



Australian Government

National Emergency
Management Agency

Submission to the Independent Review of Commonwealth Disaster Funding

Response ID: IRCDF_1401_146

Consent option: Publish Anonymously

Submitted by: Anonymous

Q1. What experience have you had with Commonwealth disaster funding support?

Council has experience dealing with the Commonwealth disaster funding; Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements (DRFA).

Q2. How could Commonwealth funding support communities to reduce their disaster risk?

Commonwealth funding can help communities reduce their disaster risk in a multitude of ways.

- Community Education and Awareness
- Infrastructure Improvement
- Early Warning Systems
- Post-Disaster Recovery works
- Capacity Building, Training & Resourcing
- Support for Risk Assessments and Preventative Operations
- Research Studies and Innovation
- Community Resilience Grants
- Risk Reduction Schemes such as House Raising, Acquisitions etc

Q3. Please describe your understanding of Commonwealth disaster funding processes.

No response provided.

Q4. Are the funding roles of the Commonwealth, states and territories, and local government, during disaster events clear?

During time of disaster, it is critical that seeking and obtaining funding for required works is as simple and quick as possible.

Simplification and greater clarity of the roles would be helpful.

Q5. Is there any further information you would like to provide?

The following possible improvements are listed for consideration regarding Claims and Guidelines:

1. Clear and Consistent Interpretation: The guidelines for disaster funding should be interpreted consistently across all levels of government and agencies involved. This will help avoid confusion and disputes regarding eligibility and scope of works.





Australian Government

National Emergency
Management Agency

2. Standard of Repair Clarification: The guidelines should explicitly clarify what constitutes a "permanent repair" and how temporary emergency repairs should be addressed in the funding process. This will prevent conflicting interpretations and ensure that repairs meet the intended purpose of the funding program.
3. Attribution to Event Guidelines: The guidelines should address how damage attribution should be handled in cases where multiple factors contribute to asset damage. Establishing clear criteria for attributing the cause of damage will help determine eligibility for funding more objectively.
4. Standard of Proof: Establishing a standard of proof for determining the attribution of cause of damage is important. This could involve considering reasonable probabilities or gathering expert opinions to ensure a fair assessment of eligibility for funding.
5. Consideration of Asset Condition: The guidelines should address how assets in less than "perfect" condition prior to the event should be treated for funding purposes. Exploring options like cost-sharing based on remaining asset life can ensure a fair allocation of funds for restoration.

