$ 58,870
After Action Review and Coronial	Enhancement/ Future focused	3.6	\$0	\$ 30,000	\$ 50,000
Contingency Fund		3.4	\$0	\$ 78,500	\$157,000
Tier 3 Sub-Total			\$0	\$160,500	\$265,870
All Proposals Total			\$0	\$1,063,503	\$2,037,237

*Lower Optimal cost reflects integration with Strategic Planning Team Leader role

**No functional option reflects that partial delivery is not viable

***10 year repayment term applies to co-location

- 21. The functional option represents a partial investment approach, improving resilience while retaining some residual risk and reliance on reprioritisation.

22. Waikato Regional Council's current estimate for 2027/28 is 227,000 rating units. For every \$227,000 increase in the budget, will approximately equate to a \$1.00 (+ GST) increase in the CDEM targeted rate.

ĒTAHI ATU TAKE | OTHER MATTERS

23. Operational cost pressures of \$147,000 per annum are driven by existing contractual commitments/CPI increases that compound annually and increase operating expenses, and are sought for inclusion in the request for increased budget to the Waikato Regional Council Long Term Plan 2027-2037. They include ongoing licensing costs, building lease and other contractual operating expenditure increases, higher vehicle running costs, and duty staff standby required to sustain existing service levels.

TE URUTAI KI TE HURIHANGA ĀHUARANGI | ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

24. This decision will increase the ability of the region to proactively respond to the impacts of climate change now and into the future.
25. The 2026 National Climate Change Risk Assessment identifies increasing exposure to natural hazards across New Zealand, highlighting the need for improved risk information to support decision-making and reduce long-term impacts.

TE AROMATAWAI I TE HIRANGA | ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

26. Having regard to the decision-making provisions in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002, the Local Government Act 2002 and Waikato Regional Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, a decision in accordance with the recommendations is considered to have a high degree of significance. Staff are of the opinion that the content and recommendations in this report are consistent with legislative decision-making requirements.

TE HOROPAKI Ā-TURE | LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

27. Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.

KŌWHIRINGA I MANAKOHIA | PREFERRED OPTION

28. The preferred option is for the Joint Committee to confirm the value of increase to be requested from Waikato Regional Council for inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2027-2037.

NGĀ WHAIWHAKAARO KAUPAPAHERE | POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

29. To the best of the writer's knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with, nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with, any policy adopted by the Committee or any plan required by the CDEM Act or any other legislation.
30. The recommendation is consistent with the Waikato CDEM Strategic Group Plan 2025-2030.

41. While operational cost pressures are necessary to sustain current service levels, the proposed investment options represent deliberate choices about strengthening system capability in response to increasing hazard exposure, climate-related risks, and rising community expectations.
42. The Joint Committee is therefore requested to determine the appropriate level of budget increase to be recommended to Waikato Regional Council for inclusion in the Long Term Plan 2027-2037, balancing affordability with the need to ensure a resilient, effective and future ready CDEM system.

NGĀ TOHUTORO | REFERENCES

43. Reference 1 - [2026 National Climate Change Risk Assessment](#)
44. Reference 2 - [Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002](#)
45. Reference 3 - [Waikato CDEM Strategic Group Plan 2025-2030](#)
46. Reference 4 - [Waikato Group Plan Actions 2025-2030](#)

ĀPITI HANGA | ATTACHMENTS

1. [Investment and Options Analysis - Long Term Plan 2027-2037](#) ↓

Cost Analysis for LTP

Research Hazards by Risk and Knowledge Gaps (Tier 1)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i>	Continue hazard and risk research on an ad hoc basis from existing budgets.	Establish a limited but dedicated annual hazard and risk research fund.	Establish a dedicated annual hazard and risk research fund to ensure timely research.
Advantages	No cost.	The availability of limited research and information will benefit the Waikato CDEM Group members to support effective reduction, readiness, response and recovery. Limited information and understanding to identify, assess, and manage hazards and risks to meet the CDEM Groups requirements under the CDEM Act 2002 (S17).	The availability of comprehensive, timely research and information will benefit the Waikato CDEM Group members to support more informed, timely and effective reduction, readiness, response and recovery. Comprehensive information and understanding to identify, assess, and manage hazards and risks to meet the CDEM Groups requirements under the CDEM Act 2002 (S17).
Disadvantages	Status quo limits knowledge and understanding of hazards and risk to the communities of the Waikato region.	Increased financial commitment of operational costs. Need to prioritise which research to undertake.	Increased financial commitment of operational costs.
Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i>	The CDEM Groups requirements under the CDEM Act 2002 (S17). EM Bill Purpose 'to promote and improve management of hazards...', Group Plan s91, 98 requirements.	The CDEM Groups requirements under the CDEM Act 2002 (S17).	The CDEM Groups requirements under the CDEM Act 2002 (S17).
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i>	Strategic Risk - Limited hazard and risk insight. - Inconsistent Group knowledge. Operational Risk - Decisions based on incomplete hazard data. Community Risk - Delayed or uneven hazard understanding impacting outcomes. Reputational Risk - Reduced confidence from inconsistencies of knowledge	Delivery Risk - Risk of underuse in planning and risk reduction. Operational Risk - Stronger focus on known hazards may overlook others. Residual Risk - Improved hazard insight may not be consistently applied.	Delivery Risk - Reduces risk of underuse in planning and risk reduction. Operational Risk - Stronger focus on known hazards may overlook others. Residual Risk - Improved hazard insight may not be consistently applied.

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
Risk Statement	impacting decisions. Public perception of not knowing or doing enough to reduce risk. Operational decision making using incomplete information.	Chosen solution will not fully eliminate all identified risks.	A residual risk remains that uncertainty will persist in the mitigation of decision-making and long-term risk reduction planning.
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			5
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	\$50 000 annually	\$100 000 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	Nil
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	\$0.22	\$0.44

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

Statutory Function (Tier 1)

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward to which user and where?</i>	Group Manager holds two primary statutory roles (Group Controller and Group Recovery Manager).	Additional funding for primary statutory function attached to a senior role within GEMO.	Additional funding for primary statutory function attached to a new team leader role within GEMO.
Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i>	CDEM Act. Supports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - s17 - coordinated response and recovery functions. - s59 - obligation to take all necessary steps to perform functions. - Emergency Management Bill. 	CDEM Act. Supports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - s17 - coordinated response and recovery functions. - s59 - obligation to take all necessary steps to perform functions. - Emergency Management Bill. 	CDEM Act. Fully meets and demonstrates compliance with statutory requirements by providing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clear appointment, delegation, and succession arrangements. - demonstrable capability and capacity to deliver statutory functions at all times. - alignment with Emergency Management Bill requirements (e.g. regional statutory leadership).
Advantages	Lower cost. Breadth of knowledge with Group Manager.	Reduces reliance of multiple primary statutory function to a single role.	Sustainable and scalable statutory leadership model. Provides resilience for employee turnover. Enables Group Manager to focus on strategic leadership. Strong alignment with assurance frameworks and national expectations. Separation of statutory roles supported by a dedicated senior position to recognise the complexity, accountability, and workload associated with statutory functions. Provides a sustainable, resilient leadership model with clear role delineation. Supports governance assurance that the Group has fit-for-purpose statutory leadership capability.
Disadvantages	Limited resilience and reduced capacity. High dependency on one individual.	Increased financial commitment. Constitutes a significant change to existing senior GEMO roles and may result in organisational restructuring within GEMO, including potential redeployment or redundancy.	Increased financial commitment.
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing</i>	Strategic risk - Statutory leadership and	Strategic risk - May not fully demonstrate a	Delivery / implementation risk - Establishing a new role requires clear

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
<i>or investing</i>	<p>accountability remain concentrated in a single role, limiting the Group's ability to meet current and future legislative expectations under the Emergency Management Bill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inability to demonstrate mature, scalable statutory capability aligned with national direction and assurance expectations. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High dependency on one individual creates vulnerability during concurrent or prolonged events. - Limited depth and redundancy which reduces effectiveness in response and recovery coordination. - Increased likelihood of role overload impacting wellbeing. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perception that the Group is underprepared for large-scale or complex emergencies. <p>Governance / assurance risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited separation of duties reduces transparency and audit defensibility. - Weak succession planning and role redundancy creates continuity risk. 	<p>mature statutory leadership model aligned with future legislative and assurance expectations.</p> <p>Delivery / implementation risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires significant changes to existing senior GEMO roles, including clarification of delegations and accountabilities. - May result in organisational restructure, including potential redeployment or redundancy. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While improved, reliance on existing staff may still limit capacity during high-demand events. <p>Financial / sustainability risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased and ongoing cost commitment. - Ongoing investment required in training, development. - Potential one-off costs associated with organisational restructuring, including redundancy. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk of perceived as partial or interim solution. <p>Governance / assurance risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement in the separation of roles, but assurance capability may still be limited. 	<p>mandate, integration, and organisational alignment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment may be extended given the specialised statutory and assurance skillset required. <p>Financial / affordability risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased and ongoing cost commitment. - Ongoing investment required in training, development, and succession planning. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transition period may create temporary uncertainty as roles and responsibilities are embedded. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher investment raises expectations of demonstrable performance. <p>Governance / assurance risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires strong clarity to avoid perceived duplication between strategic leadership and assurance functions.
Risk Statement	<p>Failure or unavailability of a single primary statutory role holder creates significant operational and statutory risk.</p> <p>Reduced effectiveness during prolonged or concurrent emergencies. Governance and audit risk due to limited depth and succession.</p>	<p>Ongoing cost.</p> <p>While this option reduces single-point dependency and strengthens statutory capability, it requires significant changes to existing GEMO roles and may result in organisational restructuring, including potential redeployment, or redundancy. This introduces one-off financial costs and creates organisational and delivery risk during change.</p>	<p>Ongoing cost.</p> <p>While significantly reducing single-point dependency and strengthening statutory capability, the model introduces an ongoing cost commitment and requires sustained investment in capability, succession planning, and role clarity to maintain effectiveness over time.</p>
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			5

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	\$73,003 annually	\$32,073 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	(included in proposed new Strategic Role)
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	\$0.32	\$0.14

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

Strategic Planning Role (Tier 2)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i>	Strategic planning, assurance, monitoring, and system improvement functions are undertaken within existing roles in the GEMO - with no dedicated capacity.	Engagement of contractor/s to undertake development of assurance framework and ongoing monitoring.	Establishment of Team Leader Strategic Planning Role (1.0 FTE) within GEMO, holding dedicated assurance portfolio alongside a primary statutory function.
Advantages	No additional cost.	Enables proactive, evidence-based strategic planning. Aligns with legislative reform and national expectations. Development and implementation of an assurance framework. Monitoring, evaluation, and performance reporting. Supporting governance with evidence-based decision-making. Reduced financial burden.	Provides clear governance assurance and performance visibility. Supports continuous improvement across the 4Rs. Reduces reliance on key individuals. Dedicated role enables proactive, evidence-based strategic planning. Aligns with legislative reform and national expectations. Development and implementation of an assurance framework. Monitoring, evaluation, and performance reporting. Group-wide strategic planning and alignment. Governance assurance of Group primary statutory role capacity.
Disadvantages	Limited capacity to deliver strategic priorities. No structured assurance framework. Increasing gap between expectations and delivery. Reliance on individuals rather than systems. As a result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited capacity to develop or implement a formal assurance framework. - Limited capacity of monitoring, evaluation, and performance reporting. - Strategic planning is reactive rather than proactive. 	Existing staff maintain core planning outputs (e.g. Group Plan Actions work programmes, reporting) and re-prioritise non-core work, with assurance provided through contractor.	Increased financial commitment.

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
<p>Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i></p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p> <p>CDEM Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit's ability to demonstrate that the Group is taking all necessary steps under s59. - Weak alignment with emerging Emergency Management Bill expectations. - Does not meet Strategic Group Plan requirements for an assurance framework s7. 	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p> <p>CDEM Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support evidence-based delivery of s17 functions across the 4Rs. - Enables ability to meet s59 obligations through structured monitoring, evaluation, and improvement. <p>Delivery of Strategic Group Plan assurance framework. Aligns with Emergency Management Bill.</p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p> <p>CDEM Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support evidence-based delivery of s17 functions across the 4Rs. - Enables ability to meet s59 obligations through structured monitoring, evaluation, and improvement. <p>Delivery of Strategic Group Plan assurance framework. Aligns with Emergency Management Bill.</p>
<p>System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i></p>	<p>Strategic Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No coherent assurance framework in place to demonstrate alignment between system activity and priority risks. <p>Operational Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited processes to collect, validate, and analyse information needed for assurance; reliance on ad hoc reporting. <p>Community Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No clear visibility between planning activities and actual reduction in community risk. <p>Financial Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased likelihood of reactive spending due to unaddressed system weaknesses. <p>Reputational Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inability to demonstrate system performance. <p>Governance / Assurance Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governance lacks visibility as no structured assurance framework. 	<p>Strategic Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreed frameworks used but not consistently applied. <p>Operational Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standardised processes exist but vary in application. - Utilisation of contractors introduces potential control and continuity risks, including reduced organisational knowledge retention and reliance on external capability. <p>Financial Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional ongoing annual cost. <p>Governance / Assurance Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reporting on risk prioritisation provided. - Some assurance system risks remain but are actively identified, managed, and reduced. 	<p>Operational Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time required to embed assurance framework across the Group. <p>Financial Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional ongoing cost of 1 FTE. <p>Governance / Assurance Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some assurance system risks remain but are actively identified, managed, and reduced.
<p>Risk Statement</p>	<p>There is no coherent assurance framework providing visibility of whether system-wide activity is aligned to the Waikato region's highest-priority risks. As a result, governance cannot demonstrate that investment and effort are effectively</p>	<p>An emerging assurance framework provides visibility of the relationship between priority risks, planning activity, and outcomes. No increased capacity for further statutory planning</p>	<p>A robust, risk-based assurance framework is embedded across the system, providing governance with clear, consistent, and evidence-based insight into how activity, investment, and capability are aligned to priority risks. This enables confident,</p>

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
	reducing risk, weakening accountability, and exposing the system to misalignment between priorities, actions, and community outcomes.	activity.	informed decision-making, strong accountability, and demonstrable progress in reducing community risk and enhancing regional resilience.
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			4.3
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	\$150,000 annually	\$239,914 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	1 (joined with Statutory Function)
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	\$0.66	\$1.06

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

New Zealand Response Team (Tier 2)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i>	No New Zealand Response Team (NZRT) capability in the Waikato CDEM Group area.	A centralised NZRT (Two Teams) is established, maintained and funded by the Waikato CDEM Group in accordance with the requirements of the NEMA NZRT Accreditation Guidelines. The NZRT would consist of minimum 20 active and deployable members along with the necessary equipment to perform the Foundation Strand. They can be deployed anywhere in NZ and operate in combination with neighbouring NZRT resources.	Four teams located in two locations trained to the level of the functional option.
Advantages	No cost.	The development and maintenance of NZRT resources will benefit all Waikato CDEM Group members to support timely and effective response and recovery. Single location improves interoperability between teams and volunteer management. Reduced facility and maintenance costs. Ability to be brigade and pre-positioned assets as required. Easier to recruit volunteers in larger population centres. Additional resource to meet the CDEM Groups requirements under the CDEM Act 2002 (S17).	The development and maintenance of NZRT resources will benefit all Waikato CDEM Group members to support timely and effective response and recovery. Wider coverage of the Group area. Increased interoperability between the co-located teams. Less reliance on prepositioning of assets.

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Disadvantages	Status quo fails to meet the needs of the communities of the Waikato region. Should emergencies as severe as the North Island storm sequence early 2023 experienced on the North Island East Coast and in Auckland occur, the Waikato CDEM response will be found wanting. Affected Councils will suffer reputational damage, and people will not get the response they expect from the emergency management system.	Increased financial commitment. Prioritisation may be required to affectively preposition teams. For deployments, travel time to the affected location may be required.	Increased financial commitment. Increased management burden. Harder to recruit required number of volunteers in some locations.
Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i>	Not a requirement to meet legislation. Supported by EM Bill s27 EM Committee Functions to respond to and manage the adverse effects of emergencies in its area.	Not a requirement to meet legislation, although better outcomes for communities will be provided and will assist in improved responses.	Not a requirement to meet legislation, although better outcomes for communities will be provided and will assist in improved responses.
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i>	<p>Strategic risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not being able to provide in kind support to neighbouring CDEM Groups. - Not meeting the goals and vision of the Strategic Group Plan. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced regional response capability. - Reliance on other agencies/CDEM Groups to provide capability. - Reduced situational awareness. <p>Community risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delayed response to disproportionately affected communities can increase the impact and recovery from emergencies. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced public trust in response. - Increased media scrutiny after events. 	<p>Delivery / implementation risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficulty recruiting, managing and retaining sufficient active volunteers to sustain two deployable teams. - Accreditation within stipulated timeframes. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A centralised model may result in longer travel times to some affected communities, particularly rural or geographically isolated areas. - Pre-positioning and prioritisation decisions may be difficult during fast-moving or uncertain events. <p>Financial / sustainability risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing funding may be vulnerable to future budget pressure if benefits are not clearly demonstrated. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communities may perceive inequity if the centralised team is seen as benefiting some districts more than others. 	<p>Delivery / implementation risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Four teams across two locations significantly increases the accreditation burden along with management complexity. - Accreditation of all teams within stipulated timeframes. - Recruiting and retaining enough volunteers across two locations may be challenging, particularly outside larger population centres. <p>Financial / affordability risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If volunteer numbers decline, the Group may carry high fixed costs without achieving full operational benefit. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location delivery may improve coverage but still may not provide timely access to all parts of the Waikato region. - Deployments may be constrained if multiple teams are affected by the same regional event. - Single point of dependency - critical knowledge and relationships held by one person. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A larger investment raises expectations that teams will be available, deployable, and

Community Engagement Advisor (Tier 2)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i>	<p>Community engagement and preparedness support are currently delivered by existing GEMO roles.</p> <p>Emerging expectations under the Emergency Management Bill increase the requirement to proactively identify and engage with vulnerable and priority communities, placing additional demand on current resourcing and highlighting a growing gap between existing capability and future requirements.</p>	<p>There is no functional option identified.</p>	<p>Establishing a dedicated engagement (one FTE) resource enables a proactive, structured, and sustained approach to community resilience.</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - targeted engagement with priority and vulnerable communities. - consistent technical support, planning, and training to build community resilience. - improved coordination with councils and partners. <p>To shift the model from capacity-limited to planned and capability-building, strengthening community preparedness, improving equity of outcomes, and reducing long-term response and recovery costs – strengthening community resilience.</p>
Advantages	No additional cost.		<p>Coordinated, group-wide approach to impacted communities and iwi/Māori.</p> <p>Culturally appropriate support across the 4R's, integrated into response, recovery, and programmes.</p> <p>Efficient, culturally appropriate services for all communities.</p> <p>Increased alignment with emerging national requirements.</p>
Disadvantages	Status quo fails to meet the needs of the communities of the Waikato region.		Additional cost of employing an FTE staff member.
Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i>	Not a requirement to meet legislation.		<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p> <p>Emergency Management Bill introduces strengthened expectations for proactive, inclusive engagement with specified community groups, including vulnerable populations, an additional role will directly support those requirements.</p>
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i>	<p>Strategic Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Misalignment with national direction and legislation. <p>Operational Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inability to meet the resource demand. 		<p>Financial Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional ongoing cost of 1 FTE. <p>Delivery Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Set-up time required to embed and build relationships.

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
Risk Statement	Reputational damage from failure to meet public expectations that "Civil Defence is here to help us". Waikato CDEM Group is seen as not being capable to manage emergencies in its own area or unable to support neighbouring Groups	The Functional option reduces the current capability gap but introduces delivery, accreditation, volunteer sustainability, and ongoing funding risks. A centralised two-team model may not provide timely coverage across the full Waikato CDEM Group area and will require strong management to maintain operational readiness.	<p>effective across the region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to sustain four teams or demonstrate clear public value could attract scrutiny. <p>The Optimal option provides broader regional coverage and greater resilience but introduces higher financial, management, and volunteer sustainability risks. Establishing and maintaining four teams across two locations will require stronger management, consistent training and accreditation oversight, and sufficient support capacity to ensure the investment delivers the intended operational benefits.</p> <p>Increased reliance on a central coordination role creates a potential single point of failure if not appropriately supported.</p>
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			4.3
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	\$480,000 annually	\$800,000 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	1	1
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	\$2.11	\$3.52

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
	Community Risk - Lack of capacity to meet expectations. Reputational / Governance Risk - Limited assurance of community preparedness.		
Risk Statement	Without dedicated engagement capacity, there is a risk that the organisation will not meet emerging legislative expectations to engage with vulnerable and priority communities, resulting in inconsistent engagement, reduced community readiness, and inequitable outcomes in response and recovery.		Residual risk of time to build relationships prior to outcomes experienced.
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			4.3
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	Nil	\$180,138 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	1
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	Nil	\$0.79

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

Co-location (Tier 2)

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
<p>Current state, service options, and preferred approach i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</p>	<p>CDEM Group have IL4 building lease until December 2031. CDEM and [S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987] are geographically dispersed.</p>	<p>No functional option.</p>	<p>CDEM co-located [S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987] in purpose-designed facility accommodating GEMO alongside [S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987]. [S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987] Designed to support BAU, training, and response.</p>
<p>Advantages</p>	<p>Existing lease has right of renewal.</p>		<p>Co-location supports inter-agency coordination, which is fundamental to how the Act expects the system to function. The Coordinated Incident Management System (CIMS) is the <i>key national framework</i>, and it strongly supports co-location principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unity of effort (agencies working toward common objectives) – shared situational awareness. - Interoperability and coordination of resources - supports training, exercises, and BAU collaboration. - Use of designated response facilities and coordination centres. <p>[S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987]</p> <p>Provides opportunity of timing to align with local government restructures to unitary authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunity to increase/decrease in alignment with future unitary authorities i.e. smaller if less geographical requirement or larger if multi-unitary CDEM Group. - Align lease payments with ratepayer base. <p>[S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987]</p>
<p>Disadvantages</p>	<p>Missed opportunity to align timing with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local government structural reform - [S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987] co-location opportunities - Lease lifecycle. <p>Reduced ability to deliberately design fit-for-purpose. No potential for integration of NZRT co-locality.</p>		<p>Repayment of fit-out. Current unknowns until proposal develops.</p>
<p>Statutory Alignment</p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation. CDEM Act 2002:</p>		<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation. CDEM Act 2002:</p>

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
<i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i>	Supports delivery of s17 functions through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enhanced readiness and response capability 		Supports delivery of s17 functions through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improved coordination and integration - enhanced readiness and response capability - alignment with CIMS principles (unity of effort, interoperability, coordinated action) Strategic Group Plan alignment. CIMS framework promotes co-location, shared situational awareness. National after-action reviews and the Government Inquiry into the North Island Severe Weather Events (2023) identified that fragmented coordination, inconsistent situational awareness, and reliance on informal inter-agency relationships reduced the effectiveness of response efforts. These findings highlight the importance of strengthened multi-agency integration, shared situational awareness, and coordinated planning and response capability. Co-location directly addresses these system-level findings by enabling structured, day-to-day inter-agency collaboration, improving readiness, strengthening relationships, and enhancing coordination during emergencies.
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i>	Strategic risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No opportunity to adjust to future CDEM Group requirements (space) with local government reorganisation to unitary authorities. - Failure to invest in co-location perpetuates nationally identified system weaknesses, including fragmented coordination, inconsistent situational awareness, and over-reliance on informal relationships between agencies. Operational risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fragmented locations reduce coordination, communication, and interoperability between agencies. - Reduced situational awareness during response. Community risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced effectiveness of response coordination – may impact outcomes for affected communities. Financial risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inefficiencies due to duplicated facilities, systems, and processes. - Age of current building creates a risk of escalating maintenance costs and unplanned repairs. 		Financial risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant capital and ongoing cost commitment (lease, fit-out, maintenance). - Budget inclusion creates a forward liability, but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o no funding impact until LTP Year 2 o can be rephased, reduced, or removed through Annual Plan processes. Implementation risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires multi-agency agreement and budget, governance alignment, and coordinated investment. - Timing dependencies with external partners. Operational risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transformational period may disrupt existing arrangements. Strategic risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires long-term commitment and alignment with future organisational structures. Residual risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some geographic limitations remain for a large region like Waikato.
Risk Statement	There is a system-level risk that maintaining		There is a system-level risk that investing in a co-located

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
	geographically dispersed facilities and not investing in a fit-for-purpose, scalable co-located facility will perpetuate nationally identified weaknesses in emergency management, including fragmented inter-agency coordination, inconsistent situational awareness, and over-reliance on informal relationships between agencies. This limits the effectiveness of readiness and response functions, reduces interoperability, and constrains the ability to deliver coordinated, timely outcomes for communities during emergencies. In addition, the current arrangement restricts the Group's ability to adapt to future structural changes (including potential local government reorganisation), align with s7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987 co-location opportunities, and optimise long-term infrastructure investment within the existing lease lifecycle.		facility will commit the organisation to long-term financial and strategic obligations, with delivery dependent on multi-agency alignment and external timing.
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			4.3
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	Nil	s7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987 annually over 10 years Start LTP Year 2
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	Nil
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	Nil	s7(2)(h) LGOI...

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

Operational Response System (Tier 2)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i>	An operational system made up of inconsistent tools, manual spreadsheets, and multiple systems across 11 local authorities.	Implementation of a centralised shared operational/information system used in response when ECC/EOCs are activated. System is maintained and funded by the Waikato CDEM Group.	Implementation of a centralised shared operational/information system used in response when ECC/EOCs are activated. System is maintained and funded by the Waikato CDEM Group. In addition to Functional, the system would be used in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GECC/EOC Exercises - BAU - Training.
Advantages	No cost.	The implementation and maintenance of a uniform operational system will benefit all Waikato CDEM Group members to support a timely and effective response and recovery.	Same as Functional. The implementation and maintenance of a uniform operational system will benefit all Waikato CDEM Group members to support a timely and effective response and recovery.
Disadvantages	Status quo fails to meet both current and future needs of Waikato CDEM Group. The current environment is characterised by inefficiency and repetition due to inconsistent tools and incompatible systems across 11 local authorities.	Increased financial commitment. Annual subscription costs ~ <small>57(2)(b) LGOIMA 1987</small> (including standard service level plan).	Increased financial commitment. Annual subscription costs ~ <small>57(2)(b) LGOIMA 1987</small> (including standard service level plan). Plus, minimal addition to annual subscription costs (\$30,000) to upgrade to advanced or professional level service plan.
Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i>	Not a requirement to meet legislation.	Not a requirement to meet legislation although it will provide better outcomes for communities and assist in an improved response.	Not a requirement to meet legislation although it will provide better outcomes for communities and assist in an improved response.
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i>	Strategic risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current tools and processes do not meet current or future Waikato CDEM Group operational requirements. - Not meeting the goals and vision of the Strategic Group Plan. - Inconsistent systems across 11 local authorities limit Group-wide alignment and assurance. Operational risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manual spreadsheets, incompatible systems and duplicated processes reduce 	Delivery risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation in 2027-2028 will require strong planning, change management, training and adoption across the Group. Operational risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A centralised shared system will improve interoperability but creates reliance on a single operational platform during ECC/EOC activations. Residual risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standard support reduces but does not remove the risk of service-impacting issues during significant 	Delivery risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expanding system use into BAU, training and exercises requires stronger adoption, governance, user management and ongoing capability development. - The broader operating model may fail to deliver full value if staff do not consistently use the system outside activations. Operational risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wider use improves familiarity and readiness but increases dependence on one shared platform for operational information management. Residual risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Premium support reduces service disruption

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
	<p>interoperability, situational awareness, tasking, reporting and intelligence flow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reliance on local staff and IT departments creates variable support, slower issue resolution and reduced surge capacity during activation. <p>Community risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delayed or inconsistent operational decision-making may affect community outcomes during response and recovery. <p>Financial risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No direct system cost, but ongoing inefficiency, duplication and staff time create hidden and deferred costs. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Slow information sharing, limited accuracy and delayed decision-making may reduce confidence in the Waikato CDEM Group response system. 	<p>or concurrent events.</p>	<p>risk but does not eliminate outages, data quality issues or user error during high-pressure events.</p>
Risk Statement	<p>The status quo presents a high system risk. Continuing with inconsistent tools, manual spreadsheets and incompatible systems across 11 local authorities will constrain interoperability, situational awareness, resource tracking, tasking, reporting and intelligence flow. This increases the likelihood of delayed decision-making, inefficient surge capacity, reduced cross-council support and reputational damage during significant events.</p>	<p>The Functional option materially reduces current operational and reputational risks by providing a shared operational system, standard support, documentation, training environment and improved information flow during ECC/EOC activations. Residual risk remains around implementation, user adoption, system reliance and whether standard support arrangements are sufficient during major or concurrent events.</p>	<p>The Optimal option provides the strongest reduction in system risk by embedding the shared platform into BAU, training, exercises and activations, supported by a higher service level. It significantly improves readiness, familiarity and resilience. Residual risk remains around system reliance, data quality, user adoption, and potential service disruptions, although these are reduced through higher service levels and broader system integration.</p>
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			4.0
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987	S7(2)(h) LGOIMA 1987
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	Nil

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
*Cost per rating unit <i>(GST exc)</i>	Nil	S7(2)(h) LGOMMA ...	S7(2)(h) LGOMMA ...

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

Business Support Role (Tier 3)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i>	Business support functions are delivered alongside other operational commitments of two FTE GEMO staff.	Engagement of temp agency for additional business support for up to 20 hours per week.	Establishment of a dedicated 0.5 FTE Business Support role within GEMO to provide structured, consistent support across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governance (CEG and Joint Committee). - Support coordination (e.g. NZRT, planning, engagement initiatives). - Operational commitments.
Advantages	No additional costs.	Provides flexible, short-term capacity to manage administrative workload peaks. Lower cost and reduced long-term commitment compared to a permanent role. No leave or non-productive overhead – all paid hours translate directly to output.	Frees up technical and strategic staff to focus on core CDEM functions. Improves efficiency and consistency of business processes. Strengthens executive support and reporting quality.
Disadvantages	Growing administrative burden impacting delivery.	Limited continuity and organisational knowledge due to temporary nature. Ongoing need for onboarding and supervision. Not suited for governance, or complex support functions.	Increased financial commitment.
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i>	Strategic risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of structured business support constrains delivery of strategic priorities and executive requirements. Operational risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical staff diverted from core functions to administrative tasks. Financial risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inefficient use of higher-cost staff for lower-value administrative work. 	Financial risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing cost commitment. Delivery risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Temporary support may not be sufficient within same hours allocation of a FTE to meet ongoing or peak workload demands. Operational risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of continuity impacts quality and consistency of outputs. Sustainability risk	Financial risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing cost commitment for a permanent role. Residual risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some dependency on a single role, though significantly reduced compared to status quo.

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Risk Statement	Inability to meet increasing expectations under legislative reform.	<p>- Reliance on temporary resourcing creates ongoing churn and inefficiency.</p> <p>Temporary business support improves short-term capacity but provides limited continuity and organisational knowledge. This creates operational and delivery risk, with potential inefficiencies arising from repeated onboarding, reduced output consistency.</p>	There is a system-level risk that establishing a permanent business support function creates an ongoing dependency on sustained funding and a single role; if funding continuity or role coverage is not maintained, this may result in reduced efficiency, loss of organisational knowledge, and renewed diversion of technical staff from core functions.
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			3.8
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	\$52,000 annually	\$58,870 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	1
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc) <i>The proposed approaches vary significantly in the scale of stakeholder engagement. Kiwi Consulting proposes a highly comprehensive model, with an estimated engagement of up to 700-750 participants across governance, operational, and functional roles through a combination of interviews, group sessions, and a system-wide survey. In contrast, Sage Planning and Simplexity propose more targeted engagement</i>	Nil	\$0.23	\$0.26

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
<p><i>models, focusing on representative stakeholder groups to generate sufficient system insight while maintaining efficiency. These approaches are estimated to engage approximately 75-200 participants (Sage Planning) and 100-200 participants (Simplexity), reflecting a balance between coverage and analytical depth rather than full system saturation.</i></p>			

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

After Action Review / Coronial Costs (Tier 3)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
<p>Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i></p>	<p>After Action Reviews (AARs), lessons learnt processes, and any Coronial inquiry support are undertaken on an ad hoc basis, with no dedicated funding or provision.</p> <p>Costs associated with external reviews, legal advice, or coronial processes are managed reactively within existing budgets.</p>	<p>Establishment of a modest, planned provision for AARs and coronial-related costs.</p>	<p>Establishment of a dedicated funding provision, based on historic data to support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive AAR programmes for significant and complex events. - Independent or third-party reviews where appropriate. - Full legal supported participation in coronial or inquiry processes.
<p>Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i></p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p> <p><i>Supported by:</i> <i>CDEM Act:</i> <i>S17 Functions of CDEM Groups - responsible for ongoing capability and performance (through planning, coordination, and continuous improvement).</i> <i>s59 'must take all necessary steps to perform their CDEM functions and duties'.</i> <i>Coroners Act 2006 - requirement to participate in coronial processes where relevant - legal support to ensure rights are effectively exercised.</i></p>
<p>Advantages</p>	<p>No direct budget impact.</p>	<p>Provides planned, but limited, funding for AARs following moderate or significant events.</p> <p>Enables more consistent lessons learnt processes.</p> <p>Reduces need for reactive budget reprioritisation.</p> <p>Supports more timely review and</p>	<p>Enables comprehensive and consistent AAR programme across events.</p> <p>Supports independent/third-party reviews to strengthen credibility and assurance.</p> <p>Ensures appropriate legal support for Coronial inquiry processes.</p> <p>Enables lessons learnt to be identified for planning, capability, and system</p>

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Disadvantages	Reactive and constrained response to Coronial inquiry processes. Overspend of budget due to financial cost of AARs/legal support required for Coronial inquest.	improvement actions. Additional ongoing cost. May be insufficient for large/ongoing or complex events requiring extensive review or legal support.	improvement. Strengthens governance assurance. Higher financial commitment.
System Risk <i>Risk of not investing or investing</i>	<p>Strategic risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of structured learning limits continuous improvement and system maturity. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lessons identified are not consistently captured or embedded. <p>Financial risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unplanned costs from Coronial inquiry processes. <p>Governance risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited assurance that issues are identified, addressed, and monitored. 	<p>Delivery risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding may be insufficient to support large or complex reviews. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvements in learning occur but may not be fully embedded. <p>Residual risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some reliance on prioritisation of review activities. 	<p>Financial risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing cost regardless of event frequency. <p>Residual risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal, limited to low-likelihood, high-impact events of national scale (e.g. COVID-19 response), which may exceed budget allocation.
Risk Statement	Lack of dedicated funding for AARs and Coronial processes limits the ability to systematically learn from events, reducing continuous improvement, increasing exposure to unplanned costs, and creating governance risk.	A planned funding provision improves the organisation's ability to undertake AARs and respond to Coronial processes; however, funding constraints may limit the scope of reviews. Any additional funding requirements are likely to be met through reprioritisation of the existing work programme, creating trade-offs that constrain broader continuous improvement efforts.	A dedicated, ringfenced funding provision enables comprehensive After Action Reviews, effective participation in Coronial processes, and integration of lessons learnt, significantly reducing system, financial, and governance risk; however, residual risk remains in low-likelihood, high-impact events where review scope and cost may exceed planned provision.
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			3.6

Dimension	Status quo (used as baseline comparator)	Functional	Optimal
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	\$30,000 annually	\$50,000 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	Nil
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	\$0.13	\$0.22

* Based on 227,000 rating units.

CDEM Group Contingency Fund (Tier 3)

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
<p>Current state, service options, and preferred approach <i>i.e. what is currently in place, what alternatives exist, and the optimal model going forward</i></p>	<p>There is currently no dedicated contingency funding for regional response and recovery activities. Costs associated with emergency events are met reactively through reprioritisation of existing budgets post-event.</p>	<p>Establishment of a partial contingency fund (50% of optimal), providing a financial buffer based on historical cost patterns while acknowledging it may not fully meet demand for larger or concurrent events.</p>	<p>Establishment of a ring-fenced contingency fund, based on historical cost patterns, with clearly defined settings.</p>
<p>Statutory Alignment <i>i.e. how will assist in meeting our statutory obligations</i></p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation. CDEM Act: S17 Functions of CDEM Groups - Funding is part of 'readiness' and 'response capability'. A contingency reserve is an enabler of delivering s17 functions. s59 'must take all necessary steps to perform their CDEM functions and duties'.</p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation.</p>	<p>Not a requirement to meet legislation. Supports CDEM Act requirements by strengthening the Group's ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deliver s17 functions across readiness, response and recovery. - demonstrate financial preparedness as part of capability. - meet s59 obligations to take 'all necessary steps' to perform functions.
<p>Advantages</p>	<p>No direct cost budgeted.</p>	<p>Reduces immediate financial pressure following emergency events. Provides a limited degree of financial certainty and readiness.</p>	<p>Improves financial resilience and predictability. Smooths cost impacts across rating cycles. Reduces reliance on post-event reprioritisation and ad hoc decision-making. Provides transparency of funding approach. Reduces disruption to planned work programmes. Fund size must be actively managed to avoid over- or under-provisioning.</p>

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Disadvantages	<p>Defers spending only, does not reduce it.</p> <p>Reliant of GEMO staff capacity – diverts budgeted labour from planned work programmes.</p> <p>Reactive funding approach.</p> <p>Historical analysis demonstrates variable but often significant costs over the past 11 years, creating financial uncertainty, inconsistent impacts and disruption to planned work programmes.</p>	<p>May be underfunded relative to actual event costs.</p> <p>Ongoing financial commitment.</p> <p>Disruption to work programmes.</p>	<p>Requires higher ongoing financial commitment.</p>
<p>System Risk</p> <p><i>Risk of not investing or investing</i></p>	<p>Strategic risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Misalignment with long-term planning and risk-based investment approaches. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disruption to planned work programmes. <p>Financial risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High variability in costs creates budget shocks for councils. - Reliance on reactive funding and post-event financial recovery mechanisms. <p>Reputational / governance risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perception of inadequate financial preparedness. 	<p>Financial risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fund size may be insufficient to cover moderate to large-scale or concurrent events. - Potential for rapid depletion following a single event. <p>Operational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partial funding may still require reprioritisation resources, disrupting delivery of Strategic Group Plan work programmes. <p>Strategic risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partial alignment to historical cost trends limits effectiveness of the fund. - Inability to fully sustain planned strategic outcomes due to disruption from event-driven reprioritisation. <p>Reputational risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expectations of financial preparedness may not be fully met if the fund proves inadequate. <p>Residual risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued reliance on reactive funding for larger, prolonged or concurrent events, impacting 	<p>Financial risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing cost commitment and need to balance fund size with affordability. - Risk of over- or under-estimation of appropriate funding levels. <p>Residual risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Larger, prolonged or concurrent events may still exceed fund capacity.

Dimension	Status quo <i>(used as baseline comparator)</i>	Functional	Optimal
Risk Statement	Reliance on reactive funding, combined with absorption of costs through staff budget, creates financial uncertainty and disrupts planned work programmes. This reduces system resilience.	system resilience. A partial contingency fund (approximately 50% of optimal) improves short-term financial resilience; however, it may be insufficient for moderate to large, prolonged, or concurrent events. This results in continued reliance on reactive funding, which disrupts delivery of the Strategic Group Plan work programme and creates ongoing financial and operational risk.	A ring-fenced contingency fund based on historical data, significantly improves financial resilience. It reduces reliance on reactive funding and disruption to planned work programmes. Residual risk remains for larger, prolonged or current events that exceed fund capacity.
Assessment Priority Matrix Score out of 5			3.4
Financial comparison of options			
	Status quo	Functional Option	Optimal Option
Cost	Nil	\$78,500 annually	\$157,000 annually
Headcount (number)	Nil	Nil	Nil
*Cost per rating unit (GST exc)	Nil	\$0.35	\$0.69
		\$47,100 = \$0.21	

