

# The Treasury

## Earthquake Commission (EQC) Act Review Submissions Information Release

### Release Document

January 2018

[www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/reviews-consultation/eqc/submissions](http://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/reviews-consultation/eqc/submissions)

Key to sections of the Official Information Act 1982 under which information has been withheld. Certain information in this document has been withheld under one or more of the following sections of the Official Information Act, as applicable:

- [1] 9(2)(a) - to protect the privacy of natural persons, including deceased people;
- [2] 9(2)(b)(ii) - to protect the commercial position of the person who supplied the information or who is the subject of the information.

Where information has been withheld, a numbered reference to the applicable section of the Official Information Act has been made, as listed above. For example, a [2] appearing where information has been withheld in a release document refers to section 9(2)(b)(ii).

In preparing this Information Release, the Treasury has considered the public interest considerations in section 9(1) of the Official Information Act.

**From:** [1]  
**Sent:** Monday, 7 September 2015 5:36 p.m.  
**To:** Submissions Eqcreview [TSY]  
**Subject:** EQC

You asked for public submissions:

I have three rental properties. Of these one I have not allowed EQC yet to touch. One property was “repaired” using EQC’s repair strategy by Fletchers EQR. The repair has failed and I am in discussions with the Head of EQR and the EQC Land Settlement Claims manager to address this, but only as a result of appearing in a newspaper article, otherwise I would have been ignored. I do not know how this will turn out. The third property has had its repair strategy designed by EQR engineers and is in the view of other experts whose very detailed identification of earthquake damage has resulted in a far more durable repair strategy. Another property we have followed the EQC repair strategy to the letter but found foundation elements using all the best techniques recommended by Fletchers and EQC likely to be problematic in the future. We intend to sell this as a “repaired” property.

1. EQC should not be involved in setting up a bureaucracy for a large scale disaster for dealing with residential claims. It had none of the experience of dealing with such matters and in my view it has duplicated much of the work required to be done and set up a massive data base in a poor manner. It should have far more liaison with the insurers, and attention to their insurance policy should be paid.
2. EQC’s standard of repair is poor. If the legislative standard results in such a standard of repairs then it must be changed. If it doesn’t then all structural repairs should be handed over to insurers who seem to have a more respectful idea of durability standards (well at least mine does, AA).
3. MBIE guidelines should not have been introduced for repairs. They should not have been produced in collusion with EQC. These two entities have colluded and the result is substandard structural repairs in Canterbury.
4. EQC should, whatever proportion of a claim it funds, be relegated to the status of reinsurer. The idea of EQC taking charge of an even larger proportion of claims is absolutely a disaster of epic proportions.
5. EQC should be prepared to take advice from the ground up, not the top down. It seems very little feedback from customers is actually broached.
6. It is great that EQC helped defend Geoffrey Robinson. EQC should take responsibility for its failings. In particular a failure to deliver clear reasons for decisions, a failure to review and request geotechnical advice separate from its structural engineers. It should be required to pay automatic stress payments to people who have been dealt with in the manner that is described in the appeal papers I have read for Mr Robinson.
7. EQC should have nothing to do with contents claims. What a waste of money.
8. EQC should have concentrated its energies on auditing claims as IRD would do, and perhaps immediate governmental disaster response. Setting up a behemoth style bureaucracy with requirement that every single person’s claim be assessed and reviewed numerous times on the basis one or two bad eggs may exist in the hundreds and thousands of claims is nonsense and results in far less appropriate targeted and economic oversight. As it is no one would be able to commit fraud because of the requirement to produce appropriate expert’s reports (which is expensive and time consuming).
9. More appropriately thought out policies early on would have been helpful. Too many expenses incurred on my behalf by Fletchers emergency or EQC or whoever that I had to pay for later were poorly done temporary repairs that achieved nothing but a massive bill for me.

Thanks

[1]