

# Regional Hazards and Risk Management SIG: - *Strategic Issues*

SIG Research Strategy Workshop  
20-21 July 2017

# Hazards SIG – Strategic issues

- ❖ A national level natural hazards policy platform
- ❖ A national web-based hazards information portal
- ❖ Best practice nationally agreed definition of acceptable and tolerable risk
- ❖ High quality topographic (LiDAR) and bathymetric data
- ❖ Good quality social & economic risk assessment indicators in RiskScape
- ❖ Improved collaboration between research providers in BAU and response (incl a response mandate for NIWA?)
- ❖ Addressing of funding gaps (BAU in low income Regions, nimble funding for emergency response research)

# Hazards SIG – Work priorities

- ❖ Natural hazards national policy statement (NPS) development (with MfE)
- ❖ National disaster resilience strategy development (with MCDEM)
- ❖ Natural Hazards Research Platform priorities
- ❖ Resilience to Nature's Challenges RS&T funding rounds
- ❖ Envirolink-type fund for natural hazards
- ❖ Hazard information management:
  - National datasets development
  - Improving accessibility of LA practitioner and public uses
  - New research & tool development – raising awareness and transfer to policy & practice
- ❖ Managing re-development &/or retreat from high hazard areas
- ❖ Learnings from KHM & Canterbury earthquakes (Process as well as Natural Haz Info)
  - Pre-event collaboration between researchers and EM staff re management of research needs
  - Need for nimble research funding
  - Inclusion of non CRI researchers
  - Regional/national coordination of geotechnical consultants for large responses.
- ❖ Consistent application nationally of risk based approach to hazard assessment and management
- ❖ Progress being made in all of the above areas in regard to practice sharing. Timetables are otherwise determined by central government agencies that lead these programmes of work. Recent hazard events have added overall to both impetus and workload.

# From Murray Cave

Has Christchurch & Kaikoura made us lose sight of the “why” of Natural Hazards

1. It's all about reducing the number of fatalities & cost of future events
2. Natural Hazards is not a stand alone box. There are strong linkages between hazards & land use decisions (e.g the ECFP) & these impact on our natural & social environments. How to integrate with the Mauri Compass
3. The alignment between research providers & users (RC's, Communities) is orthogonal. We are still talking across each other.
4. Capacity There are skilled practitioners outside the CRI/University sphere who are cut out of the process.
5. The small regional/unitary councils are that homeless man on the street with the begging bowl seeking pennies. GDC NH strategy identified 47 areas of risk; cut down to 35. can internally fund 1 per year. The math is obvious. We need the equivalent of Envirolink for hazards.