

Alternative Commonwealth Capabilities for Crisis Response Discussion Paper form

Submission from:

Daryl Camp ESM



Please contact me if you require any clarification about what I have written here. Thank you.

To help us address the challenge outlined in this discussion paper, you may wish to consider the below questions:

- Acknowledging the primary role of state and territories in emergency response, what longer-term capacities and capabilities does the Commonwealth need to develop to meet the challenges of the evolving strategic environment?
- At a national level, what are likely to be the key pressure points or challenges for the Commonwealth responding to competing and concurrent crises?
- How could the Commonwealth build community resilience and capability so they are better able to respond to and recover from national-level crises?
- What changes in the current system are necessary to help Australia have the right capabilities and capacity to handle concurrent crises?
- What models could the Commonwealth explore to replace or supplement support currently provided by the ADF during domestic crisis?
 - What does the right mix of Commonwealth capabilities look like?
 - How could a Commonwealth workforce surge capacity be replicated in a scalable, efficient and effective way?
 - How could we harness the critical role of volunteers and civilian groups under this model?
 - How do these models supplement, but not replicate, existing models operating at a state and territory and local level?
 - What role could industry / the private sector play? How can the Government attract increased investment in emergency management from the private sector?
 - What gaps currently exist in state and territory emergency management capability?
- Are there sectors that could replicate the capabilities provided by the ADF?
- What are the critical functions the Commonwealth Government should continue to perform in disaster relief and recovery, in support of local, state and territory governments?
- What legislative, regulatory or policy changes could be undertaken to make it financially viable for other sectors to contribute to a Commonwealth crisis response capability?

Next steps

- Using the questions above to guide a response, the Department is seeking your views, ideas, and offers of assistance, on how to best enhance Australia's national level emergency

response capabilities. We are particularly interested in the perspectives of peak bodies, private sector organisations, academia, and key stakeholders operating in the emergency response and recovery space, including representatives from State, Territory and local government, not-for-profit groups and community organisations.

- The Department of Home Affairs and NEMA will use information gathered from submissions to inform the policy development process and advice to Government on potential options.
- PDF submissions to this discussion paper can be uploaded via the enclosed [hyperlink](#).
- Submissions close 11:59pm Wednesday, 20 September 2023.
- Submissions received after this deadline may not be considered. Submissions received will be made public – unless there is a request for it to be kept confidential (subject to legal requirements, such as those imposed by the Freedom of Information Act 1982 (Cth)).
- If you have any questions in relation to enhancing Australia’s emergency response capabilities or wish to submit a confidential submission, please feel free to contact us through NationalResilience.Consultation@homeaffairs.gov.au

Reply to the questions:

- I am going to advocate that floods, cyclones and storms cannot be mitigated against successfully in most cases due to the following reasons:
 - Towns and cities are already built on flood plains, around rivers and water ways and will always flood, even so called flood mitigation dams cannot completely stop flooding.
 - The cost to build and maintain flood proofing in cities becomes a cost to every Australian, to support the few who choose to live in properties that are known to flood on a regular basis.
 - Perhaps a true buy back scheme to get people out of flood prone housing may work, and then turn the land into a different use.
 - Housing stock can be up to 100 years old so has anything built before about 1981 is susceptible to wind damage.
 - Once again the cost to strengthen homes to current standards is a huge impost. If there was a Commonwealth grant scheme available, that is not means tested, but more based around risk and resilience, people could strengthen their homes to stay in them.
 - Many areas of Australia do not have the same wind ratings, even though they are now being affected by severe storms and wind speeds equal to cyclone prone areas, so even modern houses are adversely affected by wind from storms and fronts pushing through.
 - Even with retro fitting houses to modern standards, they can still be affected by wind borne debris and only have to get one window or door breached to damage/destroy the house,
 - Perhaps a grant scheme to assist with roller shutters, or similar, to protect doors and windows.
 - There is a mistaken assumption that these works will make a building impervious to the hazard, which is an unreasonable expectation (unless we are in concrete “doomsday prepper” bunkers)
 - Even with the plethora of research and data available to local and state governments, planning considerations remain inadequate to prevent further community expansion into disaster prone areas.

- Challenges of balancing said planning considerations against human-social issues such as the current housing crisis and the implementation of short-term solutions that do not consider natural hazard risk.
- I will also have something to say about resilience
 - Not everyone in the community can afford all the steps to be completely resilient
 - People will always need a response effort and the Commonwealth should be assisting the state and territory emergency services with funding, resourcing and training, similar to the National Counter Terrorism Strategy and National Counter Terrorism Plan
 - It is not fair to leave the funding, direction and resourcing of the state and territory emergency services just with the States.
 - We need to be coordinated, trained, resourced and prepared the same across Australia so we can effectively respond outside our own jurisdiction as required to assist. Emergencies and disasters are borderless, and so should we be in response.
 - We need to consider items such as raising, sustain, training members where the majority of the population is and have them established as a ready reserve for any incident/event with their state and to assist other states when required. A tiered response to volunteering might be a great option.
 - We need to have caches of equipment ready to go when more human resources are sent in to a large event

Capturing new volunteers and harnessing short-term altruism

- The decline in commitment to long-term volunteering means that volunteering organisations should be considering frameworks that will allow them to harness spontaneous volunteers at a time when altruism is high, albeit for the short term. This enables a connection between those who may not have engaged with a volunteering service in the past and could lead to a longer term relationship, as well as increasing the capability to support the community – which is what we're here for after all.
- A structure needs to be established with clear guidelines to connect spontaneous volunteers with agencies early, provide leadership and direction and purposeful tasking in a safe and meaningful way – for both volunteer and community.
- Development of a national plan to resource agencies to meet the gap that is currently filled by ADF where it is not a defence-specific skill.

On the topic of resilience (as it relates to people, not infrastructure)

- Resilience is relative to the individual and fluctuates as their personal circumstances change, with the hazard often coming in a poor second.
- A lack of tolerance for disruption is often mistaken for a lack of resilience – “just because I don't want to, doesn't mean I can't”. Our language during preparation for and response to disasters doesn't tackle the discomfort that the community should reasonably expect. We are letting our communities down by not being frank and fearless in our conversation and message.
- A country as disaster prone as Australia, and especially Queensland, should expect to be impacted by hazards and the disruption/loss that they bring.

Who is best at resilience?

- Insurance companies.

- They have the best handle on hazards and risks, where the interaction sits and what the cost of the interaction will be.
- If they will not insure a location or a facility/premise, it is because the place is too risky.
- Insurance companies look at recurrence and if you have a \$500,000 house that gets flooded every 20 years, then your insurance premium will be at least \$25,000 per year so they can afford to payout every 20 years.
- The Australian public do not understand or consider this as a risk. The only way the insurance companies can show risk is by increasing premiums until the premise becomes financially unsound to insure, or too risky.
- However, when people are either not insured or under insured, someone always comes along and helps them, so they rebuild in the same location again.
- We have to stop this type of “help” as we are all promoting a lack of resilience and pushing up insurance premiums across the board.
- If a property is deemed uninsurable, this should be recorded against the property so it can be found when doing a property search. If someone chooses to build on uninsurable land, they should not get any support when they are flooded, as this proves the reasoning behind the uninsurable status.

My thoughts on **response efforts** and rather than a Commonwealth surge capacity, I suggest a different option.

- I wish to comment on the role of Australian civil and volunteer groups, not-for-profit organisations and state-based services in preparing for, responding to and recovering from natural disasters, and the impact of more frequent and more intense natural disasters on their ongoing capacity and capability.
- Under Australia's current emergency management arrangements, the states and territories have primary responsibility and accountability in emergency management functions. However, the Commonwealth can, and does, provide coordinated assistance when crises exceed the capacity and capabilities of a single state and/or territory
- NEMA is leading the implementation of a package of measures to consolidate and enhance existing crisis management arrangements ahead of the upcoming high-risk weather season, with a focus on:
 - supporting non-government organisations, volunteer organisations and state and territory governments, through greater coordination of assistance via the National Coordination Mechanism
 - enhancing the existing National Emergency Management Stockpile model to continue to rapidly support states and territories during a disaster
 - continuing to support the growth of operations and capacity of Disaster Relief Australia
 - working in partnership with governments, academia and Volunteering Australia to increase the number of volunteers involved in disaster resilience, response and recovery activities
- Australia's state and territory governments are responsible for the protection of life, property and the environment within their jurisdictions – this includes prevention and preparedness activities to mitigate disaster risk and impact, and response to and recovery from natural hazards.
- Part of the issue is funding, as Local Governments can only obtain funding through their rates and charges, or grants managed by State governments and sometimes the Federal Government.

- States and territories are the first responders to any incident that occurs within the bounds of their jurisdiction. Each state and territory maintains its own emergency management legislation, processes, plans and arrangements to respond to crises, but have arrangements in place to share resources across borders if required. Where a crisis exceeds state and territory capacity to respond, states and territories can request additional support from the Commonwealth to bolster their response and recovery efforts.
- In all of these cases the community is still reliant on a volunteer workforce to respond to the disaster event. Unfortunately, with the increased demand on these volunteer services to respond to the ever increasing number of events and the longer duration of events, we see a negative impact on volunteer numbers. As volunteer numbers decrease we see more reliance on volunteers being deployed into a community to ensure response can continue.
- This may be in relation to current volunteer practices whereby each State sets their own criteria against how often a volunteer is required to attend training and activations to remain a current member of the organisation. We may need to consider some new models for volunteering that are more consistent with volunteering trends. There is a lot of research into volunteering and trends in volunteering that is available to access online. One example is found here <https://knowledge.aidr.org.au/resources/volunteering-in-ajem/>
- I believe one option to help with this is to have people trained, equipped and held in reserve to be deployed into areas when required.
 - This can work in the larger population centres, where we have a trained and deployable resources who can work closely with the limited number of volunteers, who have the local knowledge and links to the affected community, to coordinate the response.
 - To do this effectively we will need funding to recruit, train, exercise and deploy these people, as the states cannot afford this in most cases.
 - These trained and deployable teams can be used both intrastate and interstate.
 - If we are able to run exercises for them 3 times a year, they will understand their time commitment and may be more amiable to this limited belonging to a response organisation.
 - We will need to train and exercise the current volunteers across the state in incident management skills so they can effectively manage these deployable teams as they come in to assist.
 - If the Commonwealth can fund training and exercises for Counter Terrorism, it should be easy enough to run a similar program, in conjunction with the States and Territories, to ensure we have a well trained and exercised volunteer response resource across the country.
 - This will have the added benefit of many courses being the same across all jurisdiction and will allow for better portability of knowledge and skills between the states.
 - The risk management process for severe weather events and bush fires will show that Australians are at a greater risk from weather related events than any other current threat or hazard.
 - The outlay by Commonwealth to support this process will be returned when volunteers can once again be the greatest asset in response to these events across Australia and support our communities.
- When we look at the process that was followed for terrorism where the Commonwealth funded training, exercises, extra resources, stockpiles and coordination services, I believe

this will work for our volunteer services, not for profit organisations and state based services in being able to respond better.

- A Commonwealth funded and supported training curriculum will mean everyone across the country is operating under the same system and using very similar equipment.
 - A national curriculum will mean training is truly portable and will help to alleviate each State and Territory having to design, develop and implement their own training, will lead to cost savings and should mean we can keep volunteers even when they move states. The single most relevant difference will be the legislation in each State and the procedure they utilise. This can be briefed to incoming teams as necessary.
 - As well as training, we should explore the outcome of allowing all STES organisation to have similar responses, such as boat rescue, in water rescue, and many others.
 - This way if we all train the same way, we can easily respond interstate to assist and use our trained “reserve” base to assist with a surge capacity.
 - If we have this surge capacity trained across the country in each State and Territory, we should be able to manage our deployments so we can respond with people over a protracted event without overwhelming any one section of our system. This means volunteers can work out when they are needed and not risk their job to respond. This goes for the affected community and the deployable surge capacity.
- In most cases the States and Territories fund their own State or Territory Emergency Service (STES), and it is based on an older model of volunteerism. To attempt the concept described above, we will require access to a Commonwealth fund that is easy to access and is ongoing.
 - This funding should extend to facilities to house current and projected STES volunteer organisations in communities. Many facilities lack standard features (such as toilets, showers, kitchenettes, running water, electricity and so on) and many fail to meet all Workplace Health and Safety requirements when the volunteers are working from the facility.
 - Each State or Territory may need to make minor changes to their legislation to ensure incoming teams have the same protections as their own teams and STES organisation may have to alter some of their policy and procedures to allow this new type of volunteerism without the expectation of full attendance.
 - If we want volunteers to feel engaged and respected, we must provide them with suitable facilities to work from.
 - This extra funding will also need to extend to fleet. Many organisations do not have access to a suitable response vehicle and many locations are limited to one dual cab utility which is incapable of taking more than 5 people. If they have 20 volunteers who are trained and ready to respond, they cannot respond effectively with only one vehicle.
 - If we could have a reserve capacity of vehicles, which could be rotated through active groups, we could maintain a larger fleet and manage response much more effectively.
 - To match a larger fleet we will also require a cache of response equipment ready to go at all times to service the deployable teams we have built up.
 - We have already established a system to utilise hire vehicles, unfortunately when a disaster impacts the community it is often very difficult to acquire hire vehicles that are suitable as a response vehicle.

- Even if our reserve capacity vehicles are detailed to a standard build, we would be able to turn them into a severe weather response vehicle within 30 minutes utilising our STORM Pods (Safe Transport of Response Materials).
- If we can access Commonwealth funding at every State and Territory to ensure our facilities are adequate, we have a surge capacity built into our fleet systems, we have a standardised training system across the country and a surge capacity that supports all volunteers over protracted events.
- While the concept that NEMA has about a National Stockpile, I believe that we could have a smaller stockpile in each state and even have some of this farmed out to “at risk” communities so they can start to respond before further resources arrive.
 - We currently work on a 72 hour window, where each of our Groups has sufficient resources to last their response teams. We believe that we can get extra human and physical resources into the affected community within 72 hours.
- The other issue to consider here is emergency logistics transport.
 - At a Commonwealth level, they should manage the transport aspects so we can get both human and physical resources into any location within 72 hours.
 - While the ADF will not be involved in the response to these events, they could become a logistics transport hub, allowing us to move resources into an effected area safely and efficiently so we can support the response in the affected community.
 - If ADF is not available, and this could be for numerous reasons, it would still be appropriate for the Commonwealth, perhaps through the Australian Crisis Coordination Centre (ACCC) or NEMA, to coordinate transport for the STES.
- Recovery is something that most STES organisation do not get fully involved in as yet, due to their reliance on preparedness and response activities.
 - The preparedness and response activities take a lot of time from our volunteers already and rather than impose the full gamut of recovery on the same volunteers, I believe this is where organisations such as Disaster Relief Australia (DRA) can come into play.
 - DRA is being funded to recruit and train more volunteers nation wide right now. These volunteer scan come in during/after the response phase and start work on more recovery based activities, under the direction of the Local Government.

Here is my attempt at a summary, with quotes direct from the discussion paper:

- Over the coming decade, we expect that a wide range of threats and hazards will come together, exposing gaps in existing capacity and placing increased pressure on governments, institutions, economies and communities. While we have collectively made progress to enhance Australia’s disaster preparedness, response and resilience capability, we have to do much more to make sure we can handle the challenging future we expect to face. This is a whole-of-society issue that requires whole-of-society action.
- In response to the [Defence Strategic Review](#), released on 24 April 2023, the Government agreed in-principle to work with the states and territories to develop national resilience and response measures for adverse climate change at the local level **without the need of ADF support**, except in the most extreme emergencies. **The Government also agreed in-principle that Defence should be the force of last resort for domestic aid to the civil community.**

- To ensure Australia is prepared to respond to these growing threats, the Australian Government announced a series of measures as part of the October 2023 Budget and the 2023-24 Budget to help communities strengthen their resilience and preparedness in the face of more frequent and intense natural hazards.
- This discussion paper forms part of the Commonwealth's approach to public consultation, which seeks to gain insights from a broad range of stakeholders, including industry experts, non-government organisations, not-for-profit groups, volunteer organisations, corporate Australia, the education sector, state and territory Government agencies, local governments, unions, and peak bodies. The insights gained through public consultation will be used to inform potential long-term options to uplift Commonwealth capabilities, which will be provided to the Commonwealth Government for consideration.
- This discussion paper calls for views on the capabilities that the Commonwealth Government needs to have to support state and territory-led crisis response and recovery efforts as an alternative to the ADF
- While the Commonwealth is scoping alternative national capabilities, it acknowledges that crisis response and recovery begins at the community level, and as crises escalate, local governments and states and territories are the first responders in Australia's emergency management system – as enshrined in the Australian Constitution.
- Under Australia's current emergency management arrangements, **the states and territories have primary responsibility and accountability in emergency management functions.** However, the Commonwealth can provide coordinated assistance when crises exceed the capacity and capabilities of a single state and/or territory
- NEMA is leading the implementation of a package of measures to consolidate and enhance existing crisis management arrangements ahead of the upcoming high-risk weather season, with a focus on:
 - supporting non-government organisations, volunteer organisations and state and territory governments, through greater coordination of assistance via the [National Coordination Mechanism](#)
 - enhancing the existing [National Emergency Management Stockpile](#) model to continue to rapidly support states and territories during a disaster
 - **continuing to support the growth of operations and capacity of Disaster Relief Australia**
 - working in partnership with governments, academia and Volunteering Australia to increase the number of volunteers involved in disaster resilience, response and recovery activities
- Australia's state and territory governments are responsible for the protection of life, property and the environment within their jurisdictions – this includes prevention and preparedness activities to mitigate disaster risk and impact, and response to and recovery from natural hazards.
- States and territories are the first responders to any incident that occurs within the bounds of their jurisdiction. Each state and territory maintains its own emergency management legislation, processes, plans and arrangements to respond to crises, but have arrangements in place to share resources across borders if required. Where a crisis exceeds state and territory capacity to respond, states and territories can request additional support from the Commonwealth to bolster their response and recovery efforts.
- **Volunteers, Not-for-Profit Organisations and Charities**
 - The volunteer, not-for-profit and charity sectors are crucial parts of Australia's national response and recovery arrangements. Australia has a long and proud tradition of volunteering, particularly in the emergency management sector, with volunteers offering an invaluable asset – their time – to contribute to activities and causes they care about, without expectation of reward. Volunteers make up the

majority of state emergency service personnel and are currently the foundation of Australia's workforce that responds to and supports recovery from domestic crises.

- While the overall number of volunteers joining state emergency service organisations has been in decline since 2015, there remains strong community appetite to provide assistance in times of need. Spontaneous volunteers are a crucial resource for Australia, often responding immediately at the site of an emergency and contributing to community-led response and recovery. Civilian groups, including volunteer groups, not-for-profit organisations and state-based services, are also essential in helping communities prepare for, and respond to emergencies. These groups supplement resilience building, preparation, response and recovery activities during disasters, while bolstering community cohesion and positive community connections.
- A key challenge facing Australia's emergency management system is the potential 'double counting' of its emergency response workforce. This is important when assessing the feasibility of a surge workforce as many volunteers perform a range of different roles during a crisis. For example, volunteer firefighters and first aiders are often also Army reservists, police, nurses and doctors. As a whole, the emergency management sector also faces competition from other sectors when trying to retain high-demand workers, such as search and rescue pilots, medical staff, and engineers.
- Not everyone in the community can afford all the steps to be completely resilient, so quiet often the lower socio economic individuals are the ones who cannot afford to make better their properties.
 - We have many people living in caravan parks and tents due to housing shortages.
 - Unfortunately they are living in parks which flood and many caravan parks are built in flood plains or near beaches.

Affordability also affects how well people can adapt to climate threats. One US study looking at homeowners given financial incentives to bolster their houses against bushfires found just 10 per cent did so; poorer homeowners couldn't afford to retrofit, even with the incentives.

"What it has meant, in America already, is you get ghettoisation," says the University of Tasmania's Dr Chloe Lucas, who has published multiple papers on the climate crisis and insurance.

"The most disadvantaged people end up in the riskiest places because they can't afford to leave."

Background Statements:

1. The role of the Australian Defence Force in responding to domestic natural disasters:
 - from the NATIONAL DEFENCE, DEFENCE STRATEGIC REVIEW 2023, Chapter 5 Climate Change and Support to Domestic Disaster Relief.
 - Paragraph 5.2 Climate change holds a number of significant implications for Defence. The acceleration of major climate events risks overwhelming the Government's capacity to respond effectively and detracting from Defence's primary objective of defending Australia. Climate events already place concurrency pressures on the ADF and this has negatively affected force preparedness, readiness and combat effectiveness.
 - Paragraph 5.3 Defence is frequently required to make large contributions to domestic disaster relief efforts as well as support to the community, such as during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, Defence is not structured or appropriately

equipped to act as a domestic disaster recovery agency concurrently with its core function, in any sustainable way.

- Paragraph 5.4 State and local governments, in partnership with the Commonwealth, must have in place the necessary plans, resources and capabilities to deal with all but the most extreme domestic disaster operations.
 - Paragraph 5.5 Defence must be the force of last resort for domestic aid to the civil community. This is critical given the urgent geostrategic risks that the nation faces and the need for the ADF to be in a position to respond to regional contingencies
 - **Recommendations:**
 - The Commonwealth should work with the states and territories to develop national resilience and response measures for adverse climate change at the local level without the need of ADF support, except in the most extreme emergencies.
 - Defence should be the force of last resort for domestic aid to the civil community, except in extreme circumstances.
2. The role of Australian civil and volunteer groups, not-for-profit organisations and state-based services in preparing for, responding to and recovering from natural disasters, and the impact of more frequent and more intense natural disasters on their ongoing capacity and capability;
- The volunteer, not-for-profit and charity sectors are crucial parts of Australia's national response and recovery arrangements. Australia has a long and proud tradition of volunteering, particularly in the emergency management sector, with volunteers offering an invaluable asset – their time – to contribute to activities and causes they care about, without expectation of reward. Volunteers make up the majority of state emergency service personnel and are currently the foundation of Australia's workforce that responds to and supports recovery from domestic crises.
 - While the overall number of volunteers joining state emergency service organisations has been in decline since 2015, there remains strong community appetite to provide assistance in times of need. Spontaneous volunteers are a crucial resource for Australia, often responding immediately at the site of an emergency and contributing to community-led response and recovery. Civilian groups, including volunteer groups, not-for-profit organisations and state-based services, are also essential in helping communities prepare for, and respond to emergencies. These groups supplement resilience building, preparation, response and recovery activities during disasters, while bolstering community cohesion and positive community connections.
 - A key challenge facing Australia's emergency management system is the potential 'double counting' of its emergency response workforce. This is important when assessing the feasibility of a surge workforce as many volunteers perform a range of different roles during a crisis. For example, volunteer firefighters and first aiders are often also Army reservists, police, nurses and doctors. As a whole, the emergency management sector also faces competition from other sectors when trying to retain high-demand workers, such as search and rescue pilots, medical staff, and engineers.
- What models could the Commonwealth explore to replace or supplement support currently provided by the ADF during domestic crisis?
 - What does the right mix of Commonwealth capabilities look like?

- Commonwealth should fund and support the State and Territory Emergency Services to increase capability and support training and exercises.
 - See my ideas around a Ready Reserve for STES above.
 - How could a Commonwealth workforce surge capacity be replicated in a scalable, efficient and effective way?
 - I cannot see the sense in replicating services that exist at State and Territory level, why not just help these with better funding for recruitment, training, exercising and caches ready for deployment?
 - How could we harness the critical role of volunteers and civilian groups under this model?
 - As above support the STES to raise their own capability and to have a Ready Reserve membership model.
 - How do these models supplement, but not replicate, existing models operating at a state and territory and local level?
 - As above if developed in the States and Territories they will be managed at this level and available for anything.
 - What role could industry / the private sector play? How can the Government attract increased investment in emergency management from the private sector?
 - Some individual companies already do this.
 - Suncorp will allow their staff unlimited time to respond to disasters in their own state.
 - I am unsure how you can convince industry/private sector to invest in this.
 - What gaps currently exist in state and territory emergency management capability?
 - Declined in volunteerism, based on our current practices
 - Insufficient funding for facilities, fleet and cached equipment to support a Ready Reserve force of volunteers or deployments coming into an area.
 - Out of date policies and procedures for volunteering in the current climate.
- Are there sectors that could replicate the capabilities provided by the ADF?
 - There is some capacity within the private sector capabilities in logistics and transport, however this is not as large or as easy to access as the ADF capabilities.
 - There is no current capability of large numbers of trained personnel ready to assist, see comments above about a Ready Reserve in each state and/or territory.
- What are the critical functions the Commonwealth Government should continue to perform in disaster relief and recovery, in support of local, state and territory governments?
 - I cannot comment on all aspects.
 - The ability to access funding to help cover costs of response is paramount. None of us are funded to meet all the aspects of moving staff and volunteers around, accommodating them, feeding them, maintain their equipment and clothing in these events, hiring extra equipment and vehicles (if they are available).
 - Funding for recovery efforts is critical and an expansion of build back better should be supported.
- What legislative, regulatory or policy changes could be undertaken to make it financially viable for other sectors to contribute to a Commonwealth crisis response capability?
 - Unsure.