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Key Themes

- **Engineering Lifelines Groups – ‘similar but different’**
  - with the increasing maturity of ELGs, it is time to achieve greater alignment of activities

- **More effective involvement of national utilities is crucial**
  - In both regional ELG activity and at national level

- **Matching the information supply from ELGs (the ‘push’) with the need by Lifeline Utilities (the ‘pull’)**
Some Bigger Picture Developments Over the Past Two Years

- National exercises ‘Capital Quake’ and ‘Ruaumoko’

  - The dependence of end users on infrastructure is beginning to sink in!
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- Infrastructure Resilience programme
  - General view is that government should step up its leadership to move the resilience agenda forward
Engineering Lifelines Groups: Recap on Purpose

- Providing an **overarching layer to the risk management by individual organisations**
- Focuses on identifying the interdependencies and weak links at a **regional level**
Engineering Lifelines Groups: Recap on Context

- Regional scale emergencies involving more than one utility
- ELGs are voluntary, collaborative entities – not structured institutions with a mandate and accountabilities
  - ‘by utilities for utilities’
  - ‘Educate, Facilitate, Motivate and Advocate’
Engineering Lifelines Groups: Reframe the Objectives

i. Engagement amongst Lifeline Utilities, and between Lifeline Utilities and CDEM agencies

ii. Sharing of information on hazards, vulnerabilities, risk reduction and response arrangements

iii. Helping individual Lifeline Utilities improve their risk management (ability to continue to function)

iv. Helping the region reduce its infrastructure vulnerability and improve resilience
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Questions Abound …

From Engineering Lifelines Groups:

- Given all that we could do, what should we be focusing on?
- Should we have a structured 3 to 5 year work plan?
- If so, what would it look like?
- What is a good meeting format that we should be following?
Questions Abound …

From National Lifeline Utilities:

- How can we have greater interaction with other utilities in the various regions as part of our operational readiness?
- How can the key outcomes of ELG workshops and activities be exchanged more effectively?
Questions Abound …

From both Engineering Lifelines Groups and National Lifeline Utilities:

- Can ELGs work together more effectively on some projects?
Some Tips for ELGs for Making it Relevant

1. At meetings/workshops, maintain a balance of presentations/information out with general engagement opportunities (cross-talk)

2. Have a ‘show and tell’ update at least annually on resilience achievements (both mitigation and preparedness) – each utility to give a 3 min verbal summary
Some Tips for ELGs for Making it Relevant (continued)

3. Maintain a balance of activities between risk reduction (mitigation) and readiness for response and recovery (preparedness)

4. Take into account the regular flow of newcomers – revisit presentations by key utilities on their networks and the vulnerabilities
Some Tips for ELGs for Making it Relevant (continued)

5. Involve the Group Controller more!

6. Have meetings in EOCs

7. Involve critical facility end-users more (esp. hospitals)
   – Part of giving more consideration to the whole ‘through chain’
Some Tips for ELGs for Making it Relevant (continued)

8. Draw upon projects undertaken by other Groups
   eg. Fuel inventory (West Coast); Generator review (Auckland); Inventory levels (Canterbury)

9. Make sure Lifeline Utilities are involved in the forthcoming CDEM Group plan reviews and updates
Some Tips for ELGs for Making it Relevant (continued)

10. Be realistic in your expectations of input from national utilities
   - Seek to involve them in key workshops/development meetings

11. Encouragement for newer/ non-metropolitan Lifelines Groups to focus on the networks that link the cities and towns
   - Establishing the vulnerabilities of the regional linkages provides the platform for subsequent specific work within urban areas
Core Focus: Regional Risk ‘Hot-Spots’

Manawatu-Wanganui
Auckland
Wellington
Wairarapa
Marlborough
How the National Engineering Lifelines Co-ordinator Can Help

- Compile and circulate a quarterly summary of key points from ELG meetings, and relevant national sector meetings
- Keep in more active contact with national utilities
- Prepare a sample framework of a Workplan (for ELGs that are only nominally funded)
- Develop a listing of interdependency examples
Key Questions for Discussion

- What information/ inputs/ assistance do Lifeline Utilities need in order to progress their resilience work?
- What are some examples of inter-ELG projects with shared objectives and funding?
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Summary:
Just Keep the Focus on

Making it Relevant!

Relevant to:
- Providers – national utilities, local utilities
- End users – other infrastructure providers, critical facilities and the community
Key Questions in Identifying Projects

1. What do Lifeline Utilities need assistance with in order to progress risk reduction and readiness?
2. What are the region’s biggest infrastructure-related risks?
3. Can the ELG collaborative framework make a difference?
4. What are the implementation issues?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of lifeline utilities (and sectors) that would benefit from the project</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number and population of local authorities that would benefit (geographical parameter)</td>
<td>&gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The range of hazard categories that the project would apply to</td>
<td>&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which the impact of a hazard or risk would be reduced as a result of the application of the project outcomes (level of mitigation)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which the time to restore basic and normal levels of service would be reduced as a result of the application of the project outcomes</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The urgency of the issue (and potential for the risk to increase)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of lifeline utilities (and sectors) that would benefit from the project</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number and population of local authorities that would benefit (geographical parameter)</td>
<td>&gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The range of hazard categories that the project would apply to</td>
<td>&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which the impact of a hazard or risk would be reduced as a result of the application of the project outcomes (level of mitigation)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which the time to restore basic and normal levels of service would be reduced as a result of the application of the project outcomes</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The urgency of the issue (and potential for the risk to increase)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>