Cluster: Governance and Institutional Knowledge

Project: Policies, Institutions and Governance of Natural Hazards

(The "PIGS of natural hazards" – project update and (almost) end of project report)

B&NH CRC RAF, Perth, 4/2017
Our mascot, Squeak: a **resilient** piggy, **sharing responsibility**. (... *soon available: need a project mascot?*)
The team:

- Michael Eburn, Lead Researcher) (Law, ANU)
- Steve Dovers (Fenner, ANU) (Cluster Lead Researcher)
- Karen Hussey (GCI, UQ)
- Jamie Pittock (Fenner, ANU)
- Anna Lukasiewicz (Law/Fenner, ANU)
- Caroline Wenger (Fenner, ANU – CRC’s first submitted PhD)
- Sue Hunt (CRC PhD, Fenner ANU).

- John Schauble, EMV: lead end user.
Update: Project theme #1

• What is ‘community’ and how can governments share responsibility with communities as well as individuals?

• Universal policy goal “shared responsibility” but widespread confusion (and cynicism?) over what it means – and, how policy can define and enforce shared responsibility.


-- a framework matching who (is responsible?), for what (actions?), and how (do we select the policy instrument to make it happen?).
The SR matrix (Lukasiewicz et al 2017)...

- **Who** might/should take “responsibility” – firms large or small, various agencies of the state, “communities” (no), households, heads of households, NGOs, local social institutions, etc?

- For **what** – warnings, numerous preparatory actions, coordination, relief provision...

- And **how** – statutory responsibility, incentives/disincentives, social sanction or expectations – **policy instrument choice** (many options).

- And, most importantly, can the **who** be held to account for their “responsibility”, how and by whom – how **hard** can the policy instruments we use be? Please discuss...
• How can insurers play a more active role in communicating risk and encouraging hazard mitigation?

• There are perversities in use of insurance as a policy tool, *per se* and in combination with other policy settings.


• Re fire, often argued that insurance could include assessments and vary premiums/coverage to encourage mitigation – would it be worth the effort for the companies? Please discuss...
Update: Project theme #3

• Is there a better process or institution for effective lesson sharing after natural hazard events?
• Following first phase work by Eburn and Dovers on litigation and limits to RC’s and other quasi-judicial processes (see previous reports and publications).
• Eburn currently in UK collaborating on post-disaster inquiry and restorative justice research.
• Paper presented by Eburn at IWF conference, Barcelona, to be presented at UK Emergency Planning College.
• CRC discussion paper out for comment—analysis of current post-event processes, and proposal of restorative justice-based processes.
• Will politicians, agencies, the media and angry public embrace civilized post-event lesson-drawing and reconciliation? Please discuss...
Other stuff that the CRC has helped happen, in and around our project themes...


- Eburn forthcoming papers for ASPI (‘Coordination of Federal, State and Local Disaster Management Arrangements in Australia – Do we need a Civil Contingencies Act?’) and for Risk Frontiers (‘Allowing fire affected communities to rebuild’).
Forthcoming, submitted, still being worked on...

- Lukasiewicz, Eburn and Dovers developing a framework/paper on the theme of ‘disaster justice’ (cross-project themes).
- Sue Hunt’s PhD proceeding.
- Hunt and Eburn paper under development ‘How can business share responsibility for disaster resilience’ (project themes 1 & 2).
- Publications arising from Caroline Wenger’s thesis on flood management.
- Whatever comes out of the restorative justice discussion paper and feedback (project theme 3) – Eburn paper at AFAC.
And what happens next?

• PhDs finish and go off and do Good Things.
• Michael Eburn continues with his research, blog, legal advice, etc.
• Steve Dovers joins the urban planning project, amongst other retirement hobbies...

• The scales fall off the eyes of governments all over Australia and they implement many of the excellent policy prescriptions developed by the team.
• (Which raises the issue of the uptake of policy research – Dovers paper at AFAC.)