

Minutes

SAR Consultative Committee Meeting

Wednesday December 1 - 9.30 am

MoT Boardroom

Attendees: Stuart Crosbie (3C Consulting), Chris Raley (RCCNZ), Kevin Rangi (Coastguard Federation), Laurie Gallagher (LandSAR), Geoff Logan (Police), Mike Cuddihy (DOC), John Cooper (ARNZ), Roger Pringle (Defence), Brian Purdie (AREC), Peter Garnett (CAA), Ian Nicholson (Mountain Safety Council), Jon Graham (SAR Sec), Lyn Turner (MOT)

Apologies: Glen-Marie Burns (MOT), David Waters (Ambulance NZ)

Introduction and welcome:

Jon welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for everyone to introduce themselves.

Jon apologised for the late release of the documents for the meeting and explained the tight timeframe and reduced resources available to work on this project. He stated that the Business Case needs to be to the Treasury by the end of January 2005.

Jon then gave a brief run through of some basic statistics from 2001 & 2002, showing an increasing number of deaths and injuries in SAR incidents, supporting the need for increased funding.

Review Part 1 report to SAR Council: Risk assessment results

Stuart began the meeting by thanking everyone who put time into preparing the draft documents. He reiterated that they were a “work in progress” and by no means complete at this stage. He stated that attempts had been made to consult all parties who it was felt needed to contribute in some way. He stated that there were a further 2 Appendices to be added to Part 1.

Part 2: Strategic Funding Assessment - Feedback on overall approach

Stuart stated that Part 2 was addressing all the risks except education. The main thrust of Part 2 was three fold:

- Understanding of what SAR Region is – Primary and Secondary responders
- Developing Service Level Agreements with the agencies concerned
- Two types of expenditure – one off expenditure to close the gaps and then recurring expenditure for ongoing work

Stuart asked for comments on the part 2 documents. Comments included:

- Approach generally good although there are still concerns over the belief that because some provision of services has been voluntary in the past and currently, it should not necessarily remain so into the future.
- Some good shape and framework being provided across resources and entities providing SAR services.
- Some concern expressed that resourcing and budgeting was being done around existing conditions rather than looking at a needs analysis for the future.

Stuart then introduced Figure 1 – Partitioning of SAR Regions. After discussion and agreement some additions and alterations were made to the matrix. The issue of some other resources not being mentioned in the matrix was raised and it was thought that maybe these could be listed in an appendix as “vessels of opportunity”

Service Level Agreements with Coastguard, Aviation and LandSAR were discussed.

Two main issues for the NZ SAR Sector were identified as being Beacons and Public Education.

Discussion included:

- the huge costs involved in purchasing the new 406 beacons
- the fact that 65% of RCCNZ activity relates to EPIRBS
- target is to move from 5% beacon usage to 10% and change beacons from 121 to 406 and begin a registration system
- less than 5% of boaties actually have beacons
- Interagency Beacon Transition Task Force has been reconstituted and will meet on 16th December
- suggestion that some sort of ability to hire beacons could be made available for the non regular trampers and other infrequent users in order to increase usage

Stuart introduced another matrix using SAR incidents in which people died with a view to devising a number of lives that could have been saved if a beacon had been used or if education had been better. It was put together by Geoff Logan. Stuart stated that in conducting this exercise it became apparent that this was workable for beacon usage but was more difficult for public education.

Co-ordination of SAR Activities was discussed. The document looks at suggesting that all “green zone” activities from Figure 1 were Police (excluding airways) and all “blue zone” activities were RCCNZ. Lots of discussion on this and views were varied.

Appendix G Force Field Analysis was discussed. Geoff gave an overall view from Police that there is confusion over what constitutes class 2 and class 3 activity. He stated that Police are currently in talks with RCCNZ with a view to achieving agreed definitions.

The final item discussed was the SAR Secretariat Involvement and Resourcing Requirements. It was stated that for the Secretariat to function in a meaningful way it would need the equivalent of 4 FTEs – 1 Secretariat Manager, 1 Technical Manager, 1 Policy Manager and 1 Administrator. It was noted that either the Technical Manager or Policy Manager role could be filled with staff seconded one or two days a week from either of the two co-ordination agencies.

General Business

There was no general business discussed

The meeting closed at 12.30pm