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WE ALL KNOW MITIGATION IS COST EFFECTIVE …

‘It is generally accepted in the emergency management community that.

one dollar spent on mitigation can save at least two dollars in recovery costs

Figures from overseas experience, particularly in the UK, have indicated that, as much as eight recovery dollars may be saved for every one mitigation dollar spent.’

Robert McLelland
Commonwealth Attorney General 25 March 2011
Relief/Recovery: $27,364m in 13 years
Mitigation: $480m in 13 years
Large number of options

Competing objectives

Community expectation

Risk and uncertainty

Insufficient data / information

Lack of measurable criteria
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OBJECTIVES

1) To develop a **systematic and transparent approach** to sifting through, evaluating and ranking disaster and natural hazard mitigation options using analytical processes and tools.

2) To develop **prototype decision support software tools** that implement the above approach for three end-user defined case studies.
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MAJOR OUTCOMES (1)

1) Utilisation of a **systematic** and **transparent** approach to evaluating disaster and natural hazard mitigation options (e.g. infrastructure, land use, policy).

2) The ability to make **more strategic** and **less responsive** decisions in relation to mitigating the impact of disasters and natural hazards as a result of the availability of better information.
MAJOR OUTCOMES (2)

3) The availability of prototype decision support software tools for three end-user defined case studies to enable recommended options to be identified by sifting through and evaluating and ranking a large number of options).

4) A better understanding of the trade-offs between economic, environmental and/or social objectives for different mitigation options for three end-user defined case studies.
DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR ASSESSMENT OF POLICY & PLANNING INVESTMENT OPTIONS FOR OPTIMAL NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION

Holger Maier
School of Civil, Environmental and Mining Engineering, The University of Adelaide, SA