Beyond the Blanket:

The role of not-for-profits and non traditional stakeholders in emergency management

2nd National Disaster Resilience Roundtable Report

21 October, 2014
Melbourne, Australia

the **power** of humanity

AUSTRALIAN RED CROSS

contents

Executive Summary

The release of the National Strategy for Disaster Resilience (NSfDR) by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2011 signaled a shift in the way Australia approached disaster management. The notion of shared responsibility has become a key component of emergency management policy. In working to realise this goal, Australian Red Cross has sought to facilitate cross sector conversation that will bridge research, policy and practice.

There are now a number of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders within the emergency management sphere. While in the past their roles have been conceptualised in quite limited terms, in recent years, both traditional and non-traditional stakeholders have recognised their unique attributes and capacity to contribute to emergency management. Their subsequent roles have expanded in scope. Not-for-profits have begun contributing beyond traditional disaster relief and welfare provision. Similarly, non-traditional stakeholders have diversified their interests and contributions to disaster management.

The second Australian Red Cross National Disaster Resilience Roundtable provided an opportunity for those in the Emergency Management sector to discuss and action cross-sector collaboration and explore innovative solutions for engaging non-traditional stakeholders within the Emergency Management space.

This report summarises the second National Disaster Resilience Roundtable, which took place on October 21, 2014 in Melbourne. The roundtable brought together 44 researchers, policy makers, peak bodies, business representatives, not-for-profit organisations and community members to explore the role of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders in disaster management.

Aims and objectives

Aims:

To hold a second National Disaster Resilience Roundtable that examines the role of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders in disaster management and explores opportunities for greater engagement and collaboration in the emergency management sector.

Outcomes:

‣ Bridge research, policy and practice in the emergency management sector.

‣ Contribute quality literature to the emergency management sector that facilitates further discussion and solutions for shared responsibility and cooperative governance.

Background

Australian Red Cross initially contributed to the development of the NSfDR by participating in meetings and forums, and subsequently providing a submission to the strategy drafting team. Following this, the NSfDR explicitly recognised the contribution that not-for-profits make to disaster resilience.

In 2011, Australian Red Cross offered further assistance to the Attorney General's office with implementing the NSfDR. It was proposed that Red Cross host a National Disaster Resilience Roundtable that would bring together parties, outside existing government committee structures – to provide commentary and input into policy and practice questions relating to disaster management and resilience.

The inaugural National Disaster Resilience Roundtable was held in 2012. It brought together thought leaders, practitioners, policy makers, and those affected by disaster to examine the links between social capital and the building of disaster resilience. Its success prompted Red Cross to consider conducting a second roundtable.

In 2014 Red Cross decided to host a second roundtable to explore the role not-for-profits and non-traditional stakeholders play in disaster resilience and emergency management. The terms of reference for the second Roundtable included consideration of the following questions:

- What are the traditional and non-traditional roles of not-for-profits in emergency management? What potential benefits may be reaped by engaging these groups more deeply in all aspects of emergency management?

- What would enable non-traditional stakeholders and existing not-for-profits to contribute further to the emergency management sector?

- What are the barriers to non-traditional stakeholders and existing not-for-profits to contributing further to the emergency management sector? How could we overcome these barriers?

- What opportunities can we identity to enable more effective collaboration between not-for-profits, government, and other contributors to emergency management (e.g. Business)?

The Roundtable encompassed groups and parties with an interest in, experience of, or expertise in emergency management and disaster resilience to help shape the outcomes. Membership included, but was not limited to:

- People from communities affected by disaster
- Key research institutions
- Peak bodies
- Industry groups
- Emerging groups
- Experienced practitioners.

From the outset, it was considered important to include people from communities affected by disaster to ensure that any discussion was well grounded within people's experience. It was also considered important to include non-traditional emerging groups in the sector to ensure a broad perspective was captured. The Roundtable further sought to bring together emergency management agencies and community service agencies.

The Roundtable was chaired by Andrew Coghlan, National Manager of Emergency Services for Australian Red Cross, and commenced with four theoretical and practical inputs from the following stakeholders:

Each presentation provided a unique perspective from a policy, practice, research or community lens. This was followed by small group discussion of four questions looking at engagement, enablers, barriers and opportunities for collaboration in the emergency management sphere. The day concluded with a group facilitated discussion of next steps and potential solutions.

The following is a summary of each presentation.

Opening remarks

Mr. Noel Clement
**Head of Australian Services,
Australian Red Cross.**

Red Cross is a very traditional emergency management organisation. Communities expect us to respond to acute humanitarian needs within the community. This includes emergencies. As such, Red Cross have been responding to emergencies here in Australia since 1914.

What separates us from other not-for-profits in this sector is our long standing history and experience in emergencies, as well as our capacity. We have found ourselves in a unique position that allows us to bridge the communication gaps between stakeholders within the emergency management space. The National Disaster Resilience Roundtable seeks to bridge such gaps.

The goal of today's roundtable is to bring together community members, researchers, practitioners, policy makers and peak bodies – those of us in civil society – to deepen the understanding of each of our roles and responsibilities in disaster management in this new era of shared responsibility.

section one
conceptual perspectives

To set the scene, we had four speakers from a variety of backgrounds provide their perspective on how non-traditional stakeholders are influencing policy and practice in emergency management. Given government policy shapes what we do and when we do it, our first input was from that of Mathew Healey.

Presentation 1

Government
– Mr. Mathew Healey

Director of the Royal Hobart Hospital Redevelopment Rescue Taskforce. Mr Healey has worked in central government policy at the State and Commonwealth level for over 15 years in a wide range of roles, including eight years as the Director of Security and Emergency within the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Mr Healey was the Director of the Bushfire Recovery Unit that oversaw recovery following Tasmania's bushfires in January 2013.

Representing the Tasmanian Department of Premier and Cabinet, Mr. Healey presented the first of the inputs for the day.

Mr. Healey spoke of the different roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders in emergency management and provided his own observations on four: government, not-for-profit, business and community. He implored each stakeholder to understand and recognise the role they play in the sector, stating: "we need to define who is actually responsible for what".

Mr. Healey saw responsibility as something that should not just be shared but attributable. In assessing the role of government, he deemed it as finite. While capable of looking after the collective interest and wellbeing of the public, government reach does not extend to the individual. Government is rather a tool for the collective investment in personal wellbeing.

Mr. Healey observed that at present, the major government agenda was to share appropriate information and develop high-level awareness of risks. He opined that government has become braver at engaging with people about risk and respecting the notion that people know more about their risks than the government at times. He also noted his observations of a shift in government investment from recovery to mitigation with a move towards greater transparency. These developments will certainly impact the sector, including service focus and delivery.

Mr. Healey identified not-for-profits as compassionate service providers, suggesting their capacity extends beyond what government can offer in regard to individual service provision. They also offer a unique pathway for individuals to personally invest in society at large. As such, government and not-for-profits are not in the same business. Despite this, their interests do overlap at times and in some instances conflict. Mr. Healey used the example of the January 2013 Tasmanian bushfires to illustrate the overlap in interest and the lessons learnt for future collaboration. The bushfires exposed how disconnected the government was with neighbourhood houses and community centres. He offered that in future, government could work within the domain of taking responsibility or coordinating for services and clean up, assist not-for-profits in distributing grants/public appeals, as well as provide information and facilities where required.

In terms of the business sector, Mr. Healey saw the very nature of business as its greatest asset to emergency management. Businesses are legal entities designed to compete for limited resources that then use those resources to amass public and private wealth. This wealth can be invested into new areas of interest and programs in the emergency management sector, for example, risk reduction efforts. Our next challenge, he suggested, is making businesses aware and clear of their obligations within the sector.

Community service organisations, on the other hand, sit within the space of delivering non-profitable services to people in need. They play an important role within the community in articulating specific needs and building resilience. However, Mr. Healey did raise a concern about their level of reliance on government services.

Mr. Healey noted that we can't build resilience simply for the sake of it. We must demonstrate that the loss associated with the current path is unacceptable and show that disaster mitigation is effective for reducing or avoiding cost for all stakeholders. He suggested facilitating incentivised investments in resilience to align costs with benefits.

Looking forward, Mr. Healey concluded that formalised relationships, meaningful and targeted dialogue were required between stakeholders in the emergency management sector. The dialogue needs to be ongoing and requires honesty about capability from all stakeholders and accountability for the improvements we seek. Without these changes, we are at risk of repeating past mistakes, overlapping duties and failing to address the real gaps that exist in the sector.

Practitioner
– Ms. Susan Davie

Senior Advisor in Domestic Emergencies at Save the Children Australia. Ms. Davie has a background in emergency management planning for children. Working with the Victorian Department of Human Services she has experience working with communities affected by many different emergency events including large bushfires and floods.

Ms. Davie presented the second conceptual perspective of the day. She started by discussing the changing landscape in the emergency management sector, noting that fifteen years ago, a forum of this nature would have had only a quarter of the representation seen at this roundtable. Progress is definitely being made in this space. However, challenges still remain.

From a practitioner perspective, one profound challenge is the under utilisation of the international non government organisations (NGOs) experience. There are a number of Australians working in international NGO settings that can inform our practice. For example, in the field of child protection, some of the experience of the international community is directly translatable to the Australian context. However, we often look past it and dismiss this reservoir of knowledge as not applicable, when in fact it is. We need to be open to translating international concepts and ways of doing things into our own domestic context.

Another challenge is the way we work together. While multi-agency reports can pose numerous obstacles, we need to consider a national forum to feed and distribute information within the emergency management sector. Further, not-for-profits and community sector organisations (CSOs) need to be part of the committees and conversations that take place around emergency management. They have a wealth of community knowledge and experience that they can bring to the table. However, they also need to actively and collectively advocate being part of the conversation. In Ms. Davie's mind, not-or-profit's (NFPs) would have more impact working together than they would continuing to work as individual silos.

Ms. Davie noted that government are usually aware of their role in emergency management, but in a big disaster, that context is often unclear. NFP's and CSOs have a lot to offer in this instance. They have well established links in communities, with the majority of their client base being the same vulnerable people that government are trying to target.

Ms. Davie acknowledged Mr. Healey's description of NFPs as compassionate investment opportunities, but sought to build on this. In Ms. Davie's opinion, NFP's can also bring a lot of knowledge, experience and well-developed programs to inform the emergency management agenda. In regard to CSOs, Ms. Davie opined that there are many community led preparedness programs that result in solid outcomes. However, their reach and impact often fails to go beyond their community because they

don't have the support to co-ordinate more broadly. This is definitely something that needs to be addressed in the future.

While there are obviously a number of challenges and barriers within the emergency management sphere, there is also great potential, particularly in relation to linking research and best practice. If practitioners (who ask questions) and researchers (who inform/seek solutions) can create a working reciprocal dialogue, significant evidence based research is within our grasp. Forums where practitioners can feed into research questions are imperative. We are moving in that direction with the establishment of the Bushfire and Natural Hazards Cooperative Research Centre (BNHCRC). Ms. Davie acknowledged though that NFP's need to get better at commissioning research and stated that it would be useful if the sector could work together to come up with some common questions. The information we all need cannot just be sought in the heat of a disaster. We need to gather information before an emergency.

Ms. Davie further stated that we don't focus or invest enough in children in emergency management here in Australia. This is something that is very well done elsewhere in the world. She described children and young people as change agents and 'sponges' who need to have a voice in emergency planning via formal channels through which they can contribute. Existing examples in the US we could consider adopting include: videos that target children, and an emergency management Youth Council. Ms. Davie further illustrated the

great potential in Australia with an example from a Melbourne primary school, where students after learning about emergency preparedness instigated a regular drill on their school bus to remain prepared.

Ms. Davie concluded her presentation by encouraging the sector to draw more on schools, given their status as trusted networks and essential hubs in the community, which are currently underutilised. Ms. Davie suggested that information disseminated through schools has the capacity to reach around 80 percent of community members. She acknowledged that at the same time we must recognise that schools are not community service organisations and are busy undertaking everyday educational functions. Their primary role is to teach kids, not act as community hubs. Keeping this in mind we need to simplify the information available to people so that it is accessible. We currently make it too hard for schools by delivering too much information in a variety of forms. This may be overcome by simplifying and streamlining messaging.

Presentation 3

Academia
– Professor Douglas Paton

Professor in Psychology at the University of Tasmania. He is also a Research Fellow at the Joint Centre for Disaster Research (New Zealand), a member of the Risk Interpretation sub-committee of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), and a Technical Advisor on risk communication to the World Health Organisation. His research focuses on developing and testing theories of community resilience and adaptive capacity for natural hazards.

The third perspective provided was that of Professor Douglas Paton. He commenced his presentation by strongly endorsing the IFRC definition of resilience. In his opinion, resilience is not just about recovery but adaptation. It requires capitalising on previous lessons learnt. People need to be able to anticipate their risk relative to their circumstances, needs and capabilities – and respond rather than react to events as they unfold over time.

Professor Paton acknowledged the broader role of NFPs in civil society in the areas of advocacy, social policy, community development and risk management integration. He identified one of the strengths of NFPs as their volunteer base, embedded within communities. NFPs have garnered trust over time and are across the breadth of local issues. As such, they have the necessary links to the communities they serve.

He viewed scope for NFPs to facilitate mentoring/collaborative learning programs that could potentially translate to advocacy in the future.

From a research perspective, Professor Paton believes information is not enough. Research needs context. Otherwise there are too many variables. We also need to look at disaster education. Many emergency awareness campaigns don't have the effect of positive behavioural change – in fact, some of them do the opposite. For example, following the 2011 earthquake in Christchurch, 65 percent of survey participants said they would not change their habits or lifestyle after receiving education on preparedness and recovery. This alarming percentage needs to be understood.

What makes research additionally challenging is that there is no universal risk. There are many individual variables and factors that need to be considered. Research alone can't offer top down, prescriptive views of risk. Researchers and agencies alike cannot answer the questions that communities really want to know about disasters. Questions like, "how bad will it be? where will it happen? how long will it last? when will it happen?"

Yet, people need to be able to anticipate their risk relative to their location, circumstances, needs and capabilities. Once anticipated, preparedness strategies can be devised to respond in planned and functional ways to the complex, challenging, emergent and evolving hazard effects, experiences and demands of the community over a prolonged period of time.

NFPs can help communities understand how to anticipate risk. By acting as change agents, mentors and advocates in the emergency management space, they have the capacity to empower the community and encourage community engagement. Their capacity is derived from the trust they have acquired from the community over an extended period of time. Professor Paton is quick to note that trust is not a commodity though. It is a transactional process that takes a long time to build. Ongoing engagement is required to maintain trust. Furthermore, like trust, hazard readiness is also a developmental process that happens over time.

Professor Paton observed that preparedness is important because it facilitates a response to an emergency rather than an ad hoc reaction. Being prepared is about being able to respond to events rather than react. However, the focus of preparedness needs to go beyond responding to the hazard. We need to be prepared for the longer term, complex and compounding impacts. Professor Paton also identified vulnerability as something important to think about in emergency management. How well we do in any situation is a result of the balance between our strengths and vulnerabilities at any given time.

Successful recovery relies on understanding context using community led approaches, ensuring co-ordination and building capacity. Community development and risk management also require integration, with the former particularly contingent on building social capital. Social capital is but a raw material though. Professor Paton states that to capitalise on people to integrate it into the community. Furthermore, we build capacity not through risk management processes but by bringing people with expertise in these areas into risk management processes.

Using Typhoon Morakot in 2009 and the building of Da Ai village after the destruction of Shiao Lin village in Taiwan as an example, Professor Paton explained the concept of scenario planning for working in uncertain environments. He supports the affiliation of different stakeholders and integrating diverse perspectives into the emergency management space. He encourages the use of scenario planning in recovery. He sees it as a tool for collective and integrated learning and planning. Scenario planning allows for organising possibilities into narratives that facilitate shared understanding, planning and action. It also supports the affiliation between traditional and non-traditional stakeholders and emergency service providers; and is a disciplined and powerful tool to anticipate changes in a complex environment. This affiliation offers the emergency management sector the opportunity to become genuinely holistic, with responsibility shared across society.

Professor Paton concluded by discussing risk. The term risk comes from the Italian word for gambling – rischio – accounting for the gains and losses in circumstances of uncertainty. The Chinese added the notion of "opportunity" with the word for risk constructed from two symbols: "danger" and "opportunity". Ultimately, risk can lead to loss and/or growth. There is a possibility to adapt and grow or experience loss and distress. We must take the opportunity to adapt and grow.

Presentation 4

Not-for-profit/ Community

– Ms. Kris Newton

Ms. Kris Newton is the Manager of the Mountains Community Resource Network, the peak community sector body in the Blue Mountains region. Currently chairing the Wellbeing Subcommittee following the 2013 bushfires, Ms. Newton has a comprehensive understanding and involvement in the various resilience initiatives happening in the Blue Mountains community sector.

The fourth perspective was provided by Ms. Kris Newton, who began her presentation by recounting her own recovery experience as Manager of the Mountains Community Resource Network (MCRN) following the October 2013 bushfires in the lower Blue Mountains (NSW).

Ms. Newton had returned to the Blue Mountains eighteen months prior to the bushfires to take up the position of Manager at the MCRN. Similar to other local community organisations, the MCRN had no link to the emergency management sector. They had no contingency plans for when an emergency occurred. They also had limited knowledge of State Government departments and arrangements for who would be involved in responding to, or helping recover from an emergency. During the fires it was a matter of learning on the fly with other agencies as they went along.

In the wake of the fires, the NSW State Government established the Blue Mountains Bushfire Recovery

Committee. Its role was to provide strategic direction in the overall recovery process and coordinate the restoration and rehabilitation of the community. The Ministry for Police and Emergency Services (MPES), approached Ms. Newton to chair a Wellbeing Sub-committee. This sub-committee worked along three others to advise the Recovery Committee on specific environments: Economic; Built and Natural; Donations and Appeals. The subcommittee's intended focus was the psychosocial aspects of recovery.

In establishing the Wellbeing sub-committee Ms. Newton tried to assemble all the NFP and CSO players in the local area, including all the organisations that had formal roles with the Ministry for Police and Emergency Services, such as Red Cross and Centrelink. It took quite some time to ensure that those who could best advise on local community recovery were represented – including representatives from neighbourhood centres, family support services, community development projects, youth services, disability services, migrant services, children's and child protection services, community housing services, faith-based organisations and local health district services. Ms. Newton believed it was important to include all these stakeholders because as known local organisations, they are a trusted source of information in recovery. They also have a wealth of experience to drawn from and a sound knowledge base of the local community.

Ms. Newton's first introduction to the larger Recovery Committee was not dissimilar to that experienced by many in the psychosocial space. The larger Committee initially focused its attention on trees, hazard reduction and asbestos. It was difficult to make wellbeing a priority, with many response and

recovery agencies dismissing it as simply "touchy-feely stuff". These agencies seemed genuinely surprised at first at the number of organisations and service providers in the Mountains who lived and worked every day with community members. However over time and with the support of the NSW Ministry for Police and Emergency Services, and the interim appointed recovery co-ordinator, Ms. Sally McKay, the Wellbeing Sub-committee was able to change these deep-rooted misconceptions, and be accepted as legitimate contributors to the Recovery Committee.

The work of the Wellbeing Sub-committee was divided into two major areas: 1. recovery; 2. resilience and preparedness. Recovery had a long-term lens of 5-10 years and was based on a psychosocial model of delivery. Within the sub-committee, Red Cross, Blue Mountains City Council (BMCC), Salvation Army and Catholic Care took a co-ordinated approach to addressing the psychological and social needs of the affected community. A year on, the ongoing needs of the community are still apparent. According to Ms. Newton, "we are starting to see new incidents of post-traumatic stress". This is thought to have been triggered by the pending anniversary of the bushfires and smoke from burn off activities in the area, as well as the (luckily, contained) Katoomba fires in late 2014.

The work of the sub-committee in resilience and preparedness was subdivided into three further categories: (1) vulnerable and at risk residents; (2) household preparedness; and (3) service sector preparedness. The vulnerability of many residents in the Mountains area was exposed during the fires. Building relationships and networks across the community consequently became a top priority.

This work was complemented by research conducted by Dr. Valerie Ingham and Dr. Sarah Redshaw of Charles Sturt University and Macquarie University, who began identifying vulnerable people in the local community.

In terms of household preparedness, the sub-committee worked towards creating behavioural change in the community. The issue was not education, but the take-away lessons and actions. People in the community were asked to identify three things that they would do after education sessions to prepare for emergencies. Agencies and organisations then followed up with a phone call to confirm these actions were taken and if not, if there was anything the agency or organisation could do to help people achieve their three things.

The most significant area for improvement was in service sector preparedness. Ms. Newton acknowledged "we weren't prepared as organisations or as a community for the [disaster] that hit us and honestly we still aren't entirely prepared for the next one yet". The sub-committee is still working to improve this.

Ms. Newton concluded her presentation by identifying areas for future improvement. According to Ms. Newton, relationships and connections still need to be formalised and mapped in the Blue Mountains region. Roles need to be connected to other roles, relationships to relationships. A formal get together held annually with actionable accountability attached to roles would also be worthwhile. "Another fire, or other emergency, will happen some time", stated Ms. Newton, "but we are determined to be better prepared".

section two

group sessions

After the four conceptual perspectives were delivered, the participants were divided into four groups to examine the role of non-traditional stakeholders in disaster resilience. Groups had mixed representation geographically and were composed of delegates from Government, NFPs, business and academia to promote a range of views within discussion. The groups moved through each session, where they spent approximately 20 minutes considering a set of questions.

This section reports on discussions undertaken in the group sessions and looks to link these discussions to the broader intention of the day to build collaboration between non-traditional stakeholders and enhance the role of these stakeholders in disaster resilience.

Group 1

Engagement

Facilitated by Emily Wellard – Australian Red Cross, participants were asked to consider the following questions:

‣ What are the traditional and non-traditional roles of NFPs in emergency management?

‣ What potential benefits may be reaped by engaging these groups more deeply in all aspects of emergency management?

Discussions

Language, framing and perception

A key theme to emerge was the importance of language used and the impact this has on framing the emergency management landscape. It was identified that the demands placed on traditional community services typically provided by CSOs are increased during emergencies. NFPs and CSOs are inevitably involved in emergencies given their well established links to the community. As such, their services are inherently included within the management of emergencies; despite this not always being formally recognised in arrangements by governments. It was noted that the role of CSOs and NFPs would be better framed as 'non-recognised' rather than 'non-traditional'. Furthermore, to recognise these organisations as an 'add on', rather than as a core component of emergency management, risks alienating valuable organisations from partnership arrangements.

Traditional & Non-Traditional roles

Traditional roles of the NFP sector in emergency management have centred on the distribution of goods, services and information both during the immediate relief phase and throughout longer-term recovery. It was recognised that NFPs are frequently among the first responders to an emergency and work effectively to manage donated goods, oversee the provision of clean water and sanitation, provide psycho-social support in the form of case management and counselling, support rebuilding efforts (Blaze Aid), environmental recovery (Landcare), manage appeals and donations,

and support the social welfare of individuals and communities. It was also noted that these organisations help conserve government funds given their access to and reliance on volunteerism. These contributions enable NFP organisations to contribute to emergency management policy debates and shape their input supporting planning efforts.

Non-traditional roles extend beyond classic relief and response to focus on long-term preparedness and recovery. This is supported by a number of non-traditional actors including groups such as Landcare, BlazeAid, FireFoxes and recognisable groups such as the Scouts and Country Women's' Associations who are not typically involved in emergency management.

The ability to harness volunteers was identified as a role efficiently managed by NFPs, as was the ability to provide coordinated support systems centred on 'through-care'; a recovery approach focused on the successful long-term recovery of people in the wake of disaster. It carries non-quantifiable benefits through the reduction of high social and financial costs, such as supporting needs associated with high level of psychosocial disaster-catalysed trauma.

Roles, collaboration & emergency management frameworks

Roundtable delegates identified that the community and NFP experience, in addressing core human needs, can be more effectively worked into response structures. To do this, homogenous groupings of NFPs/NGOs need to be avoided; instead recognising the variance between different NFPs and their unique capacities within emergency management. Recognising these distinctions in formal emergency management arrangements is important from the perspective of involving a broad cohort of previously non-recognised actors and involving them in the various stages of emergency management. Heightening awareness and understanding of emergency management frameworks and legislation among less classically recognised actors will also enable a greater breakdown and delegation of specific responsibilities.

Channelling efforts and productivity 'downwards' toward the community and NFP sector carries many benefits, not limited to the ability for actors to work within an existing, specific and engaged client base where trust has been developed over time. Reciprocally, NFPs can provide a link between the community and the Emergency Managment sector, facilitating community-led and tailored response and recovery programs developed through genuine understanding of local community capacity. Government coordination with existing community groups and NFPs during disasters can not only help mitigate rogue groups and public uncertainty but can also bridge gaps between municipal Emergency Managment plans and legislation and their practical implementation. Moreover, such coordination can facilitate a two-way exchange to find solutions to compromise conflicting policy and on-ground realities and the exchange of knowledge, values and legitimacy.

While the benefits of engagement are apparent, it is contingent on processes that enable it to occur.

A strong emergent theme from the discussions was that better collaboration between government and non-government organisations in the emergency management sphere is needed, both administratively and in practice. It was suggested a large onus rests on government to provide space for this to occur. Similarly, acknowledging the work of NFPs may indeed enable swifter, locally relevant, innovative programs in emergency management, given NFPs can often do things that government cannot as a result of their on-ground connections. The economic benefit of engaging NFPs is also recognised to have huge economic benefits, such as the multiplier effect of volunteers. This was affirmed through a research report released by the Red Cross in August 2014, which recognised volunteering as the cornerstone of a people centred development approach.[1]

The traditional 'command and control' approach to all of emergency management was identified as outdated in its failure to utilise a community development approach; which considers how traditional stakeholders can work with community stakeholders, rather than just talk to them. While the command and control model maintains relevancy in disaster response, this is not the case for preparedness and recovery, which arguably is better serviced via the community development approach. Inherent in this model is the development of trust through frequent interactions and dialogue around resilience and best practice. The developing relationship between the Tasmanian Government and NFP Blaze Aid was identified as a case study in which trust has been developed over time, enabling a strong, reciprocal relationship that is beneficial to both parties and supports participatory EM. It was recognised that the Emergency Managment space is opening up to the community sector, but to many traditional players, the community sectors capabilities are still relatively foreign.

1   International Volunteering - An Investment In Development, August 2014, accessed via http://www.redcross.org.au/files/Report_-_International_ Volunteering__-_20140728.pdf (31/03/2015)

Group 2

Enablers

Facilitated by John Richardson – Australian Red Cross, participants were asked to consider the following question:

▸ What would enable non-traditional stakeholders and existing not-for-profits to contribute further to the emergency management sector?

Discussions

Key players

There were several key themes to come out of the discussions on resilience enablers. Representatives from the NFP sector identified the importance of referring to themselves as the community sector rather than as 'recovery agencies', in recognition of the broader, enduring commitment involved with building resilience.

Structurally, it was recognised that a number of agencies are working in the emergency management space with little to no coordination. While some MOUs have been developed in the past between community and government, only nominal efforts have been made to establish formal coordination. It was suggested that community mapping exercises that identify relevant players' interests and capacity in the sector and define needs within community will facilitate the creation of a readily available resource. Roundtable delegates also proposed that a national online resilience collaborative group be established to facilitate idea exchanges, with a resilience reporter to contribute stories and raise pertinent questions.

Other propositions included the development of a national register or database that enables people to approach agencies for specific needs and avoid duplication of services. Such a resource could also support the identification of existing gaps in emergency management. It was suggested this resource could be managed by a Chief Resilience Officer; a role built into local council, or by an

Engagement Officer who lives within the community and sits on the local recovery committee. This person would also support the relationship building efforts between organisations, in recognition that integrity of relationships is crucial in sustaining partnerships. This role would also facilitate communication between the community, government and business sectors and link similar organisations.

Involving the business sector as a key player in emergency management is another key facet of developing a holistically coordinated approach. After the Tasmanian bushfires, the business sector was noticeably absent from Emergency Managment arrangements, which was attributed to uncertainty in how to engage them. Given the likelihood that businesses are impacted themselves by emergencies, it was agreed that supporting resilience in business is essential and can reap incidental benefits such as the provision of spontaneous volunteers and vehicles during crisis.

Coordination

A recurring theme that emerged was the lack of centralised leadership among community organisations and the need for a body that can both coordinate and speak on behalf of the sector. The Australian Red Cross was proposed as a possible body that could assume this role. The role would involve assembling other relevant NFP and CSO stakeholders at forums to facilitate the exchange of ideas (similar to this roundtable), share learnings and ensure mistakes are not repeated. As the coordinating body, Red Cross could then speak on behalf of the sector in the emergency management sphere.

The institution of a centralised funding body was also proposed as a mechanism to coordinate donations and other funds channelled into preparedness and response; an initiative that would require an immense amount of coordination, but may also serve to enable a more coordinated and strategic response from the community sector as a whole.

Corporate and Government sector enablers

The ability of non-traditional stakeholders such as corporates to aid the resilience process was discussed in the context of mounting emphasis on corporate social responsibility and the potential for flow-on benefits to reach NFPs. Corporate volunteering days coordinated by companies such as the National Australia Bank who have over 35,000 employees can bring an influx of human capital to a community post-disaster. Equally, the financial contributions requested in exchange for corporate volunteering opportunities can serve as a fundraising source for resilience building.

Various questions were raised about the prospect for new partnership avenues between government, community and corporates, such as the value of economic incentives as an enabler for building disaster resilience. The idea of business-lead mentoring programs that offer both emotional and economic support to affected communities was also broached, as was the question of what can be done to better support businesses through disaster. Governmentally, it was agreed that state

administrations often have structures in place to effectively liaise with business and can work to establish relationships and build partnerships with this sector.

Essentially it was recognised that cross-sector coordination is a key facet of resilience and should feature as a central and regular agenda item. It was agreed that the costs involved with exploring this area are far outweighed by the prospective benefits the results may yield.

Group 3

Barriers

Facilitated by Kate Brady – Australian Red Cross, participants were asked to consider the following questions:

▸ What are the barriers to non-traditional stakeholders and existing not-for-profits to contributing further to the emergency management sector?

▸ How could we overcome these barriers?

Discussions

Organisational barriers

Conceptually, building resilience is fraught with numerous challenges, many stemming from organisational issues both within and between sectors. One frequently hears post-disaster, 'we didn't survive the disaster, we survived the recovery'; in recognition of the complex process that occurs in the wake of disaster.

Communication and structural barriers emerged as two key themes, underpinned by insufficient relationships between key players established pre-event and a lack of leadership to guide and advise organisations toward resilience. It was concluded that putting measures in place for greater continuity in the face of disasters is central to overcoming key institutional barriers.

Stakeholders from disaster affected towns such as Marysville, Victoria, articulated the ultimate challenge in fostering long-term resilience, noting that while their communities had been resilient against recent disasters, it was believed they had not yet managed to build resilience for the future. Inherent in this acknowledgement is the denial of social vulnerability in community and fear it is not being adequately addressed. It was suggested that greater education of the media who report on disaster events may help shift conversations away from seeking to attribute blame, to identifying vulnerabilities to address and reduce.

Other broad themes emerging centered on enhancing connectivity between NFPs, Government and Business, making efforts to establish and know key contact points at each level and build and maintain those relationships through shared vision and agenda setting.

NFP barriers

There are copious benefits to involving NFPs in disaster resilience. Intimate local knowledge, contacts and trust developed over time make NFPs natural partners for any community-focused endeavour. However, the ability of NFPs to play a central role in disaster resilience activities is inhibited due to a number of limitations imposed by restricted financial capacity and insufficient role definition.

It was noted that emergency management is rarely the raison d'être for NFPs and rather tends to serve as an extra role groups in the sector take on. This can add a significant burden to small NFPs with limited human and financial capital given it can also distract from their core work and services.

Competitiveness in the fiscal space between NFPs presents an ongoing challenge. Access to emergency funds from government during crisis is often central for NFPs to be able to scale up their activities and maintain service flexibility during times of greater need. This issue was attributed to contracting procedures between government funding agencies and community services.

A dearth of collaboration between NFPs was identified as a further barrier; a factor inhibiting communication efficiency between the NFP and government sectors and contributing to the sense that the unique roles and nuances of different NFPs is not understood or known by other stakeholders. It was suggested that regular, at minimum annual, forums be instituted. Through these, non-traditional stakeholders can communicate their capacity and how it may benefit the emergency management sector as a whole. Such forums would facilitate communication and boost understanding between various stakeholders.

Traditional approach to emergency management

The traditional command and control method to Emergency Managment was strongly critiqued. Elements of the approach such as the hierarchical command and control model were criticised for the way they frequently side-line non-traditional stakeholders, overlooking their capacity to contribute to the Emergency Managment process. The hierarchical structure of traditional Emergency Services agencies conflicts directly with the flatter structured community organisations, with trickle down effects in the communication and leadership styles within each organisation. A community organisation representative offered the example of a situation briefing she was giving to representatives from a traditional response agency. After suggesting the group sit in a circle instead of her standing in front of rows of chairs, she was asked, 'do you want us to hold hands too?!'. This comical anecdote

highlights ingrained differences in the culture of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders in the Emergency Managment space, with the latter arguably more inclined toward a more collaborative approach.

In an effort to overcome the cultural disconnect between the collaborative and classic command/control models, it was suggested that a shift needs to occur on both sides. Currently, the models differ in their use of language and terminology, such as interpretations of resilience. Among traditional stakeholders, resilience is largely viewed as an outcome to work toward and establish as part of the short-term recovery period. NFPs however tend to consider resilience as a process requiring a long-term approach; a perception that guides their work in this field. Given the perception of a challenge inevitably shapes the response to it; a single, synthesised definition may support collaboration between traditional and non-traditional stakeholders and help shape a more coordinated response. On a practical level, it was suggested that regular cross-sector scenario planning and drills would facilitate the opportunity for groups to practice and review procedures and collaborations pre-event. While this may involve a heavy investment, the enduring benefits stemming from such a practice would be significant.

Research is currently taking place to map the interface between hierarchical and horizontal control networks through Macquarie University, with the view of developing recommendations that will help to further bridge the different approaches.

Sector leadership

A strong emergent theme from the discussions focused on the absence of leadership coordinating the community sector and the clash in leadership styles between traditional and non-traditional stakeholders in the emergency management sphere.

Given the infrequent nature of large-scale emergencies, it was recognised that organisations are at risk of losing momentum, institutional knowledge and relationships that are built around disasters. It was agreed that greater centralised community sector leadership would carry a number of benefits, helping to sustain this knowledge and ensure a degree of continuity. Further benefits include supporting emergent groups and limiting the duplication of services; bridging 'siloed' organisations; identifying gaps to be filled; creating a point of contact for other sectors to liaise with; coordinating groups during emergencies and enabling strategic forward planning for disaster events and their recovery. It was suggested that public expectation is that government coordinates a number of these services; however this perception undermines notions of shared responsibility that are at the core of a wholly collaborative approach.

Government barriers

Bureaucratic and accountability issues are some of the greatest obstructions hindering the government sector's contribution to the emergency management sphere. Government emergency management arrangements on local, state and national level possess inherent barriers, such as the

lack of structure supporting formal cooperation with other sectors. While it is challenging to connect non-traditional stakeholders with local arrangements and find a way to fit thEmergency Managment in, broad consensus agreed this was very necessary.

While local governments are ideally placed policy-makers, they do not always have the capacity to dedicate a staff member to a full-time role in emergency management. Accordingly, this role is often overtaken by state governments, with little regard for local knowledge held by local government. It was suggested that greater opportunities or forums to facilitate communication between local and state governments would support a more holistic whole of government approach to emergency management policy. Similarly it was suggested that the onus should rest on government to discover what skills and capacity non-traditional stakeholders possess vis-à-vis emergency management. Structurally, incorporating an extra layer into government charged with focusing on engagement with other policy sectors would also serve to bridge the bureaucratic siloing identified to exist across government.

Deep-seated concerns around accountability also emerged as a barrier to broader collaboration. Government stakeholders are exceptionally mindful of post-disaster inquiry processes, such as royal commissions, which work to understand and often attribute responsibility for physical and human losses, which can become blame in the broader community. It was noted that governments are known to impose command/control directives

in recognition of the areas they will later be held accountable and possibly liable for. A key barrier to getting government to broaden its community focus is a lack of trust in being able to hold community groups and NFPs accountable for matters they may later be probed on. For example, Kingsborough Council in Tasmania are working to overcome this issue through the development of their 'Community Resilience Brand', which is a model that works off recommendations from community as opposed to the council dictating emergency management policy.

Business

Stakeholders from the business sector approached the roundtable querying how business can work to understand what the needs are in the emergency management sector across different states and territories, to enable how their support may be provided most effectively. It was acknowledged that the focus for business sector representatives is generally on developing their companies, with DRM relegated as a 'side task'. Suggestions were made to involve insurance agencies and small business in some broader emergency management meetings. This could provide a forum to clarify prospective roles; offer support structures in case of an emergency; and build relationships that may support the development of long-term emergency management plans made in collaboration with business.

Trust emerged as a key barrier for the business sector, given their classic role in society to make profit and tendency not to be involved in emergency management. It was expressed that the notion of

business as a 'cash cow' prepared to hand over money any time is a great misconception. Rather, there are other strengths the sector possesses that can be drawn upon through collaboration, such as accessing trades with tools. Establishing contact points between businesses and the emergency management sector can serve to advance this relationship. A successful example of this is the Community on Ground Assistance (COGA) Program, which provided practical help with the clean-up and recovery of fire-affected properties in the wake of the Black Saturday Fires in Kinglake in 2009. The program, which now operates Victoria-wide, facilitates environmental and structural repairs to properties and helps with dangerous tree removal, timber cutting and debris removal.

It was concluded that businesses should not look toward emergency management purely from the perspective of what they can contribute. The emergency management sphere can also support businesses through an event, particularly smaller businesses that may be more vulnerable to a disaster. Red Cross for example has developed REDiPlan, which can be adapted to support small business by helping them develop business continuity plans that enable them to cope and recover post-disaster.

Group 4

Collaboration

Facilitated by Angela Sutherland – Australian Red Cross, participants were asked to consider the following questions:

‣ What opportunities can we identity to enable more effective collaboration between not-for-profits, government, and other contributors to emergency management (e.g. Business)?

Discussions
Distribution of power

The core message underpinning discussions around collaboration was how sharing 'the power' is a huge enabler. Key emerging themes around collaboration focused on strategies for building understanding, enhancing communication and formalising collaboration between stakeholders. It was agreed that the imperative to invest in communication extends across all stakeholders and sectors, with a specific obligation falling on government of all levels to know the benefits of understanding the role NFPs, community groups and business can play prior to and during emergencies. It was suggested that emergency management should be brought to the community, rather than the other way around, in recognition of the agencies and departments established to lead, or at least facilitate this process.

One such way this is taking place already is through the significant number of corporate groups visiting disaster areas to help with the clean up and recovery process as part of team building efforts. This was identified as a prospective enabler, bringing both financial and human capital to disaster affected areas. Further, such visits can serve as significant educational opportunities, facilitating tough conversations about on-ground realities.

On an organisational level, even though numerous emergency management and NFP meeting schedules are currently in place, such as the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee and its equivalents. Cross-sector attendance at these meetings does not always occur in practice; and that the lead agency impacts heavily on attendance.

Compliance structures

It was recommended that compliance structures be instituted to regulate collaboration. These could be in the form of MOUs between community groups and councils; agreements between community groups and Emergency Managment agencies with contractual obligations or incentives based on commitment; or even statutory requirements. Finding a way to use existing structures within community to collaborate before an emergency would also enhance prospects for ongoing collaboration.

The question whether we focus on planning 'with' or 'for' the community was raised, prompting discussion around the importance of the state supporting local activities. Similarly, the importance of local governments lobbying state governments was raised, for the purpose of obtaining their input and advice and supporting a mutually beneficial reciprocal relationship.

Key themes

Delegates to the Roundtable generally agreed that non-traditional stakeholders have the capacity and interest to make significant contributions to disaster management. To support these contributions, four key themes emerged that must be actioned within and across the sector more broadly:

‣ dissolving silos that prevent effective collaboration;

‣ raising awareness about the capabilities and capacities of NFP and CSO stakeholders – potentially through a coordinated body;

‣ sharing information across jurisdictions and sectors – including utilising existing online resources, such as the EMA Knowledge Hub and fostering opportunity for face to face engagement; and

‣ changing the language used to describe the sector to reflect the multitude of players within the emergency management landscape and be more inclusive.

Moving forward

Australian Red Cross will continue to host Roundtables to ensure collaboration across the sector. We will further endeavour to invite a variety of stakeholders involved in resilience and disaster management activities, to ensure a good cross section of the sector is represented at each Roundtable.

We are in a unique position, as an auxiliary to government, to also facilitate and advocate for NFPs and CSOs within the emergency management space. We will continue to do so and further act to bridge the gap, where possible, between NFPs, CSOs and the broader emergency management sector.

Appendix A

Attendees

Welcome and Opening remarks:

Mr Noel Clement Australian Red Cross

Chair:

Mr Andrew Coghlan Australian Red Cross

Speakers:

Mr Mathew Healey Director of the Royal Hobart Hospital Redevelopment Rescue Taskforce
Ms Susan Davie Senior Advisor in Domestic Emergencies at Save the Children Australia
Professor Douglas Paton Professor in Psychology at the University of Tasmania
Ms Kris Newton Manager of the Mountains Community Resource Network

Facilitators:

Ms Kate Brady Australian Red Cross
Mr John Richardson Australian Red Cross
Ms Emily Wellard Australian Red Cross
Ms Angela Sutherland Australian Red Cross

Participants:

ACOSS	Emily Hamilton	**Red Cross**	Jane Booth
Adracare	Kevin Munro	**Red Cross**	Angela Sutherland
ANZEMC	Matt Healey	**Red Cross**	Roz Wollmering
Attorney General's Dept.	Samantha Chard	**Red Cross**	Kerry McGrath
Be Ready Warrandyte	Linda Lawrie	**Red Cross**	Shona Whitton
Beyond Blue	Kelly Wilson	**Red Cross**	Antonia Mackay
Blaze Aid	Lyn Bailey	**Red Cross**	Rachel Flitman
Brotherhood of St Laurence	Damian Sullivan	**Red Cross**	Emily Wellard
Charles Sturt University	Dr Sarah Redshaw	**Red Cross**	Emily Cowlrick
Charles Sturt University	Dr Valerie Ingham	**Red Cross**	James Black
Community leaders	Tony Thompson	**Save the Children**	Susan Davie
Community leaders	Kris Newton	**State Government (SA)**	Ronnie Faggoter
CRC	Richard Thorton	**State Government (NSW)**	Wendy Graham
Firefoxes	Jemima Richards and Kate Riddell	**State Government (VIC)**	Jess Freame
IAG	Lee McDougall	**Tasmania University**	Prof. Douglas Paton
Lifeline	Jane Hayden	**VCOSS**	Bridget Tehan
Lifeline	Claire Davis		
Local government (TAS)	Ian Holloway, Kingborough Council		
Macquarie University	Peter Rogers		
Melbourne University	Don Henry		
Medibank	Nicole Borg		
Red Cross	Noel Clement		
Red Cross	John Richardson		
Red Cross	Kate Brady		
Red Cross	John Santiago		

Appendix B

Invited but unable to attend:

Anglicare	Susan King, Director - Advocacy & Partnerships	**Local government (VIC)**	Christine Drummond
		Medibank	Rita Marigliani
Anne Leadbeater Consulting	Anne Leadbeater	**NAB**	Francesca Hunter and Paula Benson
Attorney General's Department	Ariane Malpas	**PwC**	Kirsty Jennings
		Red Cross	Ian Coverdale
Bendigo Bank	Callum Wright	**Red Cross**	Shane Maddocks
Blaze Aid	Kevin Butler	**RMIT**	Professor John Handmer
FRRR	Natalie Egleton	**SES NSW**	Manager of Community Engagement
Lifesaving Australia	Anthony Bradstreet		
Local government (WA)	Paul Gravett, Manager Community Development & Safety, Margaret River	**Tas Fire Service**	Damian Killelea
		Volunteering Australia	Brett Williamson

Appendix C

Acknowledgments:

Appendix D

Briefing paper for the National Resilience Roundtable

Not-for-profits have played a pivotal role in disaster relief activities across the globe.[2] However over the past 40 years, the sector has increasingly played a broader role in civil society through advocacy, the development of social policy, and the harnessing of resources for local programs. The model of service provision in the community, based on the recognition of a social model of health and community development principles, has shifted away from welfarism. While by and large not-for-profits are still generally recognised as the providers of emergency relief or welfare, as it is still known as in some states; today, the sector plays a fundamental role in disaster planning, response, and post-disaster recovery and development.[3] Similarly, non-traditional stakeholders (business and community sectors), who previously played limited roles in emergency management, have become increasingly involved in disaster resilience planning and management efforts.

There is a diverse range of literature on the role not-for-profits and non-traditional stakeholders play in disaster resilience and emergency management. The purpose of this paper is to give a brief overview of some of the theory and empirical literature pertaining to their roles to provide some context for further discussions at the 2014 Disaster Resilience Roundtable in Melbourne.

Based on the terms of reference discussed throughout this briefing paper, the roundtable will invite and facilitate discussion on topics including the following:

‣ 1 – Traditional and non-traditional role of not-for-profits in emergency management
‣ 2 – Potential benefits of greater engagement of not-for-profits in all aspects of emergency management
‣ 3 – Enablers and barriers to achieving greater engagement
‣ 4 – Opportunities for more effective collaboration between not-for-profits, government and other contributors to emergency management (e.g. business).

Understanding resilience

Resilience is defined in many different ways. The Australian Red Cross utilises the International Federation of Red Cross (IFRC) definition, that is: the ability of individuals, communities, or countries exposed to disasters, crises and underlying vulnerabilities to:

‣ anticipate,
‣ reduce the impact of,
‣ cope with,
‣ and recover from the effects of adversity without compromising their long-term prospects.

The word 'ability' is key in understanding resilience. Within the context of emergency management, it equates to capacity or capability based on different human, psychological, social, financial,

physical, natural or political assets. Resilience is best conceptualised as an ability or process, rather than as an outcome.[4]

The different abilities listed in the definition demonstrate the overlapping nature of all four phases of emergency management – prevention, preparedness, response and recovery. Resilience is not just the immediate ability to respond to negative 'events' but rather a process of positive adaptation before, during and after adversity.[5]

The phrase 'without compromising long-term prospects' also contributes to understanding resilience, distinguishing it from mere survival. For resilience is not just a return to stability or a previous state, it is an ability to 'bounce back' or rather 'bounce forward', adapt to a changed reality and capitalise on the opportunities offered by a new environment.[6]

A resilience based approach

In 2009 the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed to adopt a whole of nation resilience-based approach to disaster management. This approach was selected with a view of strengthening society long-term. COAG acknowledged the inherent capacity in people and communities and committed itself to further strengthening and increasing capacity to withstand the effects of adversity.[8]

COAG later released the National Strategy for Disaster Resilience (NSfDR) in 2011. This strategy acknowledged that disaster resilience relies on society as a whole and not solely government; emergency services departments and local authorities. It recognised that a national, coordinated and cooperative effort was required to enhance Australia's capacity to withstand and recover from emergencies and disasters. Further scope existed for clarifying the role and capacity of not-for-profits, businesses and communities within the context of disaster resilience and cooperative governance.

Role in Emergency Managment system

There are now a number of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders within the emergency management sphere. While in the past their roles have been conceptualised in quite limited terms, in recent years, both traditional and non-traditional stakeholders have recognised their unique attributes and capacity to contribute to emergency management. Their subsequent roles have expanded in scope. Not-for-profits have begun contributing beyond traditional disaster relief and welfare provision. Similarly, non-traditional stakeholders have diversified their interests and contributions to disaster management.

2   Kapucu N, Rivera F, and Hawkins C (2013) Disaster resilience and sustainability: Interdisciplinary perspectives, New York: Routledge.

3   Demiroz F and Hu Q (2014) 'The Role of Nonprofits and Civil Society in Post-disaster Recovery and Development', In Disaster and Development, edited by Naim Kapucu and Kuotsai Tom Liou, New York: Springer International; Shaw R, Takeuchi Y, Krishnamurthy R, Pereira J, Mallick F (2012) 'Universities and Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction', Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction, 67-87, Emerald Publisher, UK.

4   Norris F H, Stevens S P, Pfefferbaum B, Wyche K F and Pfefferbaum R L (2008) 'Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness', American Journal of Community Psychology, 41(1–2), 127–150.

5   International Federation Red Cross and Red Crescent (2012) 'The Road to resilience: IFRC discussion paper on resilience'.

6   Paton D and Johnston D (2006) Disaster resilience: an integrated approach, Charles C Thomas Pub Ltd.

7   Council of Australian Governments (2011) 'National Strategy for Disaster Resilience', Commonwealth of Australia.

8   International Federation Red Cross and Red Crescent (2012), 'The Road to resilience: IFRC discussion paper on resilience'.

Capacity in disaster resilience

Not-for-profits and non-traditional stakeholders have inherent adaptive capabilities that can be utilised and leveraged in disaster resilience. They have the ability to swiftly mobilise resources, expertise, and essential services in response to disasters.[9] They are also capable of fostering social capital, a crucial component to disaster resilience.

Not-for-profit

The role and capacity of not-for-profits (NFP) in disaster resilience is inextricably linked to their close and on-going relationship with communities.[10] Not-for-profits are trusted entities that the community turn to for advice and support, owing to their knowledge and experience in responding to human need and complex situations.[11]

Not-for-profits now serve as important service and support providers in all four phases of emergency management. However, their capacity is not limited to supportive tasks.[12] In the prevention and preparedness phases, they are able to plan, engage and educate the community at large through targeted education programs, as well as community outreach and awareness campaigns. They are also able to inform public policy and develop social enterprise. In the response and recovery phases, they have the ability to harness philanthropy through resourceful fundraising and provide important human services that might otherwise fall through the gaps. These services include case management, volunteer coordination, technical and financial support, community recovery planning and behavioural health and psychological support.[13]

Unlike other traditional stakeholders (government and combat agencies) not-for-profits are in a position to address the broader and longer-term health and financial impacts of emergencies;[14] what Red Cross terms the 'psycho-social' impacts of disaster.[15]

Not-for-profits are also capable of building social capital within communities. They have the distinct capacity to tap into a reservoir of community 'good will', which in turn can be used to achieve positive social goals and outcomes.[16] By drawing people in who share their vision and values, they act as 'banks' for generating social capital.[17] This has been identified and linked with an extraordinary capacity to contribute toward resilience development.

Non-traditional stakeholders

Non-traditional stakeholders have their own unique roles and capacity, distinct from their traditional counterparts. The business sector, for example, have historically provided hard capital resources in the form of facilities, supplies, technology, equipment and financial aid , as well as soft solutions in the form of human capital — both crucial components for maintaining continuity of services in the response and recovery stage.[19]

However, businesses are also strategically well placed to develop market-based incentives to support resilience solutions in emergency management. They have the capacity to steer public demand towards materials, systems and technological solutions to build and run resilient communities. For instance, they are able to set standards and quality assurance criteria for

developing safer structures in urban areas, invest in programmes or risk reduction efforts, and provide expertise in administration and internal business processes.[20]

Another non-traditional stakeholder, identified now as pivotal to disaster resilience, is the community sector.[21] They provide the glue or 'informal insurance' necessary to prepare, respond and recover from a disaster. Their capacity lies in their inclusivity, innovation and ability to empower.[22] Due to their close ties with members of the community, they can absorb and integrate prevention and preparedness techniques to a wider audience.[23] They can also define and represent needs to external agencies and specialists to secure resources and help in times of emergency.[24]

Enablers for capacity

Collaborative governance is widely considered a key enabler for disaster resilience.[25] Considering resilience as a process of positive adaptation supported by an array of players within a society, several critical variables impact the success of this process.

Participation and Leadership

The involvement of citizens is central for building sustainable community-wide resilience. Participation requires genuine interest in defining and resolving community needs; ensuring the benefits of taking part override costs associated with participation; and a sense of connection between place and people.[26] Another key dimension for community capacity building is the inclusion of formal and informal leaders. Strong leadership requires connectedness to other leaders and receptivity to suggestions and innovation submitted by citizens.

9   Kapucu N, Yuldashev F, and Feldheim, M A (2011), Nonprofit organizations in disaster response and management: A network analysis, European Journal of Economic and Political Studies, 4(1), 83–112.
10   Demiroz, F and Hu, Q (2014) 'The Role of Nonprofits and Civil Society in Post-disaster Recovery and Development', In Disaster and Development, edited by Naim Kapucu and Kuotsai Tom Liou, New York: Springer International.
11   Stys J J, (2011) 'Non-profit involvement in disaster response and recovery', accessed via http://www.law.unc.edu/documents/clear/publications/nonprofit.pdf.
12   Ibid
13   National Disaster Recovery Framework – FEMA (2011).
14   Flatt V B, and Stys, J J (2011) 'Long term recovery in disaster response and the role of non-profits', Oñati Socio-legal Series, 3(2), 346–362.
15   Richardson J F (2009) Beyond Survival: A new Look at Household Preparedness, Proc Western Australian Fire and Emergency Services Conference.
16   Hampshire A and Healy K, Social Capital in Practice, Originally published for and presented at the Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference (July 2000).
17   Scott, D. (1999). Creating social capital: The distinctive role of the non-government agency. Children Australia 24(1), 4-7.
18   O'Sullivan, T., Kuziemsky, E., Toal-Sullivan, D. & Corneil, W. (2012) 'Unraveling the complexities of disaster management: A framework for critical social infrastructure to promote population health and resilience', Social Science & Medicine, Volume 93, pp. 238-246.
19   Council of Australian Governments (2011) 'National Strategy for Disaster Resilience', Commonwealth of Australia.
20   Ventures Unlimited (2009) available at gearupgetready.org/GuGrToolkit/resources/PrivateSectorGuide.doc
21   Norris, F H, Stevens S P, Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., and Pfefferbaum, R L (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness, American Journal of Community Psychology, 41(1–2), 127–150; Paton, D and Johnston, D (2006) Disaster resilience: an integrated approach, Charles C Thomas Pub Ltd.
22   Ibid
23   Demiroz, F and Hu, Q (2014) 'The Role of Nonprofits and Civil Society in Post-disaster Recovery and Development', In Disaster and Development, edited by Naim Kapucu and Kuotsai Tom Liou, New York: Springer International.
24   Norris F H, Stevens S P, Pfefferbaum B, Wyche K F, and Pfefferbaum R L (2008), Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness, American Journal of Community Psychology, 41(1–2), 127–150; Paton D and Johnston D (2006) Disaster resilience: an integrated approach, Charles C Thomas Pub Ltd; Paton D, Johnston DJ, Mamula-Seadon L and Kenney C M, (2014) 'Recovery and Development: Perspectives from New Zealand and Australia', In Disaster and Development, edited by Naim Kapucu and Kuotsai Tom Liou, New York: Springer International.
25   Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (2011) Public-Private Partnerships and Disaster Resilience, Report from APEC Workshop on Public Private Partnerships and Disaster Resilience, Bangkok 24-29 August; Ansell, C., Gash, A. (2007), "Collaborative governance in theory and practice", Journal of Public Administration Theory and Research Advance Access, available at: http://jpart.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/mum032v1.

Trust

Trust building among and between sectors and community members is essential in reinforcing the likelihood of successful collaboration.[27] Trusted relationships serve as a foundation for collaboration, communication and the efficient mobilisation of resources. Significant advances can be made in this area pre-disaster, in the form of relationship building between community emergency managers and other recovery officials as well as pre-determining priority recovery issues. Establishing and streamlining mitigation practices, recovery plans and systems for local and remote residents are also part of this process; enabling information exchanges and transmission of knowledge from those possessing expertise or experience.[28] This process occurs in contexts that enable people to recognise one another's competencies and intentions. Sectors that build and maintain close and enduring relationships with the communities they exist within maintain an advantage in responding to their needs.[29]

Social capital

The primary resource of any community is its social capital; that is strong individual and community networks that produce trust, reciprocity and mutual benefits accessed through membership of a particular social group.[30] Explored in depth at the 2012 National Disaster Resilience Roundtable, the core facet of social capital development involves community members assessing and identifying vulnerabilities and addressing these through networks of assistance and information to enhance their own capacities when faced with risk. Strong social capital correlates with high resilience to disaster and a community's ability to co-exist with natural hazards and their consequences.[31] This process can be enabled and supported by professional practitioners, experienced in finding local creative solutions to complex situations.[32]

Traditional and non-traditional stakeholders who emphasise community engagement are more likely to understand the diversity, strengths and vulnerabilities of affected communities. Moreover, being on-ground enables local representatives to respond to disaster with unparalleled speed and agility to provide assistance both immediately and long-term.[33]

Partnerships

The considerable number of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders involved in disaster management requires the extensive ability to have horizontal, as well as vertical, communication and

26   Goodman R M, Speer M A, McLeroy K R, Fawcett S, Kegler M, Parker E, et al. (1998) Identifying and defining dimensions of community capacity to provide a basis for measurement, Health Education and Behavior, 25(3), 258–278.

27   Ansell and Gash, op cit.

28   Campbell D A (2009) 'Stand by me: Organization founding in the aftermath of disaster', The American Review of Public Administration, 40(3), 351–369.

29   Kapucu N (2006) Interagency communication networks during emergencies: Boundary spanners in multiagency Coordination. American Review of Public Administration, 36(2), 207–225.

30   Adger, WN (2003). 'Social Capital, Collective Action, and Adaptation to Climate Change.' Economic Geography, Vol 79, No 4, Pp.387-404; Aldrich, D P (2012) Building resilience: Social capital in post-disaster recovery, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

31   Council of Australian Governments (2011) 'National Strategy for Disaster Resilience', Commonwealth of Australia.

32   Demiroz F and Hu Q (2014) 'The Role of Nonprofits and Civil Society in Post-disaster Recovery and Development', In Disaster and Development, edited by Naim Kapucu and Kuotsai Tom Liou, New York: Springer International, 317-330.

33   Kapucu N, Arslan T, and Demiroz, F (2010) 'Collaborative emergency management and national emergency management network' Disaster Prevention and Management, 19(4), 452–468; Flatt V B and Stys J J (2011) Long term recovery in disaster response and the role of non-profits, Oñati Socio-legal Series, 3(2), 346–362.

coordination.[34] Best practice disaster management is dynamic and adaptive, involves cross-boundary integration and inter-organisational networks containing a diverse mix of people.[35] Core tenants of this include:

- Reciprocal links throughout the overall network that support frequent supportive interactions;
- Overlap with other networks within a community;
- The ability to form new associations, particularly with marginalised communities; and
- Cooperative decision-making processes.[36]

Employing these tenants ultimately facilitates greater awareness and connectedness within communities.

In recent years, public-private partnerships have become a priority, given their close connection to the development of social and economic infrastructure in Australia. Traditional and non-traditional stakeholders that operate day-to-day within communities have the further capacity to monitor civic dynamics, and can be leveraged for their connectivity and knowledge of on-ground nuances. For instance, they can offer techniques for handling unsolicited donated goods, or establishing metrics to evaluate the recovery progress.[37]

Comprehensive Contingency Planning
Given disasters frequently highlight gaps in community systems, cross-sector partnerships can also serve to cover possible gaps by facilitating resource sharing, training and access to information. Collaborative asset mapping acknowledges opportunities and threats associated with various resources or elements of community. This supports the resilience framework by enabling organisations and personnel to adapt to changing circumstances, demands and accessibility of resources. It can also prompt engagement with non-traditional stakeholders to devise new solutions and support overburdened systems. 'One size fits all' solutions are not adequate to promote community resilience. Instead, intervention design must emerge from the complexity of the situation and be tailored to the community context at any point in time.

Barriers to capacity
Broad recognition exists that governments alone cannot build resilience. In extending this duty to traditional and non-traditional stakeholders, a number of barriers, both perceived and actual exist. The primary challenge requires a shift to developing an all-hazards, collaborative approach to building resilience.[38] Overcoming various definitional and institutional issues will enable greater efficiency in this area.

Understanding 'long-term recovery'
Perception and definition of a problem inevitably shapes the response to it. It is recognised that successful recovery from emergencies relies on respondents understanding the context, recognising the complexity, using community-led

34   Kapucu, Arslan, & Demiroz Op. Cite no. 9.
35   O'Sullivan T, Kuziemsky, E, Toal-Sullivan D and Corneil W (2012) 'Unraveling the complexities of disaster management: A framework for critical social infrastructure to promote population health and resilience', Social Science & Medicine, Volume 93, pp. 238-246.
36   Goodman et. Al. Op. Cite no. 2.
37   Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). (2011). National disaster recovery framework: Strengthening disaster recovery of the nation. http://www.fema.gov/pdf/recoveryframework/ndrf.pdf.

approaches, ensuring coordination of all activities and acknowledging and building capacity; a process taking up to (and sometimes in excess of) five years. However, some stakeholders consider long-term recovery to span a few months.[39] Agreement around a working definition of long-term recovery among relevant stakeholders will support a more consolidated response.

Decentralisation

As individual entities, businesses and not-for-profits tend to have clear organisational models but little sector coordination.[40] Similarly larger communities tend to have many stakeholders involved in disaster management, but lack a centralised organising structure, resulting in institutional fragmentation.[41] This poor coordination becomes particularly evident during large scale disasters when sectors try to mobilise in an emergency. While a decentralised model can enable effective grassroots operations, they can also limit the efficacy of overall response efforts with stakeholders 'siloed' in their narrow field.

Acting within industry/sector silos has led to reports of non-responsiveness, miscommunication, and bureaucracy.[42] Communities are frequently unable to 'connect the dots' and identify relevant organisations' resources that could be used in training, information-sharing and service provision.[43]

This reality falls short of recommendations emerging from studies emphasising the importance of individual and organisational linkages as key components of community resilience.[44]

While the expense and logistics of cross sector coordination creates additional barriers, the benefit to collaborative activities enables greater efficiency in managing resources, facilitates functional information-sharing and avoids duplication in service provision during and post-disaster.[45] A systems-based approach is central to establishing a holistic approach to resilience.

Power and budget imbalances

A flow-on effect of decentralisation and siloing is the risk of power imbalances between stakeholders impacting broad-based participation and partnerships. Collaborative governance relies on trust between stakeholders, as well as organisational capacity, organisation, status and resources to participate.[46]

Budget constraints can also serve as a barrier to capacity among not-for-profit groups and small businesses, which may function on modest means and lack the financial capital to extend resilience-related facilities and communication infrastructure.

38   Plough J E, Fielding A, Chandra M W, Eisenman D, Wells K B, Law G Y, Fogleman S, Magaña A (2013) 'Building Community Disaster Resilience: Perspectives From a Large Urban County Department of Public Health Alonzo', American Journal of Public Health. July; 103(7): 1190–1197.

39   Stys J J (2011) Non-profit involvement in disaster response and recovery, accessed via http://www.law.unc.edu/documents/clear/publications/nonprofit.pdf.

40   Ibid.

41   Drennan L, McConnell W (2007) Risk and Crisis Management in the Public Sector, Abingdon: Routledge imprint of Taylor & Francis.

42   Stewart G T, Kolluru R, Smith M, (2009) 'Leveraging public-private partnerships to improve community resilience in times of disaster', International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, Vol. 39 Iss: 5, pp.343 – 364.

43   Plough et. Al. Op. Cite no. 14; Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., and Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008) Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness. American Journal of Community Psychology, 41(1–2), 127–150.

44   O'Sullivan et. Al. Op. Cite no. 11.

45   Carroll J M, Rosson M B, Farooq U and Xiao L (2009) 'Beyond being aware', Information and Organization, 19, 162-185.

Power and budgetary imbalances can impact stakeholders' abilities to participate 'on an equal footing', allowing stronger stakeholders to dominate and control their sector.

Planning and policy implications

While working within the scope of the National Strategy for Disaster Resilience, this paper has sought to clarify the role and capacity of not-for-profits and non-traditional stakeholders in disaster resilience. In exploring these capabilities, further planning and policy implications emerge. The continued shift from traditional command and control models, largely driven by government-based organisations to more collaborative processes is significant.

A focus on shared responsibility has lead to enhanced coordination between State and Territory emergency agencies and other traditional and non-traditional stakeholders. Emergency management policy today is developed with input from diverse participants including the Bureau of Meteorology, local councils, the insurance industry, and not-for-profits such as Red Cross.[47] Affiliation with state-based emergency and disaster services has heightened the policy influence of such groups in their capacity as key consultants on government disaster committees and research focus groups.[48] This change challenges traditional approaches to disaster management but ultimately offers the opportunity for the emergency management sector to become genuinely holistic, with responsibilities shared across society.

There has also been a recognisable shift in the way resilience is conceptualised, with it increasingly seen as a process rather than an outcome.[49] The implications of this shift are noteworthy. In identifying the long-term nature of resilience development, the enduring commitment required from a host of different stakeholders is laid bare. Recognising and embracing that shared responsibility will fundamentally transform the emergency management landscape.

This theoretical adjustment also encourages a wider analysis and commitment to all phases of disaster management, particularly the preparedness phase. This impacts not only the way we view disaster management, but also the way we address it across sectors. In moving forward, the focus at both a government and non-government level should be in cultivating strong links and relationships across sectors prior to a disaster. These links and relationships will ultimately enhance the overall effectiveness of mitigation, recovery and resilience processes in Australian disaster management.

46   Ansell C, Gash A (2007) 'Collaborative governance in theory and practice', Journal of Public Administration Theory and Research Advance Access, available at: http://jpart.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/mum032v1

47   Duft, N (2011) 'Engagement or Education?', The Australian Journal of Emergency Management, Volume 26, No 3, July; Smith E (2006) 'National Disaster Preparedness in Australia – Before and After 9/11', Australasian Journal of Paramedicine, 4(2), available at: http://ro.ecu.edu.au/jephc/vol4/iss2/7

48   Weir J (2013) 'Fire authorities and planners: reducing risk across diverse landscapes', in L J Wright (Ed) 2013, 'Proceedings of Bushfire CRC and AFAC 2013 Conference Research Forum' 2 September 2013, Melbourne Australia, Bushfire CRC.

49   Pfefferbaum B, Reissman D, Pfefferbaum R, Klomp R and Gurwitch R (2005) Building resilience to mass trauma events. In Doll L, Bonzo S, Mercy J and Sleet D (Eds.), Handbook on injury and violence prevention interventions, New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

redcross.org.au

Red Cross National Office
155 Pelham St
Carlton VIC 3053
Ph: 03 9345 1800

Australian Capital Territory
Red Cross House 3 Dann Cl
Garran ACT 2605
Ph: 02 6234 7600

New South Wales
St Andrews House
Level 4, 464 Kent St
Sydney NSW 2000
Ph: 02 9229 4111

Northern Territory
Cnr Lambell Tce and Schultze St
Larrakeyah NT 0820
Ph: 08 8924 3900

Queensland
49 Park Rd
Milton QLD 4064
Ph: 07 3367 7222

South Australia
212 Pirie St
Adelaide SA 5000
Ph: 08 8100 4500

Tasmania
40 Melville St
Hobart TAS 7000
Ph: 03 6235 6077

Victoria
23-47 Villiers St
North Melbourne VIC 3051
Ph: 03 8327 7700

Western Australia
110 Goderich St
East Perth WA 6004
Ph: 08 9225 8888