

Date/Time: Friday, 14 November 2025, 10.00am
Venue: Te Ao Nui – Huia Room - Palmerston North

MWCDEM GROUP PLAN SUBMISSIONS HEARING

HEARING PANEL

Chair:

Mr. Clive Manley (CEG Representative)
Mayor Michael Ford (Local Authority)
Mrs. Hollei Gabrielsen (MWCDEM Joint Standing Committee Iwi Representative)
Mr. James Lamb (NEMA)

Advisors:

Mr. Chay Hook (MWCDEM Manager)
Mr. Matthew Putt (MWCDEM Senior Advisor)
Mr. Ian Wilson (NEMA)

**Full Agenda is available on Horizons Regional Council website
www.horizons.govt.nz**

for further information regarding this agenda, please contact:
Rosa De Souza, 06 9522 800

Table of Contents

HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS.....	4
Annex A - Schedule Of Submitters	7
Annex B - Public Submissions To Be Heard.....	8
SUBMISSION 1	8
SUBMISSION 2	9
SUBMISSION 3	14
SUBMISSION 4	15

HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the schedule of submitters who wish to speak to their submission to the Manawatū-Whanganui Civil Defence Emergency Management (MW CDEM) Group Plan 2025 - 2030 Draft.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 A total of 10 submissions were received, including one (1) late submission.
- 2.2 The Hearing Panel, and a sub-committee of the MW CDEM Group, is being asked to accept the one (1) late submission.
- 2.3 At the agenda deadline, four (4) submitters have been scheduled to speak to their submission.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the MW CDEM Group Office recommends that Hearing Panel:
- (a) receives the information contained in this report, and the information contained in the Submissions contained in Annexes A and B.
 - (b) receives one (1) submission (Submission ID No. 4107) as late submission to the MW CDEM Group Plan 2025 - 2030 Draft.

4 FINANCIAL IMPACT

- 4.1 There is no financial impact associated with hearing submissions.

5 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- 5.1 Before making a civil defence emergency management group plan, a Civil Defence Emergency Management Group must:
- (a) give public notice, and any specific notice that the Group considers appropriate, of the proposal to make a plan; and
 - (b) specify in every notice given under paragraph (a) a period within which persons interested in the proposal may make submissions on the proposal to:
 - (i) the Group, or
 - (ii) a subgroup or committee of the Group; and
 - (c) ensure that any person who makes written submissions on the proposal within the period specified in the notice given under paragraph (a) is given a reasonable opportunity to be heard by the body to which the submissions are made; and
 - (d) make all written submissions on the proposal available to the public unless there is some good reason in law why it should not do so; and

- (e) ensure that the final decision in relation to the proposal is made at a meeting of the Group.
- 5.2 The period specified under subsection (5.1) (b):
- (a) must not be less than 1 month; and
 - (b) unless the Group otherwise directs, must not be more than 3 months.
- 5.3 To give effect to the consultative procedure outlined in subsections 5.1 and 5.2, the MW CDEM Group Office undertook public consultation from 30 September 2025 to 31 October 2025 and is providing the opportunity for submitters to speak to a Committee of the MW CDEM Group about their submissions at a hearing session on 14 November in Palmerston North. Microsoft Teams link is available at this hearing for those who are not able to attend in person.
- 5.4 Consultation on the MW CDEM Group Plan 2025 - 2030 draft has been widely advertised throughout the region to promote awareness and encourage participation. This has included:
- i. Media releases to regional media at the beginning and end of the consultation period.
 - ii. A summary of the consultation process was included in the Across the Region newsletter sent to all households in the region (and via the e-newsletter database).
 - iii. Social media posts.
 - iv. Emails to key stakeholders.
- 5.5 The public could access the consultation document, the submission form, and the supporting information via the 'have your say' website, and in hard copy from offices.

6 BACKGROUND

- 6.1 When a Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan has been in operation for 5 years it is required by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 to be reviewed.
- 6.2 The review of the current Group Plan (2016 – 2021) review began in 2021 and focused on the Hazard review. This Group Plan review was put on hold due to the uncertainties surrounding the development of a new Emergency Management Bill. In April 2024 the Government informed they would no longer be progressing the new Emergency Management Bill in its current form and subsequently the MW CDEM Joint Standing Committee approved the reinstatement of the Group Plan review in June 2024.
- 6.3 The Group Plan must align with national legislation and guidance and any change to these has the potential to impact on the Plan outcome. There is a significant review of New Zealand's Emergency System currently underway, the end state for this review being a fit for purpose Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act.
- 6.4 There have been three significant pieces of Emergency Management System Reform work produced to date:
- (a) Government Inquiry Report into the Response to the North Island Severe Weather Events.
 - (b) Government Response to the Report of the Government Inquiry into the Response to the North Island Severe Weather Events.
 - (c) Discussion document – Strengthening New Zealand's emergency management legislation (April 2025)
- 6.5 Due to the ongoing Emergency Management review process and the forthcoming re-write of the CDEM Act, the Group Plan review has aligned with the National Disaster and Resilience

Strategy (NDRS). This is a ten-year plan which outlines the vision and long-term goals for Civil Defence and Emergency Management in New Zealand. The project team will also reference the documents and reports being produced to shape the future of Emergency Management in New Zealand, as these will be the founding documents of the new Emergency Management Bill.

- 6.6 The purpose of the Group plan is to enable effective, efficient and coordinated CDEM delivery at a Group level. The outcome of the project will be to have a fit for purpose in date MW CDEM Group Plan which aligns with national legislation and guidance, which represents our regional communities.

7 TIMELINE / NEXT STEPS

- 7.1 Deliberations for the MW CDEM Group Plan 2025 - 2030 draft are scheduled to be held on 14 November 2025.
- 7.2 A Joint Standing Committee meeting for adoption of the MW CDEM Group Plan 2025 - 2030 is scheduled to occur on 2 December 2025.

Matthew Putt
SENIOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ADVISOR

Chay Hook
MANAGER EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

ANNEXES

Annex A - Schedule Of Submitters

Annex B - Public Submissions To Be Heard

Annex A - Schedule Of Submitters

Speaker	Location	Submission number	Timeslot
Jonathan Procter	Horowhenua	4103	10:30am – 10:45am
Kaike Kereopa	Ruapehu	4101	10:45am – 11:00am (via Teams)
Kevin Wilkie	Whanganui	4106	11:00am – 11:15am
Kim Coates	Manawatū	4098	11:15am – 11:30am (Declined)

Annex B - Public Submissions To Be Heard

SUBMISSION 1

Submission ID: 4098

Date of Submission: Oct 01, 2025, 09:51 AM

Name: Kim Coates

Email: [REDACTED]

District: Manawatū

Speak to Submission? Yes

Submission:

"I would like to see two additions at the local council level:

One - offer residents a discounted water supply tank. Other council have done and are doing this. They buy in bulk and pass that saving to the resident costing little to none to council, whilst giving residents the option and encouragement to have a personal clean water supply in an emergency. Being were a rural, flood prone area this would relieve town water supply in emergencies

Two - consult with the local disabled community and emergency services to ensure all disabled/deaf residents have the support they need. Ensure local services have contacts and details, where appropriate, to assist those who cannot assist themselves in emergencies."

SUBMISSION 2

Submission ID: 4101

Date of Submission: Oct 04, 2025, 12:43 PM

Name: Kaike Kereopa

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

District: Ruapehu

Do you want to speak to your submission: Yes?

Iwi/Hapū/Marae: Maniapoto / Tuwharetoa / Paerangi / Uenuku Land Administration Ruapehu

Submission:

"My consistent engagement with Horizons has been met with all sorts of run around, in regards to who I should consult with over this 2025 year, thanks to a staff member who tried his hardest to engage me with the right person, sadly never eventuated.

This is very concerning for me and I do not intend on letting this matter be dissolved in anyway by a Crown department. Climate change continues to do it's utmost to impact what little whenua we still hold, but those powers to be need to ensure we as tangata whenua has the support & resources to do what we need to as kaitiaki.

I have a submission for you but I intend on elaborating this further in my brief of evidence for the Wai 3450 Inquiry."

https://haveyoursay.horizons.govt.nz/download_file/1273

Submission to the Emergency Management Bill Review (2025)

Na Kaike Kereopa ahau

Whenua Maori Matanga

Wahine Toa, Lead Claimant, Constitutional Advocate

CIMS Level 3 Certified

Rohe: Taumarunui, Taringamotu me Ongarue nga awa, Tuhua te Maunga.

04/10/2025

1) He Kupu Whakataki/Executive Summary:

This summary outlines urgent concerns regarding erosion-prone whenua, blocked river access and the disestablishment of local river committees. As a certified level 3 Emergency Responder and Uri of the whenua, I call for the removal of systemic barriers that undermine kaitiaki leadership and emergency readiness.

2) Nga Take Matua/Key Issues:

Te Hoha o Te Awa/ River Erosion

The river is worsening, with photo evidence captured. Leaseholder's reluctant to intervene due to council regulations that prohibit debris removal.

Te Aukatinga o te Ara/ Blocked Access

Road access is compromised, posing risks to whanau and emergency responders. Horizons has not provided a recovery plan under the CDEM framework, around my whenua.

Te Whakakore i te Komiti Awa/ Disestablished River Committee

The local river committee was disestablished, and funding for kaitiaki roles withdrawn – breaching Te Tiriti and resilience principles.

3) Nga Tutohu/Recommendations

Amend council regulations to allow debris removal and awa protection.

Support certified level 3 Maori responders to participate in regional planning, more so those that know the area, awa and whakapapa to the whenua.

Prioritize erosion-prone whenua in Horizons' hazard strategy

Embed kaupapa Māori frameworks into resilience planning

Consultation first and foremost with tangata whenua of the whenua in question, not next door or down the road whanau, not those listed on your go to contact list, Hapu/lwi representatives do not speak for me, Pou Kuia, Pou Matua and Whanau Roopu.

He Kupu Whakakapi/Closing Statement

I am a Uri of the whenua, a kaitiaki, and certified level 3 emergency responder. I urge the review panel to honour Maori Knowledge, support Uri to protect our whenua, and remove the regulatory barriers that prevent rightful action.







SUBMISSION 3

Submission ID: 4103

Date Submitted: Oct 21, 2025, 02:11 PM

Name: Jonathan Procter

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

District: Horowhenua

Would you like to speak to your submission: Yes In-person

Submission:

"I do not agree with aspects of the draft Group Plan.

The natural hazards components and analysis in the Group do not provide the detail needed to quantify risk. The classifications are in my opinion, qualitative at best. The assessment of risk should be based on either recurrence rates assessed with past impacts detailed to determine risk or based on the probability of recurrence with a potential impact of lives lost or economic impact similar to that outlined in the ""Briefing to the Incoming Minister for Emergency Management and Recovery (NEMA) 2023; Annex 3"". All parts of the natural hazard descriptions seem qualitative with a lack of detail to actually calculate risk.

I do not agree with the comments/note on page 41 with respect to Ruapehu Volcano. The comments diminish the future impacts of a volcanic eruption. The past 1995-1996 eruptions nationally caused a significant economic impact of ~\$100 million, a much greater impact than many of the other natural hazards experienced by Horizons. Lahars from Ruapehu Volcano have also resulted in 151 lives being lost, which is nationally significant. The secondary and flow-on effects from a volcanic eruption of Ruapehu will have not only regional but national impacts and should not be seen as simply a local issue. This ideology of seeing a hazard as simply being local is contradictory to all over-riding aspirations of CDEM/Risk/DRR legislation and policy. If one of NZ's most active volcanoes is considered a local problem, then why isn't each other's hazard considered in that aspect? Tsunami only impacts coastal communities; earthquakes (by similar logic) should only impact those near faults, and the Hikurangi Scenario should only impact the East Coast of NZ. Volcanic eruptions should be assessed as a much greater risk.

I am also confused why the Hikurangi Margin scenario is considered a separate natural hazard. This is, at its simplest, only a scenario and a subset of earthquake and tsunami hazards. While the magnitude of the event may be high, the probability of the event is most likely low. The assessment does not provide details that would indicate it as a new type of natural hazard that should be assessed separately.

I would also like to see the role of Marae included in the group plan alongside other key recovery/relief/community organisations."

SUBMISSION 4

Submission ID: 4106

Date Submitted: Oct 31, 2025, 05:00 PM

Name: Kevin Wilkie

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

District: Whanganui

Do you want to speak to your submission: Yes In-person

Submission:

"I support the draft Group Plan.

I believe that the plan would benefit with some strengthening in regard to digital solutions that support Emergency Management and, in particular, to have some tweaks made to the Group Plan that outline support for the establishment of an Urban Digital Twin [UDT] for the region. The main benefits of UDT's for Emergency Management are detailed in the attached overview. In addition, a key component for the creation of UDT's is to have a region wide LiDAR dataset so the Group Plan should also advocate for the completion of the LiDAR datasets for the region.

Support for adding these tweaks to the Group Plan is laid out in the recent Report of the Government Inquiry into the Response to the North Island Severe Weather Event.

An issue identified in this report was that there was a major disconnect between communities and emergency management agencies. Community members felt their efforts to support their communities were made necessary due to a failure of the official emergency response. Emergency management agencies saw the community response as a key part of the official emergency response.

The report's recommended shift was to put people and their communities at the heart of emergency management. A UDT would be an excellent tool to support this shift.

The draft plan already has a reference in this general area on page 13 where Investment in Digital Infrastructure is listed as one of the Government's recommended areas of response to the Inquiry."

https://haveyoursay.horizons.govt.nz/download_file/1275

AI Overview of the use of Urban Digital Twins for Emergency Management

Urban digital twins are used for emergency responses by providing real-time situational awareness during an event and for pre-disaster preparedness through simulations and training. They integrate various data streams like real-time traffic, building layouts, and sensor data to improve resource allocation, coordinate efforts, and train emergency personnel in high-risk, virtual scenarios. This approach helps cities respond more effectively to disasters, manage public health crises, and plan for future risks.

During an emergency

Real-time awareness: Digital twins use live data from sensors, social media, and satellite feeds to give a dynamic, real-time view of an unfolding disaster, such as a flood, fire, or earthquake.

Optimised resource allocation: By analyzing data on building layouts, population density, and traffic, digital twins can guide emergency responders to the most affected areas and help coordinate resource deployment for maximum efficiency.

Coordinated response: They facilitate better collaboration between different agencies by providing a common, up-to-date operational picture for all stakeholders.

For preparedness and training

Disaster simulation: Digital twins allow cities to simulate various disaster scenarios to test and optimize emergency plans, identify vulnerabilities, and predict potential impacts.

Training and readiness: They provide realistic, virtual training environments, such as using VR headsets to immerse firefighters in high-risk situations without any actual danger. This can also be used for public health emergencies to simulate resource needs and test response measures.

Long-term planning: By simulating different scenarios, digital twins help planners prepare for long-term risks, like the effects of climate change, and inform decisions on infrastructure and policy changes.

Public health management: They can predict public health risks by monitoring data and can be used to manage and coordinate the surge capacity of healthcare systems during an epidemic or other public health events.