

SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM

MW CDEM Group Plan Review: Officer's Report

1. Information

- Reference number: 4107
- Submitter: Palmerston North City Council
- Date: 5 November 2025
- Officer: Matthew Putt, Senior Emergency Management Advisor; Strategy, Plans, and Reduction (Manawatū-Whanganui Emergency Management Group Office).

2. Purpose

To assess the submission for the Manawatū-Whanganui Civil Defence Emergency Management (MW CDEM) Group Plan and provide a recommendation to the Hearing Panel, as a sub-group of the MW CDEM Group.

3. Summary

Due to the larger number of recommendations made by the submitter, the submission, analysis, recommendations, and rationale are summarised in the table below.

Submission 4107 Analysis with reference to suggested edits to the MW CDEM Group Plan 2025-2030 for Hearing Panel consideration

Summary of Submitter Comment	Response/ Change	Staff Recommendation / Reasoning	Hearing Panel Recommendations
<p>Clarify that the Plan must be reviewed at least every five years but may be reviewed earlier following significant events or legislative change, and that any formal review requires public consultation under s 56 and s 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.</p>	<p>Change</p>	<p>The Group Plan is not a static document and will be updated throughout its lifecycle to remain current with the operational and strategic arrangements of the Manawatū-Whanganui Civil Defence Emergency Management (MWCDEM) Group.</p> <p>Clarification on Formal Review and Public Consultation In addition to ongoing updates, the Group Plan must be formally reviewed at least once every five years, or earlier if significant events or legislative changes occur.</p> <p>Any formal review will require public consultation in accordance with sections 56 and 83 of the Local Government Act 2002, ensuring that the community has the opportunity to participate in shaping the Plan. This reinforces transparency, accountability, and alignment with best practice across regional CDEM Group Plans.</p> <p>Recommend adding this to page 9.</p>	
<p>We suggest the Plan could more clearly connect the findings from the 2024 Lifelines Vulnerability Study in a lifelines section. It could outline how the region will coordinate between councils, lifeline utilities, and the CDEM Group to establish shared priorities, exchange information effectively, and plan for alternate routes or backup supply options. Enhancing this connection would reinforce coordinated planning and shared</p>	<p>Change</p>	<p>The 2024 Lifelines Vulnerability Study provides critical insights into infrastructure risks across the region. The Group Plan incorporates these findings to guide coordination between councils, lifeline utilities, and the CDEM Group. This includes establishing shared priorities, improving information exchange, and planning for alternate routes and backup supply options.</p>	

<p>understanding, contributing to more effective management of essential services during and after major events.</p>		<p>These actions support a unified approach to managing essential services during and after major events.</p> <p>Recommend putting this on page 10: Linkages to regional plans.</p>	
<p>Strategic Objectives are sound and well aligned; however, slight wording improvements could improve alignment with national direction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Manage risks’ to ‘Understand and manage risks to reduce impacts.’ • ‘Empower community resilience’ to ‘Empower and enable community-led resilience.’ <p>Objective 2 was sound. Our suggested adjustments for the other two would maintain the original intent while strengthening alignment with national terminology and the 4Rs framework. They also anticipate the direction of the forthcoming Emergency Management Bill, which is expected to emphasise integrated risk management, critical infrastructure resilience, and community-led recovery.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>The Strategic Objectives are intentionally concise and accessible, and we believe they already reflect the principles of the 4Rs framework and national direction. While we acknowledge the suggested changes aim to enhance alignment, we consider them unnecessarily complex at this stage. We will review the language once the Emergency Management Bill is finalised to ensure continued consistency with national policy.</p> <p>Recommend no change.</p>	
<p><u>Te Ao Māori and Treaty Alignment</u></p> <p>We support and endorse the strong Te Ao Māori focus and the prominent use of te reo Māori throughout the Plan. Feedback from our Māori Advisory and wider Iwi Māori function team and the wider iwi</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>We appreciate and acknowledge the thoughtful feedback provided by the PNCC team. Your insights are valued and reflect a deep commitment to clarity, cultural integrity, and partnership.</p>	

<p>network highlights an opportunity to clarify overlapping headings and strengthen logical flow.</p> <p>There are currently three separate ‘principles’ sections within a short span:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our Principles (Te Ao Māori principles) • Meeting the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi • Our Principles – Ō Mātou Mātāpono <p>To improve clarity please consider the feedback and comments from our team below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first set of principles are fine, they establish regional settings which are the most relevant to CDEM operations here, and we dont have any overt suggestions to change these or their position in the document (we are interested if they will get strong iwi endorsement from across the rohe). They flow naturally from everything beforehand however they could be more specifically titled to what they are which is ‘Iwi and Hapū Engagement Principles’. • The next set of principles we humbly suggest is actually not the best title therefore we recommend this section to be retitled ‘Meeting Our Responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi’ (instead of the current ‘Meeting the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi’). 		<p>Following a thorough internal and external review, our team is confident that the current structure and wording of the Plan appropriately reflect the principles of Te Ao Māori and our responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three ‘principles’ sections each serve distinct purposes and are contextually placed to support the logical flow of the document. • The existing titles, while similar in phrasing, are anchored in their respective thematic content and are clearly differentiated within the Plan. • The use of te reo Māori and English throughout the document is deliberate and respectful, supporting accessibility and cultural visibility. <p>We acknowledge the suggestion to retitle “Meeting the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” to “Meeting Our Responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.” While we understand the rationale, we believe the current title remains appropriate and recognisable within the broader emergency management and governance context.</p> <p>Recommend no change, however, we remain open to revisiting this in future iterations of the Plan, particularly in partnership with iwi across the rohe.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would address one of the three areas where the ‘principles’ headings currently overlap, improving clarity and flow. • We believe this approach is appropriate because as outlined above, CDEM expresses its regional engagement strategy principles up front – perfect. It then outlines very clearly and comprehensively in the next section titled ‘Our Responsibilities’ what specific accountabilities this represents for the regional CDEM team, followed by ‘How We Will Achieve This’. • This sequence creates a clear and logical flow — first setting out our iwi Māori responsibilities, then explaining how we will deliver on them in practice. It also helps to reduce confusion caused by having three separate Māori language-sourced ‘principles’ headings within a short span of pages, each with a different basis. • The phrase Meeting the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi may read as unusual - in contemporary Treaty language, we tend to speak of applying the principles to meet our Tiriti responsibilities. • Additionally, while the use of both te reo Māori and English throughout the document is appropriate, we believe this particular title should be in te reo Māori hence, ‘Meeting 			
---	--	--	--

<p>Our Responsibilities Under Te Tiriti o Waitangi’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finally, the third title ‘Our Principles - Ō Mātou Mātāpono’, appropriately follows ‘Our Vision – Tō Mātou Matakiteanga’ and ‘Strategic Objectives – Ngā Whaingā Rautaki’. These are on pages 20-21 and seem like they could be much closer to the front of the document. If these three were included earlier, it would add to the overall national context being upfront, which then shapes local settings. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other general comment on this section was the correction to ‘Maunga Ruapehu’ which should be corrected to ‘Ruapehu Maunga’. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge the suggestion to revise “Maunga Ruapehu” to “Ruapehu Maunga.” We have intentionally used “Maunga Ruapehu” in accordance with te reo Māori syntax and formal usage conventions which is widely accepted in iwi narratives and official documents.</p> <p>Recommend changing referring specially to “Maunga Ruapehu” to “Ruapehu” to simplify and acknowledge the relationships communities within our region have with him.</p>	
<p><u>Logistics and Operational Readiness</u></p> <p>Feedback from our logistics team highlighted several opportunities to strengthen regional readiness, particularly around supply chain resilience, logistics coordination, and resource visibility.</p>	<p>No Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge and appreciate the logistics team’s insights, which highlight important considerations for regional readiness. Logistics is indeed a critical enabler of effective emergency management. However, we note that under the CIMS framework, logistics and lifelines are distinct functions. While they intersect during response and recovery, they serve different roles</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Their observations identified potential gaps such as the absence of a defined regional logistics coordination model, limited contingency planning for critical supplies, and the need for improved tracking and inter-regional support arrangements. 		<p>and should not be conflated within the strategic structure of the Group Plan.</p> <p>The identified gaps such as contingency planning, supplier MOUs, and resource tracking are operational in nature and are best addressed through supporting sub-plans or standard operating procedures. Maintaining a clear separation between strategic coordination (as outlined in the Group Plan) and operational logistics arrangements allows for flexibility, continuous improvement, and alignment with national frameworks.</p> <p>Recommend no changing, but we welcome further discussion on whether a dedicated Group Logistics Plan may be appropriate to capture these operational elements in a coordinated and enduring way.</p>	
<p><u>Planning and Spatial Context</u></p> <p>Feedback from our Planning function noted several areas where additional context and clarity could strengthen the Group Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The One Plan was referred to as new document, however, it has been in place for over a decade, providing a long-standing environmental management framework for the region. Correcting this reference will avoid any misunderstanding. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge that referring to the One Plan as a “new” document was inaccurate. It has been in place for over a decade and provides a long-standing environmental management framework for the region.</p> <p>Recommend correcting this reference to avoid any misunderstanding and ensure historical accuracy.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may also be helpful to expand references to adjacent national reforms that affect emergency management—such as the earthquake-prone building system, Local Water Done Well (LWDW), and ongoing resource management reform—so the regional context is more complete. 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>We agree that reforms such as the earthquake-prone building system, Local Water Done Well (LWDW), and resource management reform may influence emergency management outcomes. However, these are territorial and sector-specific reforms that sit outside the core scope of the CDEM framework. While we aim to provide sufficient regional context, we must balance this with the need to keep the Group Plan focused, enduring, and aligned with its statutory purpose. These reforms may be referenced briefly where relevant, but detailed coverage is better suited to supporting documents or agency-specific plans.</p> <p>Recommend no change.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping key assets and overlapping service areas could improve spatial understanding. For example, aligning or illustrating variations between service boundaries (e.g., Police, St John, and territorial authorities). 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge the value of spatial understanding, particularly in operational coordination. However, mapping service boundaries (e.g., Police, St John, territorial authorities) is not within the strategic scope of the Group Plan. These variations are best managed by individual agencies through GIS layers and operational coordination tools. We encourage continued inter-agency collaboration to maintain and share these resources.</p> <p>Recommend no changes because Readiness Objectives 6 and 9 of the Group plan cover this recommendation.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updating references such as the ‘inland port’ to ‘Central New Zealand Distribution Hub’ (with a hyperlink to Te Utanganui-Central 	<p>Change</p>	<p>We accept the recommendation to update references from “inland port” to “Central New Zealand Distribution Hub” and will include a</p>	

<p>New Zealand Distribution Hub) would make the Plan more accurate and user-friendly.</p>		<p>hyperlink to Te Utanganui – Central New Zealand Distribution Hub to improve accuracy and user-friendliness.</p> <p>Recommend change as above.</p>	
<p><u>Other General Comments on the Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document was well rounded however, noted a lack of consideration around other heightened vulnerable communities such as youth. There was a clear focus in some parts on the elderly but not on others. 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge the observation regarding youth as a potentially heightened vulnerable group. While the Plan includes targeted references to older adults and other at-risk populations, we respectfully note that youth are not typically classified as a heightened vulnerable group within the emergency management framework.</p> <p>Youth vulnerability is generally addressed through age-based inclusion strategies, which are embedded in broader community engagement, education, and resilience-building initiatives. This approach is reflected in Reduction Objective 4(c) of the Group Plan, which commits to supporting inclusive community resilience initiatives that consider the diverse needs of different population groups, including youth.</p> <p>Youth are not typically classified as a heightened vulnerability group unless intersecting with other factors such as disability, poverty, cultural or linguistic isolation, or rural remoteness. In such cases, their needs are addressed through targeted strategies within broader inclusion frameworks.</p>	

		<p>We believe this objective appropriately captures the intent to include youth within broader resilience planning, without requiring separate classification. However, we remain open to exploring how youth-specific considerations can be further supported through operational plans, public education campaigns, or community-led initiatives.</p> <p>Recommend no changes – Reduction objective 4(C) of the Group Plan covers this recommendation.</p>	
<p>Appendix 1 – Proofreading, Formatting and Cross-Reference Notes</p> <p>The following minor editorial notes are provided to assist in final proofreading before adoption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check overall consistency of formatting, including headings, font sizes, and bilingual layout (ensure te reo Māori and English headings are styled uniformly). • Review page numbering alignment in the table of contents — a few references appear to be off by 1–2 pages. • Standardise capitalisation (e.g., Group Plan, Emergency Coordination Centre, Lifelines Utilities). • Ensure consistent use of macrons in te reo Māori words throughout. • Review internal cross-references to figures, appendices, and page numbers for accuracy. 	<p>Approve</p>	<p>We acknowledge and appreciate the detailed formatting and consistency checks provided. These are important considerations for ensuring the final document is polished and accessible. We confirm that the document will undergo a comprehensive proofreading process once all content changes have been finalised, which will include reviewing formatting consistency (e.g., headings, font sizes, bilingual layout), page numbering alignment, capitalisation standards, macron use in te reo Māori, and internal cross-references.</p> <p>We also note that hyperlinks and footnotes have been checked and are currently functioning as intended, pointing to the correct documents such as the National CDEM Plan and the CIMS Guide.</p> <p>These final refinements will be incorporated as part of the document’s quality assurance process prior to publication.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm that all acronyms are defined at first use (e.g., CIMS, ECC, LUC). • Check and/or add hyperlinks and footnotes – check they are active and point to the correct documents (e.g., National CDEM Plan, CIMS Guide). 		<p>Approve: Document proofreading by a professional before sending to the Minister.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 10: Verify the reference to HAZ-NH page 120; there is no page 120 in the current draft. 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>This is a reference to the one plan not the group plan.</p> <p>Recommend no changes.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 11: Cross-check, Figure 1 — currently cited as appearing on page 15. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>The cross-reference in the text on page 8 to be corrected. It should point to page 11, not page 15.</p> <p>Recommend pointing to page 11, not page 15.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 12: ‘What we do’ would it make more sense to put this after ‘Who we are’? 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge the suggestion to reposition the “What We Do” section after “Who We Are.” However, we believe the current structure is appropriate and purposeful.</p> <p>The “What We Do” section speaks to the functions and responsibilities of CDEM Groups nationally, providing essential context for understanding the statutory role and scope of civil defence emergency management. In contrast, “Who We Are” focuses specifically on the Manawatū-Whanganui CDEM Group, its composition, and regional leadership.</p> <p>By introducing “What We Do” first, the Plan establishes a clear foundation for the reader —</p>	

		<p>outlining the broader CDEM framework before narrowing in on our regional identity and structure. This sequencing supports logical flow and reinforces the connection between national expectations and local delivery.</p> <p>We believe this order enhances clarity and accessibility, particularly for readers who may be less familiar with the CDEM system.</p> <p>Recommend no changes.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 17: Note indicates blessing of ‘the new road’ – the name of the road would be helpful or rewording to indicate ‘a new road’. 	Change	<p>We acknowledge the suggested change from “the new road” to “a new road” and agree that this revision improves clarity. Given that the road name is not specified, and the focus is on the blessing ceremony itself, using “a new road” avoids implying prior knowledge and better reflects the intent of the image and accompanying narrative.</p> <p>Recommend either changing the text to “a new road” or naming the road. Option 1: “a new road” Option 2: name the road</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 24: Location names are blurry – increase font size and clarity of picture. 	N/A	<p>We acknowledge the feedback regarding the clarity of location names on page 24. HRC Communications are currently working on enhancing the image quality and increasing font size to ensure readability in the final version of the document. This will be addressed as part of the final design and proofreading process.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The diagram on page 14 is difficult to follow, could it be made simpler or provide an alternative. 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge the feedback regarding the diagram on page 14. However, we believe the current version is appropriately structured and visually clear. It presents key relationships and processes in a straightforward manner, consistent with standard emergency management diagramming conventions. The layout has been designed to balance simplicity with completeness, ensuring that core elements are represented without overwhelming the reader. That said, we remain open to minor refinements if needed during final design review and welcome any specific suggestions that could enhance clarity without compromising content integrity.</p> <p>Recommend no change to the structure although improve digital clarity.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 52: 'Get ready to get through' could be more appropriate as an appendix. 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>We acknowledge the suggestion to move the "Get Ready to Get Through" section to an appendix. However, we believe its current placement is intentional and appropriate. This section has been positioned alongside the regional hazard context to reinforce the connection between identified risks and practical preparedness actions. Relocating it to an appendix may reduce its visibility and weaken the impact of this message, particularly for readers who benefit from seeing preparedness guidance in direct relation to the hazards that affect the Manawatū-Whanganui region.</p>	

		<p>We feel that keeping this content within the main body of the Plan supports its purpose: to encourage proactive readiness and community resilience in a way that is timely, relevant, and accessible.</p> <p>Recommend no change.</p>											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 55: Suggest linking the challenges to the objectives. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>Below are two (2) options to link the challenges and objectives which could be inserted on page 55.</p> <p>Option 1: Add a Linking Table Insert a short table after page 55 or at the start of Part 4:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1055 730 1626 1166"> <thead> <tr> <th>Challenge</th> <th>Linked Objective(s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Cost of living increases</td> <td>Objective 7 (community empowerment), Objective 17 (inclusive recovery)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technology reliance</td> <td>Objective 12 (utilise technology), Objective 9 (forecasting & modelling)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aging population</td> <td>Objective 7 (community response planning), Objective 18 (inclusive recovery)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Climate change</td> <td>Objective 1 (risk reduction), Objective 17 (climate resilience in recovery)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Option 2: Add a Narrative Link At the start of Part 4, include a paragraph such as:</p> <p>“The strategic objectives outlined in this section directly respond to the challenges identified in Part 2 (pg. 55). For example, Objective 1 addresses climate change impacts through risk</p>	Challenge	Linked Objective(s)	Cost of living increases	Objective 7 (community empowerment), Objective 17 (inclusive recovery)	Technology reliance	Objective 12 (utilise technology), Objective 9 (forecasting & modelling)	Aging population	Objective 7 (community response planning), Objective 18 (inclusive recovery)	Climate change	Objective 1 (risk reduction), Objective 17 (climate resilience in recovery)	
Challenge	Linked Objective(s)												
Cost of living increases	Objective 7 (community empowerment), Objective 17 (inclusive recovery)												
Technology reliance	Objective 12 (utilise technology), Objective 9 (forecasting & modelling)												
Aging population	Objective 7 (community response planning), Objective 18 (inclusive recovery)												
Climate change	Objective 1 (risk reduction), Objective 17 (climate resilience in recovery)												

		<p>reduction, Objective 7 supports communities facing cost-of-living pressures, and Objective 12 leverages technology to enhance resilience.”</p> <p>Recommend changing to one of the two options given.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 53: ‘Learning from past events’ could there be an intro to bring clarity to this section. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>Recommend adding the following instructions to page 53:</p> <p><i>Learning from previous emergencies is essential to improving resilience and shaping future actions. This section highlights key lessons from recent events and explains how these experiences inform the objectives and activities in this Group Plan.</i></p> <p>COVID-19 Pandemic</p> <p><i>The pandemic highlighted the importance of integrated planning, strong partnerships, and flexible coordination structures. These lessons have informed objectives that focus on community empowerment, welfare delivery, and organisational readiness to ensure the region can respond effectively to prolonged and complex emergencies.</i></p> <p>Cyclone Gabrielle</p> <p><i>This example demonstrates how severe weather events can disrupt communities, infrastructure, and supply chains, reinforcing the need for strong readiness and recovery planning. The lessons from this event have shaped objectives focused on community empowerment, organisational resilience, and inter-agency coordination across the 4Rs.</i></p>	

		<p><i>How these learnings are applied</i> <i>Insights from these events have been incorporated into the strategic objectives and activities outlined in Part 4 of this Group Plan, ensuring that our approach reflects real-world experience and continuous improvement.</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 80: Readiness Objectives 6 – adding ‘Developing local CDEM plan’, ‘Centralised system for welfare needs’ 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>Readiness Objective 6 focuses on establishing and maintaining key relationships with CDEM partners to build emergency management capability and capacity across the 4Rs (Reduction, Readiness, Response, Recovery).</p> <p>This objective is fundamentally about partnership development, coordination, and capacity-building not about foundational planning or system design.</p> <p>The suggestion to include “Developing local CDEM plans” and “Centralised system for welfare needs” under Objective 6 is misaligned, as both initiatives are already addressed under Objective 5 (specifically 5.e and 5.f), which deals with strategic planning and system development.</p> <p>Including these under Objective 6 risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplicating content, which can confuse implementation and reporting Diluting the focus of Objective 6, which should remain on relationship-building and capability enhancement 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misrepresenting governance roles, especially when planning and welfare systems are already being led and resourced under separate objectives <p>To maintain clarity and strategic alignment, Objective 6 should focus on strengthening inter-agency collaboration, shared training, and coordinated readiness not on duplicating structural initiatives already covered elsewhere.</p> <p>Recommend no change.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 81: Readiness Objectives 7c and 8 are the same – is 8 a different objective? 	<p>No Change</p>	<p>While Readiness Objectives 7c and 8 share similar wording, they serve distinct purposes based on their target audiences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 7c focuses on <i>community-level response planning</i>, particularly within Local Authorities and rural communities. Its intent is to build relationships and improve hazard awareness among residents through localised engagement. Objective 8, although similarly phrased, shifts the focus to <i>sector-level planning</i>. This includes working with key functional sectors such as agriculture, health, education, and infrastructure to ensure coordinated readiness and hazard understanding across systems that support regional resilience. <p>This distinction ensures that both grassroots and institutional preparedness are addressed,</p>	

		<p>reinforcing a comprehensive approach to emergency readiness.</p> <p>Recommend no change.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 81: Objective 9 to include reference to ensuring TAs are appropriately resourced to do this. 	No Change	<p>Objective 9 aims to embed forecasting, modelling, and research across all hazards to improve risk understanding and decision-making. While Territorial Authorities (TAs) play a role in applying these insights locally, the responsibility for resourcing and enabling this capability should not fall solely to the regional level.</p> <p>Horizons Regional Council already invests significantly in hazard modelling and forecasting systems. In a decentralised emergency management system, TAs are expected to contribute to the operationalisation of these tools within their jurisdictions, including staff capability, data integration, and local application.</p> <p>To ensure equitable and sustainable implementation, TAs must be appropriately resourced either through their own funding or in partnership with national agencies to fulfil their responsibilities under this objective. Regional support should complement, not replace, local investment.</p> <p>Recommend no change.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 81: Objectives 7 and 10 could possibly combine as well as 9 and 12. 	No Change	<p>Strategic alignment: Objectives 7 and 10 share a common goal of</p>	

		<p>strengthening readiness but target different audiences. Objective 7 empowers communities and volunteers to respond and recover in ways that suit their needs, while Objective 10 champions organisational readiness through business continuity planning and capability assessments. Keeping them distinct ensures tailored strategies for grassroots resilience and institutional preparedness, while collectively building a stronger regional response network.</p> <p>Strategic alignment: Objectives 9 and 12 are complementary. Objective 9 focuses on embedding hazard intelligence through forecasting, modelling, and research, while Objective 12 leverages technology to enhance operational capability and information management. Together, they ensure decisions are informed by robust data and supported by modern tools, creating a smarter, more connected emergency management system.</p> <p>Recommend no change.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 83: Suggestion around ensuring processes are in place for integration of community and development of best practice process. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>Recommend the following change to Objective 14 that incorporates the reviewer’s suggestion and adds clarity:</p> <p>Current: Ensure processes and procedures are in place to enable an effective and timely transition to</p>	

		<p>recovery, while preparing to respond to further emergency events.</p> <p>Revised: Ensure processes and procedures are in place to enable an effective and timely transition to recovery, integrating community input and applying best practice frameworks. These processes should support continuous improvement and maintain readiness for subsequent emergencies.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 85: It seems to be an odd place for this graph. Could be earlier around Part 4 where it mentions CDCs. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>The diagram on page 85 illustrates the operational response structure under CIMS, showing how coordination occurs between national, regional, local, and community levels during an emergency. While Civil Defence Centres (CDCs) appear as one element in the Incident response layer, the figure is not specifically about CDCs it represents the broader operational arrangements.</p> <p>We believe its current placement under Operational Arrangements is appropriate, but we will add a clearer caption to avoid confusion, such as:</p> <p><i>“Figure X: Operational response structure under CIMS, including national, regional, local, and community coordination.”</i></p> <p>Recommend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not move the graph. 2. Add clearer caption: 	

		<i>“Figure X: Operational response structure under CIMS, including national, regional, local, and community coordination.”</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 89: Renaming for national consistency ‘Community Emergency Hubs’. 	No Change	<p>While there is currently no nationally consistent naming convention for these facilities, we agree that aligning terminology within our region will improve clarity and support future consistency. However, there is currently no standardised model in our region such as “Community Emergency Hub” model, instead we refer to any non-civil defence led community or welfare centre as “Community-Led”.</p> <p>We acknowledge the lack of consistency in community led approaches to welfare delivery in the region and have addressed this in Objectives 5 (c) and (d) in page 80.</p> <p>Recommend no change, although try to address this issue in Objectives 5 (c) and (d).</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 90: List is ambiguous on whose plans and documents they are e.g., local or regional. 	Change	<p>Recommend changing the supporting sentence at the top of page 90 to:</p> <p><i>Response arrangements and plans relevant to the Manawatū-Whanganui CDEM Group include:</i></p> <p><i>The following supporting strategies, plans, and operational procedures are developed and maintained at the Group level unless otherwise specified.</i></p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 92: Suggested to link back to objectives. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>Recommend adding a short sentence at the end of the introduction or as a closing line:</p> <p><i>“These training and exercising activities directly support Readiness Objectives 5 and 6 by embedding a standardised approach to readiness and strengthening relationships with CDEM partners. They also contribute to Objective 10 by enhancing organisational capability and Objective 11 by ensuring iwi participation in planning and delivery.”</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 94: Links to warning / monitoring alerts and should there be a hazards section here. 	<p>Change</p>	<p>Recommend adding in a short sentence at the start or end of the Warning and Informing section such as:</p> <p><i>“These warning and alerting systems are designed to provide timely information about hazards identified in Part 2 of this plan, enabling communities and agencies to take appropriate action.”</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendices: Ensure internal references to Appendix C – Response Matrix and other annexes are correct and complete. 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>We will review all internal references to appendices to ensure they are accurate and complete during the proofreading process. This includes confirming that references to Appendix C (Response Arrangement Matrix) and other appendices (A–E) align with the correct content and page numbers. Where necessary, we will update cross-references for clarity.</p> <p>Recommend review as part of the final proofreading process.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Page 111: Adding 'Council' to Local Authority names.	Change	Recommend updating the list on page 111 to include "Council" after each Local Authority name for consistency and clarity.	
--	---------------	--	--