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Evidenced Policy and Practice

Evidence = scientific evidence

Science facts are directly useful for action
qualitative evidence

Three case studies

- Flood risk, Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley
- Fire risk, Barwon-Otway
- Gamba Fire risk, Greater Darwin Area
Reality & Expectation
Mismatch leads to:

- Less efficient use of risk mitigation monies
- More stressful work conditions
- Less effective risk mitigation
Values & principles

Eg:

What is at risk?
What risk do we want to live with?
Who gets to decide and how?
Post-truth facts

To persist with approaches that only focus on the facts, is not to exclude values, but:

“the blind subjugation of some values over others, with those whose values are left out rejecting the other side’s ‘truth’ as merely politics by another name.”

(Jasanoff and Simmett 2017: 763)
Case study partners and participants

End user team:

Monique Blason (Department of Premier and Cabinet, South Australia); Don Cranwell (Metropolitan Fire Service, South Australia); Chris Irvine (State Emergency Service, Tasmania); Leigh Miller (Country Fire Service, South Australia); Ed Pikusa (Fire and Emergency Services Commission, South Australia); Dylan Rowe (Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, Victoria); John Schauble (Emergency Management Victoria, Victoria); Patrick Schell (Rural Fire Service, New South Wales)

The rest of the research project team:

Dr Christine Hansen (University of Gothenburg); Associate Professor Tara McGee (University of Alberta); Associate Professor Michael Eburn (ANU); Professor Stephen Dovers (ANU); Professor John Handmer (RMIT)

For more information see our BNHCRC project page under my name, ‘Jessica Weir’.

You can also contact me on j.weir@westernsydney.edu.au