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The approach

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>It’s a wicked problem</strong></td>
<td>We need to understand how the problems and solutions are framed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It’s a common problem</strong></td>
<td>We can draw lessons from other experiences with it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What do we mean by ‘shared responsibility’?
2. How do we understand the challenges for sharing responsibility?
3. Are there alternative ways of responding to the problems of sharing responsibility that we might not have considered?
4. Are any of them useful in Australian FEM context?

- **Stimulate new ways of thinking about goals and process of sharing responsibility**
The first year

Groundwork

- Australian context
- Conceptual foundations
- Methodologies to review research

Research stages

- Stage 1: Concept Review
- Stage 2: Stakeholder Engagement
- Stage 3: Policy Review
Australian context

- Royal Commission reframed shared responsibility away from emphasis on self-reliance of at-risk communities towards greater degree of responsibility for authorities

- Particularly when fire conditions are extreme and where vulnerable people are at risk

- Different assessment of where capacity for some aspects of risk management lies

Figure 1: The responsibility continuum for risk management
Methodologies to review research

- Lack of attention to the way literature reviews are carried out means they can reveal as much about the reviewer's views and interests as the status of current knowledge.

- Without awareness of how a literature review was carried out and what choices the reviewer made (and why), end users have no basis for evaluating the review’s quality, partiality or relevance for their own practical purposes.
Stage 1 concept review

- How does research understand challenges for sharing responsibility in collective risk management (and what to do about them)?
- Identified ten ‘master frames’
- A guiding framework for frame-critical analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master frame</th>
<th>The underlying challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social dilemma</td>
<td>Overcoming tensions between private, short-term gains and collective, long-term benefits in collective action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Normative standards</td>
<td>Establishing clear and appropriate moral and legal standards for determining obligations and assessing accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social contract</td>
<td>Determining an appropriate balance in the rights and responsibilities of citizens and the State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Governance</td>
<td>Forming appropriate and legitimate decision-making processes for negotiating responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social capacity</td>
<td>Building social capacity and resilience amongst those at-risk to take on responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Attribution</td>
<td>Understanding and influencing styles and biases in the way people attribute cause and blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sociocultural context</td>
<td>Acknowledging and responding to the ways risk and responsibility are understood and valued in particular sociocultural contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Distribution</td>
<td>Reducing inequality and vulnerability in the distribution of resources and power to manage risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Practice</td>
<td>Devising structures and processes to work together effectively in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Complex systems</td>
<td>Confronting emergence and uncertainty in complex, dynamic risk management systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 2 policy review

- What mechanisms have been used to shape institutions for sharing responsibility in collective risk management in other contexts? How did framing influence them?

- Seven types – often used in packages
  - Achieving predetermined goals v.s. negotiating what the goals should be
  - Two levels of framing: problem and process

Table 3.3: Overview of mechanisms for sharing responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vision statements</td>
<td>•National strategies and policies&lt;br&gt;•Mission statements&lt;br&gt;•Social and ethical codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ‘Hard’ laws and regulations</td>
<td>•Constitutions&lt;br&gt;•Charters&lt;br&gt;•New, amended or extended laws&lt;br&gt;•Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘Soft’ interventions</td>
<td>•Financial incentives and disincentives&lt;br&gt;•Direct government delivery of public services&lt;br&gt;•Informational/persuasive campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contracts and agreements</td>
<td>•Treaties and conventions&lt;br&gt;•Legally-binding voluntary contracts&lt;br&gt;•Public-private partnerships&lt;br&gt;•Agreed declarations of intent&lt;br&gt;•Social relationships of reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collective inquiry &amp; decision-making</td>
<td>•Votes&lt;br&gt;•Formal public inquiries&lt;br&gt;•Public consultation&lt;br&gt;•Deliberative/collaborative decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisations and associations</td>
<td>•New or restructured department, committee, association or overseeing body&lt;br&gt;•Multi-party partnerships and collaborations&lt;br&gt;•Policy networks&lt;br&gt;•Interagency coordination and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social norms</td>
<td>•Workplace/ professional culture&lt;br&gt;•Traditional knowledge/ management regimes&lt;br&gt;•Emergent organisation and leaders&lt;br&gt;•Social movement/ protest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some examples

Vision statements

Work and Family: Towards new forms of reconciliation with social co-responsibility

‘Hard’ laws & regulation

‘Soft’ interventions
More examples

Collective inquiry & decision-making

Preparing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan
A Handbook for Wildland-Urban Interface Communities

E.g. Workplace culture of Swedish railway technicians

Organisations & associations

Contracts & agreements

SEEDS Asia

The Public Health Responsibility Deal
March 2011
The next year

- Tying up what’s been done...
  - Test and communicate ideas from the reviews in peer-reviewed publications

- Moving on... two streams
  - Stimulate frame-reflection – workshopping the idea of shared responsibility
  - Evaluate mechanisms for Australia – needs detailed understanding of context

- **Stage 4** – Two Australian case studies
- **Stage 5** - Evaluate mechanisms for Australian context
Project outputs
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