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What's the problem and what needs fixing?

There are various ways to define what the problem “really” is (and therefore what needs to be done about it, how and by who).

Inclusive governance

Community engagement

The policy cycle

1) Agenda setting
2) Formulation
3) Implementation
4) Evaluation
WHERE TO FROM HERE?

1. Be more **specific about meaning**
2. Engage with civil society on big sector-wide issues
3. Consider involving citizens in problem identification and definition **before** solutions are formulated.

Source: Nathan Maddock, Bushfire CRC
NON-TRADITIONAL VOLUNTEERING
OBJECTIVES

1) Identify how non-traditional emergency volunteering contributes to community resilience
2) Identify ways EM agencies can support non-traditional volunteering
3) Develop and evaluate more inclusive emergency volunteering models
EXPECTED OUTCOMES

1) Identification of pros/cons of engaging non-traditional volunteers
2) Practical guidance on engaging with non-traditional volunteers and volunteer-involving organisations
3) Development of new/more inclusive approaches/models for emergency volunteering
4) Assessments of legal implications
5) Adoption of more inclusive and flexible volunteer models by relevant EM agencies
MORE INFO

Project web page: google “bushfire sharing”

- Power to the people webinar
- BCRC Firenote 128

Project web page: google “bushfire non-traditional”

- Project newsletter
  Email joshua.whittaker@rmit.edu.au or blythe.mclennan@rmit.edu.au to sign up
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