

RNZ asked the 10 biggest employers in New Zealand by staff numbers, as ranked [here](#), in addition to Progressive Enterprises interviewed previously, the following:

- how many premises of any kind (eg stores, factories, warehouses) in which employees work, does your company have that were built pre-2011;
- how many of these premises have you had audited by a qualified competent engineer to ensure they are compliant with the relevant Standards re restraint of non-structural building elements, including NZS4219 and AS/NZS 2785 B1/VM1;
- RNZ requests a copy of the audit if possible.(No audits were provided).

Employers' responses:

1. Fonterra – “We have over 500 sites in NZ and the vast majority of the buildings on our sites were built before 2011.

Fonterra has always required that our buildings, including non-structural elements, comply with the requirements of the Building Act and meet relevant national or industry standards. Since the Christchurch earthquake, Fonterra has been reviewing our seismic risks and taking relevant steps to mitigate and address these risks in line with our health and safety and regulatory commitments. This is an ongoing process, and as such, in Q2 2017 we initiated a further review of the seismic work we've done to date (inclusive of structural elements, secondary structural elements and non-structural elements).”

2. Progressive Enterprises – Owner of Countdown supermarkets. They are auditing and fixing up all their stores, as reported by RNZ [here](#)

3. Fletcher Building – “Fletcher Building owns a variety of properties built before 2011 – many of which are manufacturing sites. The health and safety of our employees is a top priority. We have conducted an independent audit on all our New Zealand sites, both owned and leased. We are confident all our properties, which are habitable, meet building standards and our employees work in safe premises.”

4. Spotless Services – holds 400 major cleaning, laundry, food and other contracts. It told RNZ by phone that its staff generally work in other employers' premises, so those employers are responsible for their safety in a quake.

5. Defence Force – Owns 2394 buildings built before 2011.

“All buildings ... have and maintain a Building Warrant of Fitness Standard. ... All Have been considered within the wider sphere of the NZDF's national structural seismic resilience programme. Non-structural elements have been considered during physical inspections, and any deficiencies identified. While these buildings have not been separately reviewed under the 'restraint of non-structural building element' standards ... all ... are reviewed under NZDF Health and Safety programme. Where building or non-building elements have been identified as posing a risk, they have been remedied.”

6. Police – turned into an Official Information Act request, with the response date extended from late July to late August.

7. Carter Holt Harvey – no reply

8. Air New Zealand – no reply

9. ANZ – initially said many of its 220 buildings were leased “so the building owners are who you should approach for seismic information on those”. It said “since the Christchurch earthquakes we have exited many buildings that didn’t meet our seismic standards ... ANZ only occupies sites of a B-Grade seismic rating or above, or a C-grade where there is a remediation plan in place ... We have engineering reports on all of our sites and are currently validating them against the revised code and learnings from the Kaikoura earthquake.” It had landlords’ engineering reports peer reviewed or sought its own report and “w here a report has come back as earthquake prone [under 34% of New Building Standard or NBS] we have removed staff immediately from that building ... We don’t release our seismic reports...”

10. Auckland District Health Board – has 38 buildings built pre-2011, “11 fewer than when work on seismic resilience began in 1997 ... The works to date have focussed on the structural capacity of buildings. ... None of these buildings have been audited to determine the level of non-compliance with restraint of non-structural elements because the low risk seismic that Auckland DHB facilities enjoy is, firstly, actively managed ... Secondly, audit to this standard is very invasive and would risk an interruption to the delivery of patient care at a fiscal cost that we could not justify. We can advise that we have started a process to assess seismic restraint ... The first step was a preliminary review ... on the Auckland City Hospital site. This Found 59% of the critical assets to have ‘satisfactory’ or ‘moderate’ seismic restraint, with 40% having ‘poor’ restraint ... 1% was assess as ... ‘very poor’. The DHB currently has a major business case being prepared to remediate issues at both the Auckland and Greenlane sites. This includes seismic restraint ...”

11. Restaurant Brands – no reply.

Note: RNZ chose 2011 as a threshold year because, according to industry players, prior to the Canterbury quakes, non-compliance to the non-structural restraint rules was even more widespread - though it has improved only a little since, they say.