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A motherhood statement is ... 

a "feel good" platitude, usually by a politician, about a worthy concept that few people would disagree with, without any specified plans for realisation.

... a good idea out of context?

There is a need for a new focus on *shared responsibility.*

"*shared responsibility* much talked about, but not consistently understood.”
- Feedback at Canberra RAF, Oct 2011

"What exactly is *responsibility*?... It all depends on the perspective and on the goals pursued." ¹

“How we define and frame problems will circumscribe our search for solutions.” ²
MY ELEVATOR PITCH

What?

- Investigating what shared responsibility means for emergency management from different perspectives

Why?

- To stimulate new ways of thinking about it and to support decision-making

Focus on sharing between government and ‘communities’
TODAY

- Project progress
- The latest research
- Research utilisation
Stage 1 - Concept review
- Review ways that responsibility-sharing issues are conceptualized in relevant research

Stage 2 - Stakeholder engagement
- Direct research towards policy learning needs (ongoing)

Stage 3 - Policy review
- Identify responsibility-sharing issues encountered in a range of sectors internationally, & the policy responses

Stage 4 - Australian case studies
- Investigate specific responsibility-sharing issues encountered in Australian fire and emergency management

Stage 5 - Synthesis
- Identify and evaluate alternatives to share responsibility in Australian FEM in the context of what we learn via Stages 1-4

Research program integration


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Groundwork | - Discussion paper on reviewing research for policy  
|          | - Journal paper on the VBRC view of shared responsibility                  |
| Stage 1 | Concept review                                                              |
|          | - Report on conceptual frameworks used in research                          |
| Stage 2 | Stakeholder engagement                                                      |
|          | - Various presentations, posters, communications material                    |
|          | - Blog - [http://sharingresponsibility.wordpress.com/](http://sharingresponsibility.wordpress.com/) |
| Stage 3 | Policy review                                                               |
|          | - Report on mechanisms used to shape how responsibility is shared           |
|          | - Journal paper comparing range of mechanisms                               |
| Stage 4 | Australian case studies                                                     |
|          | - Written account of stakeholder workshop                                   |
|          | - Report on challenges reflected in public submission to the VBRC          |
| Stage 5 | Synthesis                                                                   |
|          | ...                                                                         |
| Research program integration | ...                                    |
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LATEST RESEARCH

- Identified challenges for sharing responsibility reflected in public submissions to the 2009 VBRC
- Looking through ten different conceptual ‘windows’

What did fuel treatment issues ‘look like’ through different windows?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which particular parties’ decisions or actions contributed to causing the disaster?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“the deaths were directly attributed to lack of Fuel Reduction Burning and in particular to the &quot;dirty&quot; roadsides.”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landholder group, exposed to bushfire risk (EXP031G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts have been made to blame the &quot;Greenies&quot;, local government, insufficient fuel reduction and roadside vegetation ... These accusations have done nothing to address the real problems ....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual, exposed to bushfire risk (EXP57P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“some misinformed people are blaming the extent of the fires on the inadequacy of DSE cyclic bumoffs. What nonsense! Successive state governments have strangled DSE (and its predecessors) to such an extent that they can hardly perform a useful service.”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual, household directly affected (DH64P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who had the choice, control, and capacity to be responsible?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTESTING THE SOCIAL CONTRACT

How much government intervention is enough/too much?

“By allowing councils to dictate control over trees on owners properties they remove owners’ rights but then when there is a cost, the cost is imposed back onto the owners. Where is the legal right of the owners. If councils impose rules they should bare the responsibility!”
- Individual, member of the public (PUB017P)

What rights and responsibilities should citizens (living with bushfire risk) have?

“The existing system of bushfire fuel management close to residential areas is not adequate, ... This is not the fault of councils or government authorities who are doing their best within the limited resources the community provides to carry out their responsibilities. ... obligations of awareness and action to mitigate fire risk which are not normally part of the responsibilities of property holders or residents of property in less fire-vulnerable locations.”
- Individual, subject matter expert (urban planning) (SME027P)
QUESTIONING LEGITIMACY OF GOVERNANCE

Are bushfire governance arrangements legitimate?

“Weather, staff, resources and ecological requirements dictate how much will be burnt in any given year, not some Spring Street guesstimate based on the level of public hysteria.”
- Individual, member of the public (PUB51P)

Do people trust in the decision-making process?

“The single greatest flaw in Australia's response to wildfire has been the isolation of fire science and fire management from public view. ... Fire policy and science has evolved without scrutiny. Fire history has been forgotten.”
- Individual, subject matter expert (wildfire) (SME016P)
A MANY-HEADED BEAST
RESEARCH APPLICATION

- Stimulating new ways of thinking
  - About the problem as much as the solutions
  - Hard to measure but can have real impact
- A tool for ‘mapping’ shared responsibility
  - Being developed with end user input
  - Combining our research and program evaluation
  - Range of possible applications

Feedback on what kind of tool is needed?