

# Community Reference Group meeting notes

<b>Date</b>	13 February 2019
<b>Time</b>	4.00pm – 6.10pm
<b>Venue</b>	Christchurch Community House, 301 Tuam Street
<b>Attendees</b>	Dame Silvia Cartwright (Inquiry Chair), Peter Beck, Mel Bourke, Leanne Curtis, Lucy D'Aeth, Ali Jones, Tom McBrearty, Garry Moore, John Patterson, Ken Pope, Cam Preston, Evan Smith, Deon Swiggs, Dallas Welch, Adair Bruorton
<b>Chair</b>	Dame Silvia Cartwright, Inquiry Chair
<b>Minute taker</b>	Adair Bruorton, Inquiry Secretariat

## Welcome and apologies

---

- Dame Silvia Cartwright, the Inquiry Chair, welcomed attendees and thanked them for their time and willingness to be a member of the Community Reference Group for the Inquiry.
- Attendees introduced themselves with a brief background to their involvement in EQC-related and post-earthquake advocacy and activities.
- An apology from Mike Coleman was noted, as he has decided he is unable to take up a place on the Group.
- It was noted that the Secretariat will continue to seek a recommendation from Ngai Tahu for a Group member to attend on their behalf.

## Chair's introduction, followed by discussion

---

- Dame Silvia provided an overview of the Inquiry's scope, as set out in the Terms of Reference and the inquisitorial approach she is taking to seeking information. She talked about the importance of the Community Reference Group's advice to her in ensuring appropriate and useful opportunities for claimants and citizens to submit and share their experiences and views that are relevant and within the Inquiry's scope.
- Discussion followed, broadly around how and with whom the Inquiry needs to engage with.

### *Whiteboard notes from table discussion*

- Transparency throughout the Inquiry process is crucial.
- It's really important for people to be able to share their stories and experiences using a range of channels (e.g. written, oral, video clip).
- But consideration needs to be given to possible risks of re-traumatising people by asking them to share their experience.

- Professional well-being support needs to be on-hand for submitters who may be troubled by the process of recounting their experiences. (Is there funding to support this?)
- The Inquiry needs to be about *understanding* people's experiences, not just hearing them.
- There also needs to be opportunity for people to propose suggestion for changes to EQC/systems.
- Has consideration been given to live streaming of public forums?
- People's stories should be made publicly available (though ensuring confidentiality of information for people who wish for this needs to be able to be guaranteed).
- Analysis of people's experiences and feelings will be required.
- Likely themes that will emerge in people's stories of their experiences need to be identified: these could be used as question prompts to help submitters 'organise' their stories/submissions, and also used for analysing the information received?
- A bibliography of the quake stories already gathered would be a useful record.
- Three different components or phases of the Inquiry's role need to be considered:
  - Healing (cathartic role the Inquiry has – there's an expectation of and need for this, but it's not explicit in its terms of reference)
  - Reconciliation (not the role of the Inquiry)
  - Remediating (looking to the future).
- It's important for the Inquiry to talk with current and past EQC staff.
- Would-be submitters who have confidentiality clauses in place as part of settlement agreements with EQC or insurers will need to be mindful of constraints that may impact on what they can submit on.

## Conclusion

---

- The Group agreed to reconvene, as soon as possible, to brainstorm the questions and prompts that could be asked of submitters, to assist them in preparing their submissions. The Group will meet on its own, joined by 1-2 Secretariat members. Dame Silvia offered to attend but the Group is happy to do this exercise on its own.
- Dame Silvia thanked everyone for their contributions to the meeting and looks forward to receiving their feedback following the planned brainstorm.

## Actions for follow-up

---

	Date of meeting	Action	Responsible owner	Due date	Comments
1	13 February	Adair to send around typed up whiteboard notes	Adair Bruorton	14 February	
2	13 February	Adair to email Group members to find a date/time for the brainstorm session	Adair Bruorton	14 February	