

**NATIONAL RISK ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

		1-year target (mid 2007)	2-year target (mid 2008)	5-year target (mid 2011)
PRIORITY AREA			This date marks the end of DMAP	This date marks the end of the 3rd year of any program replacing DMAP
Outcome: Roles in the Framework established				
	<p>5.1.1 Agreement reached to implement National Risk Assessment Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This outcome triggers the implementation of the framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Risk Assessment Framework (scope, goals, draft implementation plan), Terms of Reference for NRAAG endorsed by AEMC. (Dec 2006). Lead agency <u>AEMC</u>. –Completed. 		
	<p>5.1.2 Advisory bodies established</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Risk Assessment Advisory Group (NRAAG) has been operating as a Working Group and will be formally established with endorsement from AEMC (Dec 2006). The Terms of Reference for NRAAG have been prepared. Technical Risk Assessment Advisory Committee (TRAAC) was established in December 2004. The Terms of Reference for TRAAC will be modified to reflect key technical role supporting NRAAG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roles will be formally established with endorsement from AEMC (Dec 2006). Revised TRAAC TOR agreed (Jun 2007). Lead agency <u>AEMC</u>, supported by NRAAG and TRAAC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRAAG and TRAAC membership, Terms of Reference and work program reviewed annually, reported to AEMC and amended as required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRAAG and TRAAC membership, Terms of Reference and work program reviewed annually, reported to AEMC and amended as required.

		1-year target (mid 2007)	2-year target (mid 2008)	5-year target (mid 2011)
	<p>5.1.3 Framework significance maintained through monitoring, performance evaluation and revision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This essential annual step is required to measure success against performance indicators. The framework can be adjusted to accommodate changes in drivers, for example from emerging needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key recommendations on future priorities and resource requirements prepared. • Criteria for success of framework established. • Performance Indicators to measure progress against these criteria developed. • 1-year progress reported to AEMC. Report includes definitions of criteria for success, performance indicators and required information on risk, and strategy for managing and accessing information. • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by TRAAC, NFRAG, NSIM, DOTARS, EMA, GA, BOM and jurisdictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual evaluation reported to AEMC. • Key recommendations on future priorities and resource requirements included. • Framework modified as necessary to meet new developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual evaluation reported to AEMC. • Key recommendations on future priorities and resource requirements included. • Framework modified as necessary to meet new developments.
PRIORITY AREA				
Outcome: Risk assessment methods developed and baseline information produced				
	<p>5.1.4 Essential information on risk required for decision making defined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining the required information on risk establishes success criteria for the framework: e.g., ‘what do we want to achieve in managing risk, and what do we need to know about risk to achieve this?’ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential information on likelihood, consequence, uncertainty defined for the types of risk addressed by the framework. The Risk Assessment Guidelines (see 5.1.6) will describe outcomes-based processes that develop information to meet these needs. • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by TRAAC, NSIM, NFRAG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential target information reviewed and modified as required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential target information reviewed and modified as required.

		1-year target (mid 2007)	2-year target (mid 2008)	5-year target (mid 2011)
	<p>5.1.5 A picture of natural hazards across Australia developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to take stock of what we already know about natural hazards across Australia to assist in defining current knowledge gaps on the risks from these hazards. • A multi-hazard document is being prepared that will meet this need and will bring together our understanding of natural hazards across Australia. The document will provide a new, central source of information on natural hazards across Australia for policy makers and risk management practitioners. • The document will assist priority setting for method development and information development. The document is a collaborative production, facilitated by GA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first step in developing the document was to bring together knowledge for each of the natural hazards outlined in the COAG review. A draft of the report was completed in June 2006. • The second step is to consult with a wide stakeholder base, including AEMC member jurisdictions, in hazard and emergency management, planning, risk research and information management on content and conclusions prior to publication. • Document to be published May 2007. • Lead agency <u>GA</u> supported by BOM, Bushfire CRC, CSIRO, TRAAC, NRAAG, NFRAG. 		
	<p>5.1.6 Risk Assessment Guidelines developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk assessment guidelines will assist practitioners at all levels of government to undertake risk assessments that support the National Risk Assessment Framework. The guidelines will be focussed on production of consistent and improved information on risk, i.e., outcomes. • The guidelines extend the relevant risk assessment components of the processes outlined in AS/NZS 4360:2004 and EMA's Emergency Risk Management Applications Guide. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk Assessment Guidelines scoped and existing best practice hazard-specific guidelines identified. • Submission made for WTTME funding. • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by TRAAC, NFRAG, GA, EMA, peak industry and research organisations, NSIM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad stakeholder comment sought and considered. • Draft guidelines produced (Jun 2008). • Guidelines published in 2008-09. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines modified as required based on evaluation of their effectiveness and availability of new methods, data and decision support tools.

		1-year target (mid 2007)	2-year target (mid 2008)	5-year target (mid 2011)
	<p>5.1.7 Knowledge gaps defined and priorities identified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an important, iterative process to improve our knowledge of risk by defining knowledge gaps, managing these gaps and consolidating the information gained. • This process will identify resource needs several years into the future and outline strategies to obtain those resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial definition of knowledge gaps in 2006-07. The results from gap analysis at jurisdiction level will be brought to NRAAG by State and Territory delegates. • Working party established to define and scope project. • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by TRAAC, NFRAG, NSIM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Later iterations to define knowledge gaps performed in order to plan managing knowledge gaps for one or more years in advance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Later iterations to define knowledge gaps performed in order to plan managing knowledge gaps for one or more years in advance.
	<p>5.1.8 Knowledge gaps managed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be achieved by developing and implementing annual workplans, with progress measured against performance indicators. • The accumulating evidence base contains information at a resolution or ‘granularity’ that serves all levels of government, as required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First annual work plan developed, based on current priorities. • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by TRAAC, NFRAG, NSIM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplans will be developed each year concurrent with an assessment of priorities (Mar 2007). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplans will be developed each year concurrent with an assessment of priorities (Mar 2011).
	<p>5.1.9 Decision support tools for risk assessment developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will occur incrementally according to the priorities set in the ‘Define knowledge gaps’ and ‘Manage knowledge gaps’ process of this framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by TRAAC, NFRAG, NSIM, GA, BOM, CSIRO, States, Territories, non government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing.

		1-year target (mid 2007)	2-year target (mid 2008)	5-year target (mid 2011)
PRIORITY AREA				
Outcome: Information on risk managed and accessible				
	<p>5.1.10 Strategy developed for managing information on risk and making it accessible Criteria for success of this outcome include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the capability for any government to contribute its own information on risk and supporting data, and gain access to the information and supporting data of others, • the capability for any government to consolidate information on risk from its own jurisdiction, for example from several assessments spanning locations and different hazards, and • the capability for any State or the Australian Government to consolidate information on risk from numerous smaller jurisdictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft strategy prepared for managing information on risk and making it available. This will set out how this will be achieved, roles, resource implications, a timetable for implementation, Information Management solutions, IT requirements and specific skills required. • Working party formed to scope project. • Lead agency <u>NSIM</u> supported by NRAAG, TRAAC, NFRAG. 		
	<p>5.1.11 National evidence base developed through managing, sharing and consolidating information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of current evidence base, systems and protocols assessed in strategy preparation. • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by NSIM, TRAAC, NFRAG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy implemented. Effectiveness of strategy reviewed in evaluation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy implemented. Effectiveness of strategy reviewed in evaluation process.
	<p>5.1.12 Risk management stakeholders engaged through communications strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement of stakeholders improves the effectiveness of the framework by providing a dialogue on framework goals, progress and availability of baseline information, guides and methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications strategy drafted and implementation begun. • Lead agency <u>NRAAG</u> supported by NSIM, TRAAC, NFRAG, peak industry bodies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy implemented and reviewed as required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy implemented and reviewed as required.