Queensland Reconstruction Authority Operational Review

Executive summary

Contents

Executive summary 3
01 Introduction and background 14
  1.1 Context 14
  1.2 Objectives and scope 14
  1.3 Approach 15
02 Disaster management arrangements in Queensland 19
  2.1 Overview 19
  2.2 Lifecycle 19
  2.3 Governance 22
  2.4 Available funding 27
  2.5 Recent events 33
03 Queensland Reconstruction Authority 35
  3.1 Background 35
  3.2 Objectives and purpose 35
  3.3 Functions 36
  3.4 Governance and partnerships 44
  3.5 Resource profile 47
  3.6 Financial arrangements 49
04 Operational performance 51
  4.1 Overview 51
  4.2 Key consultation messages 51
  4.3 Finance 55
  4.4 Relationships 62
  4.5 Coordination 66
  4.6 Corporate 69
  4.7 Summary 73
05 International practices and external reviews 76
  5.1 International practices 76
  5.2 External reviews 81
  5.3 Summary 83
06 Future scope and functions 84
  6.1 Overview 84
  6.2 Design principles 84
  6.3 Assessment of future scope 85
  6.4 Summary 97
07 Recommendations 99
  7.1 Overview 99
  7.2 Recommendations 99
08 Implementation plan 102
Appendices 107
Inherent Limitations

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Scope outlined in the Terms of Reference (A.9) and KPMG’s engagement letter dated 28 May 2015. The services provided in connection with this engagement comprise an advisory engagement, which is not subject to assurance or other standards issued by the Australian Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and, consequently no opinions or conclusions intended to convey assurance have been expressed.

No warranty of completeness, accuracy or reliability is given in relation to the statements and representations made by, and the information and documentation provided by, the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DILGP) management and personnel / stakeholders consulted as part of the process.

KPMG have indicated within this report the sources of the information provided. We have not sought to independently verify those sources unless otherwise noted within the report.

KPMG is under no obligation in any circumstance to update this report, in either oral or written form, for events occurring after the report has been issued in final form.

The findings in this report have been formed on the above basis.

Third Party Reliance

This report is solely for the purpose set out in the Scope Section and for DILGP’s information, and is not to be used for any other purpose or distributed to any other party without KPMG’s prior written consent.

This report has been prepared at the request of DILGP in accordance with the terms of KPMG’s engagement letter/contract dated 28 May 2015. Other than our responsibility to DILGP, neither KPMG nor any member or employee of KPMG undertakes responsibility arising in any way from reliance placed by a third party on this report. Any reliance placed is that party’s sole responsibility.

Electronic Distribution

This KPMG report was produced solely for the use and benefit of DILGP and cannot be relied on or distributed, in whole or in part, in any format by any other party. The report is dated 31 August 2015 and KPMG accepts no liability for and has not undertaken work in respect of any event subsequent to that date which may affect the report.

Any redistribution of this report requires the prior written approval of KPMG and in any event is to be complete and unaltered version of the report and accompanied only by such other materials as KPMG may agree.
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Executive summary

Introduction and approach

The Queensland Reconstruction Authority (QRA / the Authority) is an independent statutory authority that was temporarily established in response to the scale and significance of damage arising from a series of natural disaster events during the summer of 2010-2011.

A key mechanism within a complex, multi-tiered framework governing disaster management within Queensland, the QRA is legislatively tasked with the coordination and management of the rebuilding and recovery of affected communities, including the repair and rebuilding of community infrastructure and other property. The Authority is empowered with a range of functions spanning from the coordination and distribution of financial assistance to the planning, coordination and implementation of measures to improve the resilience of communities for potential disaster events.

Historically, the QRA has predominantly focused on the management and coordination of the infrastructure reconstruction program within disaster-affected communities, in particular through the administration of the jointly state and Commonwealth funded grants under the Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements (NDRRA). Notwithstanding this, the Authority has undertaken a range of activities throughout the disaster management lifecycle to address perceived service gaps and support a more efficient disaster management ecosystem.

Following recent major events in North Queensland, the Queensland Government announced the continued role of the QRA as a “permanent feature of the natural disaster recovery landscape”. The Authority has also recently been subject to a number of reviews and recommendations which may impact on the operations, functions and / or responsibilities of the QRA going forward.

To support this transition, and to better inform the future role and operations of the QRA within Queensland’s disaster management framework, the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DILGP) commissioned an independent review of the effectiveness of the Authority’s operations since its commencement. The review was overseen by a Steering Committee comprised of Major General Mick Slater (AO, DCS, CSC (Retired)), Councillor Margaret de Wit, and Professor Gerard Fitzgerald (QUT).
The purpose of this Report is to assess and provide recommendations in relation to the effectiveness of the QRA’s operations and its ongoing role within the broader mitigation, reconstruction and recovery framework in Queensland. This document represents the key findings from the review of the operational performance of the Authority, as well as recommendations for the QRA moving forward, including considerations around their future scope and functions.

The operational review investigated current Queensland disaster arrangements, including the functions historically delivered by the QRA. Identified functional gaps and improvement areas were then subjected to a robust evaluation process for further consideration in the future state assessment. Activities undertaken through the current state analysis include:

- A review of financial data and operational documentation provided by the QRA or publicly available;
- An online survey of representatives from Functional Recovery Groups and local governments;
- In person consultations with Functional Recovery Group chairs and other key senior stakeholders. It was agreed that Commonwealth government and Non-government Organisations (external to the Functional Recovery Groups e.g. major contractors, engineering firms) would not be consulted in this review due to limited timeframes;
- Undertaking research into comparable international agencies and their operational arrangements; and
- Reviewing recent and concurrent external reviews that relate to the historical and future functions of the QRA.

Operational performance

Informed by stakeholder engagement and a review of relevant documentation, the QRA’s operational performance since inception was assessed against ten key focus areas across the four dimensions of Finance, Relationships, Coordination and Corporate. The review found that the QRA’s operations have been effective against these dimensions and the Authority is recognised as a valued contributor to Queensland’s disaster management and recovery operations. The review also found that there are opportunities to further enhance the QRA’s current functions and explore new functions to improve the state’s broader reconstruction and recovery arrangements. The key findings of the review are outlined below.

Key findings include:

Finance

- **Prioritisation**: despite a defined legislative function, the QRA’s involvement in prioritisation has been limited to assisting with the betterment framework in recent years however it did play a significant role in prioritising recovery and reconstruction activity during the 2011 events. On the whole, stakeholders considered that prioritisation resides with the asset owners with some involvement from the QRA where their specialist knowledge is of benefit. However, as an independent statutory authority with visibility across government, it was recognised that the Authority may play a greater role in prioritisation at a state-level in the context of significant disaster activity or, alternatively, in response to any proposed move to an upfront grant funding model under the NDRRA.

- **Grants administration**: the coordination and distribution of financial assistance to disaster-affected communities and its ability to expedite funding was consistently identified as a core strength and function of the Authority, providing a degree of comfort to the state around its financial liabilities with respect to reconstruction. In addition, this function has been well supported by operational improvement and systems development (such as Rapid Damage Assessment tools) to improve the efficiency of relevant activities. Considerations around the future scale and structure of the Authority should not compromise its ability to perform this function.
• **Value for money:** the QRA has been effective in providing assurance around value for money in relation to the disaster reconstruction program, driving change in policy (such as eligibility requirements around the use of day labour) and technologies (for example, the development of benchmarking capabilities) to support the achievement of these outcomes. While it is generally agreed that the QRA has a role to play in achieving value for money in natural disaster reconstruction, there is less clarity on the specifics of how that role should be achieved given that technical solutions are largely driven by asset owners. A commonly expressed view was that the QRA’s value for money focus provides confidence to the Commonwealth that eligibility is being appropriately considered and assessed for NDRRA funding recipients by the QRA. The ability of the QRA to drive value for money outcomes going forward will be linked to stakeholder management and its ability to influence other key parties and partners in the delivery of the recovery and reconstruction program.

**Relationships**

• **Community engagement and liaison:** the multi-faceted community engagement and liaison undertaken by the QRA is viewed positively by key partners; the on-the-ground interaction, support and expertise was particularly valued at a local government level. However, activity has largely been (informally) limited to government delivery agents in infrastructure and reconstruction to date.

• **Stakeholder management:** the QRA has been effective in developing and retaining strong linkages with key stakeholders. Its system-wide view of the natural disaster management lifecycle and understanding across the various levels of government are notable strengths. However, it was considered that the QRA could benefit from greater definition and enhanced communication of the role and functions it provides. This sentiment extended to a perceived lack of clarity around the respective roles and responsibilities of government agencies in disaster management more broadly. Retained knowledge and existing relationships of key personnel were also raised as a key area of risk in the ongoing effectiveness of the QRA, and it was noted that the QRA should have appropriate frameworks in place to allow its success to continue beyond its current Board and Executive Leadership Team.

**Coordination**

• **Data collection and distribution:** the QRA has performed a wide range of data collection and distribution activities (including the development of supporting systems) across the disaster management lifecycle. Whilst undertaken through largely informal and opportunistic means, these activities were perceived to effectively address identified needs and service gaps, such as by enhancing data reporting during the early phases of a disaster event. Whilst some considered that the QRA may have undertaken activities better performed by other agencies (such as deploying resources to undertake Rapid Damage Assessments), stakeholders recognised the value of leveraging the QRA’s position as an independent entity sitting across government to effectively and efficiently collate and distribute a ‘single source of truth’. Opportunities exist to provide a more holistic data collection and distribution model that can be used to drive improved insight in monitoring and risk-based planning activities, as well as to preserve Queensland’s financial position as the future NDRRA funding model shifts, potentially towards an upfront grant funding model.

• **Coordination, monitoring and planning:** the QRA has performed strongly in the coordination and distribution of financial assistance, and is widely recognised as the technical lead in the development and advocacy of NDRRA policy. Although the QRA has successfully undertaken initiatives relating to resilience and mitigation (such as flood plain mapping) and has the legislative authority to do so, a lack of clarity around its role in the upfront prevention and preparation phases of the disaster management lifecycle has constrained activities undertaken historically. It was recognised that there is an opportunity for greater all-hazards risk-based planning across social/human, economic and environmental dimensions to better inform all phases of the natural disaster management and recovery cycle; however, there was some
concern from stakeholders that it may lead to a potential duplication or overlap in existing functions undertaken by other agencies, such as the DILGP, the Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM) and the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES).

Corporate

- **Resourcing:** the QRA has historically utilised a temporary resourcing model comprised of interagency staff and contractors to enable a flexible and high-performance workforce which adapts to the needs of specific events. The flexibility in resourcing is also seen to lead to a number of other benefits, including: retained linkages back into line agencies; promotion of an innovative, dynamic organisation culture; and career opportunities for QRA employees. As the Authority moves to a permanent structure, the ability of the organisation to surge to meet demand will need to be retained. It will also be important to ensure that any changes to the resourcing model do not compromise the dynamic and innovative organisation culture and current strong levels of staff engagement within the QRA.

- **Governance:** current internal governance arrangements underpinning the operations of the QRA were generally considered to be operating effectively and were not observed to have significantly impacted on the ability of the QRA to undertake its activities. Stakeholders believe that consideration will need to be given to the appropriate Board composition to support the QRA as it transitions to a permanent entity with new or amended functions. In addition, the role of the QRA within the broader disaster management lifecycle is informal and / or undefined in current governance arrangements.

- **Risk management:** the QRA has undergone a process of identifying the key risks to the success of the Authority’s current objectives. In response to these risks, a variety of processes, procedures, frameworks and systems have been implemented to manage the risks, which are supported by the Authority’s internal assurance team. Any changes to the scope of the QRA may impact on its risk profile, which may require an amendment to current mitigation strategies.

Other key findings

- **Reputation for ‘getting things done’:** stakeholders interviewed consistently described the QRA as being able to ‘get things done’, citing examples of situations where the QRA had stepped in and performed tasks that should have been performed elsewhere (i.e. by a line agency or through an alternative arrangement) but that the QRA had an ‘opportunistic’ or ‘solutions’ culture of identifying a gap and filling it. Whilst this ability to be dynamic and shift resources to deal with emerging needs and priorities was identified as a strength, there was recognition of the need to ensure that this opportunism does not lead to duplication with other agencies or a situation where line agencies no longer fulfil their responsibilities because they become dependent or reliant on the QRA to step in.

- **Role clarity and scope:** flowing on from this, there is need to clarify the role and scope of the QRA and identify where it can best focus its capability and capacity for the benefit of the wider disaster management system in Queensland. There are potentially some functions that the QRA has historically undertaken that could be better performed by other key agencies within the disaster management framework. In addition, there are a number of possible functions across the disaster management lifecycle (and in particular during the prevention and preparation phases) that could be incorporated into the scope of the Authority, some of which had previously been undertaken by the QRA in an ad hoc, partial or informal capacity. Importantly, any changes in functional responsibilities for the QRA going forward will trigger the need to adjust overarching governance arrangements within the Queensland Disaster Management Arrangements (QDMA) and other state disaster management policies and plans, particularly at the Chief Executive Leadership Team level.
Future state analysis
Informed by the above findings and a consideration of other emerging influencing factors (such as complementary reviews and international practices), design principles were developed in consultation with the Steering Committee against which the ‘future state’ QRA operating model was assessed. These include:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The function should achieve <strong>alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The QRA should be the <strong>most effective agent to deliver</strong> on the function, considering corporate experience / knowledge, synergies with existing functions, duplication of roles amongst agencies, and minimising the need for additional full-time resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The function should <strong>maintain visibility of disaster recovery across government</strong> by leveraging its system-wide view of recovery and reconstruction activities. This may include: improving information flows and data distribution across government; providing greater visibility for key decision-makers; minimising social, economic and environmental risks; and preserving Queensland’s financial interest in disaster funding arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The core functions of the QRA should be preserved and the proposed function should not compromise on its ‘core business’ as defined by its legislative authority, specifically the coordination and distribution of financial assistance to affected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The function should <strong>align with or lead best practice in disaster management</strong>, building on learnings from better practices in disaster management and / or demonstrate innovative or leading practices in disaster management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The function should <strong>promote flexibility and agility</strong>, preserving the scalability of the QRA. Resource flexibility has a track record of fostering a high performance culture and is paramount in allowing the QRA to effectively respond in times of disaster. This design principle also relates to promoting flexibility and agility in the broader disaster management system whereby collaboration is enhanced and resources are deployed and shared as needed to deal with events as and when they occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drawing on the insights from the current state analysis, the following prospective functions were considered and evaluated against the design principles during a workshop with the Steering Committee:

Function 1 | Resilience and mitigation policy;
Function 2 | State-wide disaster vulnerability and risk planning;
Function 3 | Disaster readiness preparation policy and guidance;
Function 4 | Prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding;
Function 5 | Technical support to Commonwealth negotiations in disaster recovery; and
Function 6 | Sponsorship of whole-of-government disaster data collection and management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prospective functions</th>
<th>Design principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Alignment with objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Resilience and mitigation policy</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 State-wide disaster vulnerability and risk planning</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Disaster readiness and preparation policy and guidance</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Technical support to Commonwealth negotiations in disaster recovery</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sponsorship of whole-of-government disaster data collection and management</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Functions sitting within the Response and Recovery phases of the disaster management lifecycle (Functions 4-6) were found to demonstrate a stronger alignment to the defined core functions of the QRA, fully meeting the above design principles. In particular, these functions were seen to leverage the QRA’s independent and system-wide view across government and / or support or complement the provision of financial assistance and its coordination of the recovery and reconstruction program.

In comparison, whilst it was recognised that the QRA may have a strategic role to play in the prevention and preparation phases of the disaster management lifecycle, further consideration and definition should be given to the exact nature of that role and related functions (Functions 1-3). In particular, there is a need for further identification and clarification of any overlap, duplication or touch points with other delivery agents (such as QFES, DNRM and DILGP).
The operational delivery and / or development of these functions were generally not considered to meet the design principles defined above, however the coordination, leadership, and / or oversight of these functions (for example, of resilience and mitigation policy across government) aligns to the QRA’s legislated responsibilities and would leverage its significant expertise and experience, particularly under a permanent structure.

Recommendations

The results of the documentation review, survey results, stakeholder consultations, and workshop have culminated in a series of recommendations and observations for consideration by the Queensland Government as outlined in the following table. References are provided to sections within this Report that provide the basis for the recommendation. It should be noted that these references are not exhaustive given that a number of the recommendations are based on wider observations, with the section references designed to assist the reader to understand the rationale for each recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Recommended Lead Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate implementation (0-6 Months)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1: Greater role clarity in the Queensland disaster management framework.</strong></td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet Queensland Reconstruction Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future state disaster management plans and frameworks should clearly articulate the desired future role of the QRA. The QRA’s scope should also be clearly communicated across government through periodic updates of current achievements and activities. This should include the development of clear mission and purpose statements for the QRA, following government’s consideration of these recommendations. Refer sections: 4.2 (Table 6), 4.4 (Stakeholder management).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2: Formalised role in established disaster management committees.</strong></td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet Queensland Reconstruction Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative(s) from the QRA should have a defined role and participate in QDMA committees and groups as appropriate, such as permanent representation as an observer within the Queensland Disaster Management Committee and across Functional Recovery Groups, including any future CLT level Recovery Committees, given the current role of the QRA’s CEO as the temporary State Recovery Coordinator. Refer sections: 3.4 (Governance and partnerships), 4.6 (Governance), 4.7 (Summary).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Recommended Lead Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Recommendation 3: Core functions are preserved within the QRA.**  
Existing core functions of the QRA should be preserved where possible. This includes the QRA’s financial assurance and acquittal function.  
Refer sections: 4.2 (Table 5), 6.2 (Design Principles) and 6.3 (Business as Usual). | Queensland Reconstruction Authority |
| **Recommendation 4: Technical leadership in Commonwealth government funding negotiations.**  
The QRA continue to work with the Department of Premier and Cabinet and Queensland Treasury and Trade in providing technical support to Commonwealth government negotiations in disaster recovery funding to ensure that Queensland’s financial interests are preserved.  
Refer sections: 4.3 (Value for Money), 4.5 (Coordination), 4.7 (Summary), and 6.3 (Technical support to Commonwealth negotiations in disaster recovery). | Department of Premier and Cabinet  
Queensland Treasury and Trade  
Queensland Reconstruction Authority |
| **Recommendation 5: NDRRA activations are retained.**  
Retain the current arrangements for NDRRA activations until the outcomes of the current Commonwealth government considerations around future natural disaster funding arrangements are known.  
Refer sections: 2.4 (Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements). | Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services |
| **Recommendation 6: Preservation as a statutory authority.**  
Retain the QRA as a statutory authority with an independent Board within the portfolio of the Deputy Premier until such a time that another Minister is appointed with responsibilities for Reconstruction and administering the QRA Act to allow it to continue to provide independent advice to the Queensland Government and its stakeholders on disaster management considerations, particularly relating to the prevention, recovery and reconstruction phases.  
Refer sections: 4.6 (Governance), 7.1. | Department of Premier and Cabinet  
Department of Infrastructure Local Government and Planning |
## Short Term Implementation (6-12 months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7** | **Recommendation 7: Undertake organisational design and workforce planning.**  
Undertake appropriate organisational design and workforce planning tasks to identify the future capability and capacity required by the QRA to undertake new or altered functions as a consequence of this Review.  
Refer sections: 4.6 (Governance). |
| **8** | **Recommendation 8: The QRA plan for succession.**  
Develop succession plans, role descriptions and standard operating procedures for the QRA’s Executive Leadership Team to preserve its performance in the event of employee turnover where these plans are not current or have not been developed.  
Refer sections: 4.4 (Relationships). |
| **9** | **Recommendation 9: Flexibility and performance is retained and promoted.**  
Preserve the flexibility and scalability of the QRA to respond to disaster events and promote high performance by maintaining interdepartmental transfers and flexible workforce practices.  
Refer sections: 4.6 (Resourcing), 6.2 (Design principles). |
| **10** | **Recommendation 10: State disaster responsibilities are clarified and are current.**  
Further to Recommendation 1, revise state disaster management frameworks and plans including but not limited to the QDMA and SDMP to add further clarity to roles, responsibility and authority for all state government agencies and stakeholders across the disaster management lifecycle. This should include consolidation of legacy governance structures and reporting lines, to be consistent with the approved outcomes of this Review and other concurrent related Queensland Government reviews (such as the Community Recovery review and the Report into aspects of response and recovery initiatives TC Marcia & TC Nathan1).  
Refer sections: 4.2 (Table 6), 6.3 (Assessment of future scope). |

---

1 These reviews are not finalised and are subject to change.
**Recommendation 11: Sponsorship of state-wide disaster resilience and mitigation.**

The QRA assume a lead sponsorship role in developing and coordinating disaster resilience and mitigation policy in Queensland, including expanded focus to support implementation of the State Resilience Strategy and associated policies (for example, betterment and mitigation) in partnership with relevant Queensland Government departments and local government including the DILGP who should continue to support their responsible Minister in the oversight of the QRA.

(Note – transfer of Resilience and Recovery resources from DILGP to the QRA could occur as soon as practicable should this recommendation be supported. DILGP will however require some resources to assist the Deputy Premier with QRA oversight).

Refer sections: 6.3 (Resilience and mitigation policy and administration).

**Medium Term Implementation (12+ months)**

**Recommendation 12: Greater role in the prioritisation of disaster recovery funding.**

Consideration be given to the QRA assuming greater responsibility for the prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding in the event that the Commonwealth government funding arrangements move towards an upfront grants-based model.

Refer sections: 6.3 (Assessment of future scope).

**Recommendation 13: Sponsorship of state-wide vulnerability and risk-based planning.**

The QRA assume a lead sponsorship role for supporting state-wide disaster vulnerability and risk-based planning within an all-hazards framework in partnership with relevant state government agencies and local government.

Refer sections: 6.3 (Assessment of future scope).
Recommendation 14: Stewardship of whole of government disaster data collection and management.

The QRA assume stewardship for a central repository for the collection and storage of whole-of-government disaster management data and “lessons learned” to promote transparency, knowledge sharing, accountability and decision making.

It should be noted that appropriate data management and collection accountabilities and protocols will need to be established with those agencies that have responsibility for data collection and then transfer data to the QRA maintained central repository.

Refer sections: 6.3 (Assessment of future scope).

Summary

The QRA has successfully, although at times informally, operated within a complex environment with multiple stakeholders and significant time and community pressures. The Authority was seen to be a trusted and reliable advisor by key stakeholders and partners, and it is broadly recognised that the QRA has effectively performed on its core functions, as well as undertaken a number of initiatives to address identified needs and service gaps within the disaster management lifecycle. The ability of the organisation to perform against its core functions moving forward cannot and should not be compromised.

However, given previous successes, the responsibilities and resources of the Authority could be augmented to target key areas and functions of disaster management where the QRA can add value. Its system-wide view of the disaster management lifecycle, independency as a statutory authority, and flexible operating model enable the QRA to provide unique insights into and support for activities across the span of the lifecycle, including prevention and preparation, particularly where cross-government coordination is required. However, the ability of the QRA to effectively deliver on its future responsibilities is dependent on establishing and communicating a clear mandate for the organisation across government within existing disaster management arrangements.

It is noted however, that the environment in which the QRA operates is fluid, and the future operations of the Authority are subject to a number of uncertain and variable factors (including the extent of the upcoming storm season and future disaster events, as well as proposed changes to Commonwealth financial assistance arrangements). Not only will these factors need to be taken into account in the consideration and implementation of recommendations contained within this Review, as the organisation moves towards a permanent structure, it will need to respond to these key changes to continue to play a highly regarded, relevant and valuable role within disaster management in Queensland.
1. Introduction and background

1.1 Context

Since its establishment in 2011, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority (QRA or the Authority) has been responsible for the coordination and management of the natural disaster response and recovery effort across the state, reconnecting and building resilience in regional communities.

Following recent major events in North Queensland, in March 2015, the Queensland Government announced the continued role of the QRA under proposed laws to make the organisation a “permanent feature of the natural disaster recovery landscape”.2

To better inform the future role and operations of the QRA within Queensland’s natural disaster recovery and response framework, the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DILGP) commissioned an independent review of the effectiveness of the Authority’s operations since its commencement, to ensure there is clarity around its role and functions, including relationships with its delivery partners, within the reconstruction and recovery effort.

The Review was overseen by a Steering Committee comprising Major General Mick Slater (AO, DCS, CSC (Retired)), Councillor Margaret de Wit, and Professor Gerard Fitzgerald.

1.2 Objectives and scope

The detailed Terms of Reference for the Review can be found at Appendix A.9. The specific scope of the Review includes an assessment of:

- The effectiveness of the QRA’s operations since establishment in 2011, including consideration of:
  - The current governance arrangements and the impacts of the Commonwealth cessation of the National Partner Agreement; and
  - The roles of the QRA in line with the functions identified in the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011 (QRA Act); and

- The ongoing role of the QRA, in consideration of the state’s broader mitigation, reconstruction and recovery framework for natural disasters, and in responding to emergent needs during natural disaster events, including the:
  - Development of options for the future role of the QRA, taking into account inter-jurisdictional comparisons and global “better practice” in research, preparation, mitigation, response, recovery and reconstruction for an all hazards approach to natural disasters;

---

- Assessment of the process of the Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements (NDRRA) activations;
- Assessment of the governance arrangements required to support QRA’s ongoing role, including consideration of: any potential duplication with other Queensland Government agencies; how the QRA could complement the existing natural disaster preparation, response, relief and recovery functions of other government agencies; and appropriate inter-government arrangements; and
- Consideration of possible pathways for the consolidation of the preparation, planning and implementation of natural disaster mitigation functions and implications on funding.

1.3 Approach

Overview
The operational Review adopted a four phase approach as follows:

**Figure 1: Approach**

**Evaluation framework**
Based on an assessment of the defined legislative functions of the organisation and key activities defined by the Authority, an Evaluation Framework for the Review was developed (Figure 2).
Centred around ten key focus areas undertaken by the organisation, the Framework outlined core evaluation questions, potential indicators of success, and other relevant data sources, which underpinned the review of the effectiveness of the operations of the Authority across four key functional areas.

Figure 2: Summary of the Evaluation Framework

Data collection strategy

Data sources

Data for the QRA operational review was collected through a number of mechanisms, including:

- Historical operational and financial data provided by the QRA;
- Consultations with partners and other government stakeholders;
- An online survey distributed to all members of the Functional Recovery Groups including local governments;
- Consideration of relevant external reviews around or impacting on the operations of the QRA; and
- Internal documents and source data provided by the QRA at the request of KPMG.

Analysis of operational and financial data

Where possible, data spanning numerous years has been drawn upon to inform this Report, including, but not limited to, relevant Annual Reports, Reconstruction and Governance Reports, Briefing Papers, operational frameworks, strategic plans, and legislation.

Consultation process

As part of the data gathering process, KPMG conducted 13 face to face interviews with stakeholders including current and former QRA employees, government agencies and partners (refer to Appendix A.3 for a list of consultation stakeholders). Representatives from the Commonwealth government and private sector organisations (such as delivery / construction contractors) were not included in the stakeholder consultation process, and the results of the Review may or may not be reflective of the views of these organisations.
A stakeholder briefing paper was prepared for the respective groups which summarised the context of the engagement and included key questions for discussion (refer to Appendix A.2). KPMG provided this paper in advance of the meetings to assist stakeholders in preparing for the meeting and to guide the discussion.

Each discussion focused on stakeholder perceptions around the following key topics:

- The role and function of the QRA;
- Gaps or overlaps in functions provided by different entities across the broader natural disaster event and recovery lifecycle; and
- Future direction of the QRA.

Online survey

As part of the data gathering process, an internet-based survey was developed to assist with collecting data around the four key dimensions of the evaluation framework (refer to Appendix A.1). For each of the evaluation framework themes and focus areas, specific questions were developed to test perceptions of the QRA’s role and effectiveness.

The survey was piloted prior to releasing it to approximately 150 key stakeholders representing Functional Recovery Groups and local government, the results of which were cleansed and validated prior to analysis. Complete and relevant responses were received from 64 stakeholders, including 23 local government representatives.

External reviews

The QRA has been subject to a number of reviews historically which have been considered as part of this Report, including:

- Queensland Recovery and Reconstruction in the Aftermath of the 2010/2011 Flood Events and Cyclone Yasi, prepared by the World Bank in collaboration with the QRA (World Bank Report);
- The Auditor-General of Queensland’s Performance Management Systems Audit Report to Parliament (No.7 for 2011) around the National Partnership Agreement for Natural Disaster Reconstruction and Recovery (QAO Report);
- The Australian government Reconstruction Inspectorate’s Conduct of Value for Money Reviews of Flood Reconstruction Projects in Queensland, undertaken by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO Report); and
- The Report into Aspects of Response and Recovery Initiatives: Tropical Cyclone (TC) Marcia and TC Nathan (Report into TC Marcia and TC Nathan) conducted by the Department of Premier and Cabinet in April to May 2015.

In addition, there are a number of reviews and documents that have recently been released or are being undertaken concurrently with this Review, which may impact on the operations, functions and/or responsibilities of the QRA going forward. The relevant reviews are shown below. The findings from these reviews will be considered further in framing the final recommendations.

- The 2014-2015 Draft Queensland State Disaster Management Plan (to be published);
- The Community Recovery Review conducted by the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services (DCCSDS);
- Recommendations arising from the Productivity Commission Inquiry Report into Natural Disaster Funding Arrangements (Productivity Commission Report); and

---

3 Refer to Section 5.2 for a brief overview of the relevant documents.
4 This review is not finalised and is subject to change.
5 This review is not finalised and is subject to change.
• Impact of the Review of Statutory Appointments being undertaken by the Public Service Commission.

Steering committee workshop

Following the issuance of the draft interim report for this review, a workshop was conducted with members of the Steering Committee. The workshop involved a summary of the current state of the QRA followed by consideration of design principles for determining future functions and an assessment of the potential future functions against the design principles.
2.1 Overview

‘A natural disaster is a serious disruption in a community, caused by the impact of an event, that requires a significant coordinated response by the state and other entities to help the community recover from the disruption’ – section 13, Disaster Management Act 2003 (Qld)

From 2007 to 2012, Queensland was subject to 36 declared natural disaster events, with the most significant impacts occurring from November 2010 to February 2012. The scale of the response and recovery effort associated with these events was significant, with 73 Local Government Areas (LGAs) impacted and $12.2 billion in reconstruction works required across Queensland.

Natural disaster management, including recovery and reconstruction from events, operates within a complex framework in Queensland, involving multiple stakeholders that, on occasion, can be subject to political, time and community pressures. Predominantly governed by the Disaster Management Act 2003 (DM Act), natural disaster management is undertaken in four key phases: Prevention; Preparation; Response; and Recovery.6 The disaster lifecycle phases are outlined in further detail below.

2.2 Lifecycle

Prevention

The Prevention phase encompasses measures planned to reduce the likelihood of an event occurring or to mitigate the severity of the event. Activities undertaken during this phase of disaster management may include mitigation strategies such as design improvements to

---

6 Section 4A of the DM Act.
provide more resilient new or refurbished infrastructure, land use planning to identify the potential hazard-scape, disaster research and reviews into policy and governance frameworks, and flood risk reduction measures.7

Preparation
As outlined in the legislation, the Preparation phase requires consideration of whether communities, resource and services are able to cope with the effects of a natural disaster event. As identified in the ‘2013-14 Queensland State Disaster Management Plan’, this may include community education and engagement, training and education, planning and arrangements, and exercises.

Response
Response measures encompass actions planned and undertaken in anticipation of, during and immediately after an event to ensure that the impact is minimised and persons affected by the event are provided immediate relief and support.

The Response phase may involve the activation of the Queensland Disaster Management Arrangements (QDMA), the declaration of a disaster situation by a District Disaster Coordinator, or the activation of either NDRRA or State Disaster Relief Arrangements (SDRA) financial assistance; however, these actions are independent and are not conditional.

Recovery
Governed by the ‘Queensland Recovery Guidelines’, the Recovery phase of the disaster management lifecycle encompasses both short and longer-term actions and activities to support disaster-affected communities in the reconstruction of infrastructure,8 restoration of emotional, physical, social and economic wellbeing, and the restoration of the environment.

8 It should be noted that a number of stakeholders consulted as part of this review considered reconstruction to be a subsequent, separate but interrelated phase of the disaster management lifecycle extending past longer-term recovery.
The level of activity and timeframes vary for each phase of the disaster management lifecycle as illustrated in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3: Disaster management lifecycle
As articulated in the DM Act, disaster operations undertaken during the Response phase may also overlap with the Recovery phase of the lifecycle (Figure 4).

![Disaster Operations](image)

**Figure 4: Disaster operations within the lifecycle of disaster management**

### 2.3 Governance

#### Background

Following a series of natural disasters across Australia in the 1970s (including Tropical Cyclone (TC) Tracey and the 1974 Brisbane floods), a whole-of-government governance arrangement was developed for Queensland to ensure effective coordination and collaboration in the event of natural disasters. The relationships between the levels of government and across the Queensland Government are set out in the QDMA.

Undergoing several iterations over subsequent decades, the framework is governed by and outlined in the DM Act, with provisions around natural disaster management groups, plans and guidelines, the declaration of a natural disaster situation, and the establishment of the Office of the Inspector-General of Emergency Management (IGEM).

In recognition of the complex network of stakeholders involved throughout the disaster management lifecycle, the QDMA is based on four tiers: local; district; state and the Commonwealth (Figure 5). The DM Act confers primary management responsibility to local government, with district and state groups providing appropriate support and resources to disaster operations.\(^9\)

---

9 Section 15 DM Act.

10 Section 4a DM Act.
Disaster management arrangements

General
The QDMA consists of a number of management and coordination structures, including:

- Disaster management groups operating at a local, district and state level to plan, organise, coordinate and implement measures for the prevention, preparation, response and recovery from a natural disaster event;
- Coordination centres to support the disaster management groups in the coordination and collation of information, resources and services;
- Functional lead agencies which coordinate, manage and execute state-level functions and responsibilities in relation to natural disaster management, including primary agencies responsible for responding to specific threats; and
- Temporary or permanent committees established for specific purposes relating to disaster management.

Operations of these management structures are underpinned by a number of frameworks, policies and guidelines, including disaster management plans encompassing prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery measures across all levels of government.

State government governance structure
Chaired by the Premier, the Queensland Disaster Management Committee (QDMC) is the primary decision-making body at a state government level in regards to disaster management within Queensland, providing strategic direction and ensuring that activities are coordinated from a whole-of-government perspective across the entirety of the disaster management lifecycle (Figure 6). The State Disaster Coordination Group (SDCG) is responsible for

---

coordinating the operational delivery of the QDMC’s legislative responsibilities and is chaired by the Queensland Police Service (QPS) and Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES).

Figure 6: Statutory and administrative disaster management arrangements

During the Response and Recovery phases to an event, there are a number of state-level functions and responsibilities that are undertaken by a wide range of agencies across government (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead agency / body</th>
<th>Emergency support function(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster management entities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector-General Emergency Management (IGEM)</td>
<td>Oversees the functions and performance of the QDMC and related bodies through the establishment and implementation of an assurance framework aligned to the desired outcomes of the disaster and emergency management arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Disaster Management Committee (QDMC)</td>
<td>Peak decision-making body responsible for providing strategic direction and ensuring that activities are coordinated from a whole-of-government perspective across the entirety of the disaster management lifecycle (as governed by Division 1 of the DM Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Disaster Coordination Group (SDCG)</td>
<td>Coordination of the operational delivery of QDMC’s decisions and legislative responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Disaster Coordination Centre (SDCC)</td>
<td>Provision of support to QDMC and SDCG in the coordination of the state-level operational response, including information collation and dissemination across all levels of government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 As outlined in the 2014-2015 Queensland State Disaster Management Plan (unpublished). Note that the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services is a member of QDMC, but is also depicted separately to illustrate the reporting arrangement with the Inspector-General of Emergency Management. The QDMC Chair may request the local and District Disaster Coordinators to report to the QDMC through the State Disaster Coordinator (SDC) during the Response phase.

13 QDMC has been given the status of a Committee of the Cabinet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead agency / body</th>
<th>Emergency support function(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Disaster Coordinator (SDC)</td>
<td>Responsible for the coordination of response operations at a state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Recovery Coordinator (SRC)14</td>
<td>Appointed where a state-level coordinated response is considered appropriate and necessary, the SRC is responsible for the coordination of recovery operations across Queensland. This position is temporarily held by the QRA CEO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Recovery Groups15</td>
<td>Five CEO-led groups responsible for leading and coordinating the planning and implementation of whole-of-government recovery from significant natural disaster events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| District Disaster Management Group (DDMG) | Coordination of operations in the disaster district, including the development of a District Disaster Management Plan and review of local disaster management arrangements (as governed by Division 2 of the DM Act) |
| District Disaster Coordination Centre (DDCC) | Support the DDMG in the provision of District and state level support and resources to local government |
| Local Disaster Management Group (LDMG) | Management of natural disaster operations for the LGA (as governed by Division 3 DM Act) |
| Local Disaster Coordination Centre (LDCC) | Operationalisation, planning and implementation of strategies and activities on behalf of LDMG during natural disaster operations  
Coordination of local resources and collaboration with DDCC |

**Line agencies and local government**

| Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services (DCCSDS) | Human and social recovery  
Offers of assistance |
| Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) | Environmental recovery |
| Department of Energy and Water Supply (DEWS) | Electricity, fuel, gas, reticulated water supply and water dam safety  
Building recovery - energy infrastructure and water supply and sewerage infrastructure |
| Department of Housing and Public Works (DHPW) | Building and engineering services |

14 These are temporary, event-based appointments relating to specific phases in the lifecycle of disaster management; in comparison, district and local disaster coordinators are permanent positions responsible for the ongoing coordination of broader disaster operation activities.

15 Overseen by the CEO Recovery sub-committee; this arrangement is not provided for in legislation but is outlined in the SDMP. The Draft Report into TC Marcia and TC Nathan identified that its functions could be assumed by the existing CEO Leadership Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead agency / body</th>
<th>Emergency support function(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DILGP)</td>
<td>Building recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offers of assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery coordination and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC)</td>
<td>External affairs and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offers of assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation (DSITI)</td>
<td>Communication services (call centre and government website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecommunication services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State Development (DSD)</td>
<td>Economic recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR)</td>
<td>Transportation infrastructure, providers and regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building recovery - transportation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>Primary responsibility for recovery operations, including evacuation management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building recovery – water entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Business Agency (PSBA)</td>
<td>Public information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Fire and Emergency Services (QFES)</td>
<td>Activation of SDCC and critical incident directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster management response and recovery operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency supply and logistics support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid damage assessments&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact assessment&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Health (QH), Queensland Ambulance Service (QAS) and Hospital and Health Services (HHS)</td>
<td>Public health and medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency medical retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass casualty and fatality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Police Service (QPS)</td>
<td>Activation of SDCC and critical incident directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration of a disaster situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evacuation management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search and rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass casualty and fatality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>Rapid damage assessments&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDRRA activations&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery coordination and monitoring&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>16</sup> As included in the 2014-2015 Queensland State Disaster Management Plan (unpublished).
### Lead agency / body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency support function(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact assessment&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-government providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optus / Telstra</th>
<th>Telecommunication services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building recovery - telecommunication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Responsibilities of state, local and non-government entities in the Response and Recovery phases<sup>17</sup>

### Functional Recovery Groups

The Recovery phase is supported by an additional governance structure which adopts a functional approach to recovery under five key categories: economic; environment; human and social; roads and transport; and building. The objectives of the Functional Recovery Groups and details of the members of each group is provided at Appendix A.6.

The role of the QRA within some of these entities is discussed further in section 3.4.

#### 2.4 Available funding

### Overview

The Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services is responsible for the activation and coordination of financial relief and recovery measures from a whole-of-government perspective, with support provided by the QRA.

Financial assistance for the response to and recovery from a natural disaster event in Queensland is predominantly provided through two key government programs: the NDRRA and the SDRA (Figure 7). The primary intent of both of these programs is to provide financial support to assist with the relief and recovery of communities whose social, financial and economic well-being has been severely impacted by a natural disaster event.<sup>18</sup>

Other avenues of funding and financial assistance that have historically been available include the Disaster Recovery Payment, Disaster Income Recovery Subsidy and Wages Assistance programs administered by the Australian government, and disaster-specific donations provided by individuals, companies, and other jurisdictions (both national and international).


<sup>18</sup> (Queensland Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements Guidelines, 2013). It should be noted that the private or public owner retains the primary responsibility for safeguarding and restoring the relevant assets; the arrangements are not compensation based and will not extend to circumstances where negligence or human intervention (such as poor environmental planning or commercial development) was a significant contributing factor to an event.
In addition, the state and Commonwealth co-funded Natural Disaster Resilience Program (NDRP) provides targeted financial assistance to fund natural disaster mitigation projects to increase community resilience to a broad range of natural disasters.

**Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements**

‘A natural disaster is a serious disruption to a community or region caused by the impact of a naturally occurring rapid onset event that threatens or causes death, injury or damage to property or the environment, and which requires significant and coordinated multi-agency and community response. Such serious disruption can be caused by any one, or a combination, of the following natural hazards: bushfire; earthquake; flood; storm; cyclone; storm surge; landslide; tsunami; meteorite strike; or tornado.’ - NDRRA Determination 2012: Version 1

**Overview**

The NDRRA is a joint Commonwealth and state financial assistance program that provides reimbursement for eligible expenditure relating to a disaster event. As the primary mechanism for the Commonwealth to provide the states with funding for reconstruction and recovery efforts, the program is intended to complement other state-based strategies and measures for natural disasters, such as insurance and disaster mitigation planning and implementation.

The arrangement between the state and Commonwealth is governed by the ‘Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements Determination 2012: Version 1’ (Determination), as well as

---

19 Queensland Reconstruction Authority Monthly Report, April 2015

20 Disaster event includes both natural disasters as defined by the Determination, as well as terrorist events as an interim measure (subject to the same thresholds for damage that apply to natural disasters).
the ‘National Partnership Agreement 2013’ (NPA), which together outline the activation, delivery and acquittal requirements for the provision of NDRRA funding within Queensland.21

The QRA is responsible for the coordination of activation process, the management of all relief measures, and the administration of NDRRA funding, in conjunction with administering agencies.

Funding arrangements

As defined in the Determination, there are four core categories of assistance available under the program, administered through varying state and local government agencies (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding stream</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead agency</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category A (Standard)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Hardship Assistance Scheme (PHAS)</td>
<td>Financial assistance to: address immediate critical needs; replace or repair essential uninsured household contents; repair uninsured dwellings to a safe, habitable and secure condition; and provide personal and financial counselling to alleviate personal hardship and distress.</td>
<td>DCCSDS</td>
<td>Individuals and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Disaster Operations (CDO)</td>
<td>Reimbursement of extraordinary disaster management costs relating to activities involving direct assistance to, and in the protection of, the general public before, during and immediately following a disaster event.</td>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>State and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category B (Standard)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Services and Safety Reconnections (ESSR)</td>
<td>Financial assistance of up to $5,000 as a contribution towards safety inspections or and / or repairs to essential services (for example, electricity, gas, water and sewerage) damaged by an eligible disaster.</td>
<td>DCCSDS</td>
<td>Individuals and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of Essential Public Assets (REPA)</td>
<td>Financial grants for the restoration of essential eligible public assets to the equivalent of their pre-disaster standard.</td>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>State and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessional and Essential Working Capital Loans</td>
<td>Loans to assist small businesses, primary producers and non-profit organisations to recover from eligible disaster events of a substantial magnitude.</td>
<td>QRAA, DTESB22, DAF23, DCCSDS24</td>
<td>Small business, primary producers,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The NPA is only applicable to disaster events relating to floods and cyclones for which NDRRA assistance was activated from November 2010 to January 2013. The Agreement expired on 30 June 2015. Refer to Section 3.4 (National Partnership Agreement) for more detail.

22 Advice required for activation purposes in relation to small businesses.

23 Advice required for activation purposes in relation to primary producers.

24 Advice required for activation purposes in relation to not-profit organisations.
Table 2: NDRRA funding streams

Administered by the QRA on behalf of the Queensland Government, expenditure by the state on these eligible relief measures must exceed the small disaster criterion defined by the Commonwealth government before the state is eligible for assistance under the program. The degree of reimbursement provided by the Commonwealth is dependent on the type of relief measure as well as the total level of expenditure incurred by the state on the eligible disaster event (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Cost-sharing model

25 (Queensland Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements Guidelines, 2013).

26 Local governments within Queensland are subject to an additional trigger point for activation of the REPA measure (Category B) commensurate to 0.75% of a council’s net general rates from two years prior, capped at $2.2 million (excluding Indigenous councils and Torres Shire Council).
Eligible expenditure under pre-agreed relief measures may be incurred within a two year period after the end of the financial year in which the disaster event occurred, with a two year timeframe imposed for completion of eligible works.27

**Activation**

Administered through the QRA, activation of standard personal and community NDRRA relief measures will be advised where:

1. The event meets the definition of an eligible event; and
2. Initial expenditure estimates on eligible relief measures provided by relevant agencies and assessed by the QRA exceeds the small disaster criterion (as defined by the Commonwealth).28

Activation of the relevant relief measures is dependent upon an identification of need by the administering agencies, as defined by specific requirements for each relief measure. Activation for relief measures under Categories C and D may only occur where Category B has been activated and a joint agreement between the Premier and Prime Minister is in place.

Available financial assistance is geographically and time bound, as outlined and defined by the relevant activation statement. Figure 9 provides an overview of the NDRRA activation process.

---

27 Limited extensions have been provided to Queensland with respect to damage caused by 2011 and 2012 disaster events given the scale and scope of the reconstruction program.

28 Financial assistance may be available under the SDRA for isolated disaster events that do not reach the relevant threshold.
Performance monitoring and reporting

States are required to report on actual and estimated expenditure on eligible disasters, by relief measure per event, including for the following financial year, to the Commonwealth by 31 January, as well as providing quarterly expenditure and forecasts reports. Further, states are required to provide independently-audited financial statements to support claims under the NDRRA, which are to be audited by the Auditor-General of that state.

States must also submit a Post Disaster Assessment Report within three financial years of the event taking place to enable an improved national understanding on the cost of response, relief and recovery measures following natural disaster events at a national level.

As agreed under the NPA, the Queensland Government is required to report against the following measures in relation to specified events:

1. Recovery and reconstruction progress against relevant milestones, including what additional funding is being leveraged, on a monthly basis;
2. Progress with expenditure under the NDRRA around key areas of the reconstruction effort;
3. Revisions to estimates of costs; and
4. Project-specific actual expenditure relating to reconstruction, as soon as practicable after the completion of reconstruction work.

In addition, disaster events governed by the NPA are subject to an additional auditing process undertaken by the Australian government Reconstruction Inspectorate (Inspectorate), to provide assurance that value for money is being achieved in the expenditure of disaster recovery funds (refer to section 3.4). These relationships concluded following the cessation of the NPA on 30 June 2015.

State Disaster Relief Arrangements

Similar to the NDRRA, the SDRA is available for activation in relation to all hazards to provide assistance for personal hardship and the recovery and relief of communities whose wellbeing has been severely impacted by a disaster event. There are two relief measures available for activation: the Personal Hardship Assistance Scheme encompassing grants for individuals to support immediate needs, essential household contents and structural assistance; and Counter Disaster Operations, which provides reimbursement for extraordinary operational costs incurred as a result of or relating to a disaster event.

A wholly state funded program, the program may be activated by the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services where DCCSDS advises that local service providers within an affected community have reached capacity or there are no local service providers to assist in the event of a disaster. As the program is not subject to the Commonwealth eligibility requirements, it may be activated in a wider range of natural disaster events and circumstances where personal hardship exists.

Available financial assistance under this program is geographically and time bound. The defined area for the receipt of assistance may vary from a number of residents to several LGAs that have been directly impacted by a natural disaster event.

Natural Disaster Resilience Program

Administered by DILGP, the NDRP is a competitive grants program with a primary focus to ‘reduce Queensland communities’ vulnerability to natural hazards by supporting regional councils and other stakeholders to build community resilience’. Funded by state and Commonwealth governments and through co-contributions by applicants, the program provides targeted financial assistance to fund natural disaster mitigation projects to increase community resilience to a broad range of natural disasters, in particular to Queensland’s highest natural hazard risks.
The program is administered and operated in collaboration with other grants packages such as the local government Grants and Subsidies Scheme and the Royalties for the Regions Floodplain Security Scheme.

The Queensland Budget 2015-16 allocated $17.6 million to the NDRP.

**Community Resilience Fund**

In the most recent Queensland Budget (2015-16), the Queensland Government allocated additional funding of $40 million in FY16 for the establishment of a fund to support local governments with the mitigation of the impact of natural disasters on infrastructure.

### 2.5 Recent events

As at May 2015, the reconstruction program within Queensland totalled approximately $13.57 billion, relating to more than 40 NDRRA activations from 2009 to 2015 (Appendix A.4). Of this $13.57 billion, $10.7 billion had been acquitted at May 2015\(^{29}\) and it is expected that the Commonwealth government will fund more than $9 billion (up to 75\%)\(^{30}\). There have been seven NDRRA activations in the most recent financial year (as at May 2015) to the value of $0.75 billion in funding (refer to Figure 10).

---

\(^{29}\) Reimbursement occurs on a retrospective annual basis in the financial year following the completion of works and the lodgement of an audited Claim to the Commonwealth. It should be noted that $725 million of expected Commonwealth funding relating to 2009-2012 claims were subject to qualified audit claims and subsequently was not reimbursed; the QRA is undertaking a project to address the audit qualification (refer to Recovery; Assurance and Acquittal).

\(^{30}\) The Queensland Reconstruction Authority and natural disaster arrangements, 2015.
Figure 10: Historical and forecast NDRRA expenditure on reconstruction works (as at May 2015)
3.1 Background

Prior to the establishment of the QRA, Emergency Management Queensland (EMQ) was responsible for the administration of NDRRA funding in Queensland under the DM Act, totalling approximately $740 million from 2002 to 2007.

During December 2010 and January 2011, Queensland experienced extensive flooding across the state from a series of natural disasters (including TCs Tasha and Anthony) (refer to Appendix A.4), which resulted in approximately 70% of Queensland being subject to natural disaster area declarations affecting around 60% of the state’s population.31 This was further exacerbated with the arrival of TC Yasi in February 2011; natural disaster area declarations were made for 24 LGAs, with NDRRA Category D relief measures enacted for 15 of these.

Established on 21 February 2011 under the QRA Act in response to the scale and significance of damage arising from this series of events, the QRA was a key mechanism within the broader statutory purpose of achieving effective and efficient recovery from the impacts of natural disaster events.32 The original Queensland Reconstruction Authority Bill 2011 contained a two year sunset clause that was extended in 2012 and again in 2013 until 30 June 2015 in recognition of the continued need for the QRA to assist in the recovery from subsequent natural disaster events. In the aftermath of TC Marcia, the Queensland Government announced the permanency of the QRA in March 2013; the QRA Act was amended to remove the sunset clause, with no end date specified.

3.2 Objectives and purpose

‘[Our] vision [is] to reconnect, rebuild and improve Queensland communities and economy’ – QRA Strategic Plans (2012-14)

The QRA is a statutory body that was established with the legislative intent to coordinate and manage the rebuilding and recovery of communities affected by natural disaster events, including the repair and rebuilding of community infrastructure and other property.33

As outlined in the QRA Strategic Plans (2012-16), the role of the QRA has predominantly focused on the management and coordination of the infrastructure reconstruction program within disaster-affected communities, working in conjunction with other delivery partners such

---

31 (Submission to Cabinet: Queensland Reconstruction Authority Bill 2011, February 2011).
32 Sections 2 of the QRA Act.
33 Section 3(a) of the QRA Act.
as local and state government to ensure value for money and achieve the strategic objective of delivering ‘best practice in the expenditure of public reconstruction funds’.

The Authority is also responsible for management and oversight of the NDRRA policy and program more broadly, playing a role in the activation, assessment, approval, progress monitoring, audit and/or acquittal processes for all categories of NDRRA expenditure.\(^{34}\) Whilst originally focused on the natural disaster events that led to its inception, the scope of the Authority was later extended to cover the administration of all NDRRA works from 2007.

In addition, the purpose of the QRA Act and the Authority itself has evolved over time, broadening to explicitly encompass a focus on improvements to community resilience against potential natural disaster events, with the Authority empowered to coordinate and implement appropriate measures in 2013.\(^{35}\) This shift in focus has been reflected in the more recent strategic objectives of the Authority, which also seek to “build a resilient Queensland and support resilient Queenslanders”.\(^{36}\)

### 3.3 Functions

#### Legislative functions

As defined by the QRA Act,\(^ {37}\) the Authority has been tasked with a number of broad legislative functions, including:

- Decision-making around the priorities for community infrastructure and community services required for the protection, rebuilding and recovery of affected communities;
- Working closely with affected communities to ensure each community’s needs are recognised in the rebuilding and recovery of the communities;
- Collection and collation of information about community infrastructure, property and other services that have been impacted, as well as the coordination and distribution of financial assistance for affected communities;
- Facilitation of flood mitigation and ensuring that the protection, rebuilding and recovery of affected communities is appropriate and is carried out effectively and efficiently;
- Development of an arrangement for sharing data across all levels of government to ensure effective and efficient exchange of information;
- Implementation of strategic priorities as determined by the QRA Board;
- If requested, provision of advice around the recommendations resulting from the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry;\(^ {38}\) and
- Planning, coordination and implementation of measures to improve the resilience of communities for potential natural disaster events.\(^ {39}\)

The Act also empowers the Authority to undertake activities in a number of specific circumstances, including:

---

\(^{34}\) (The Queensland Reconstruction Authority and natural disaster arrangements, 2015).

\(^{35}\) Sections 2 and 10 of the QRA Act as amended in 2013.

\(^{36}\) (QRA Strategic Plans 2012-16).

\(^{37}\) Section 10 of the QRA Act.

\(^{38}\) Commissioned under the Commissions of Inquiry Order (No. 1) 2011 and publicly released on 16 March 2012.

\(^{39}\) As identified previously, this was incorporated into the defined legislative functions of the Authority in 2013.
• The declaration of a reconstruction area; and
• The creation of a new development scheme (such as the relocation of the Grantham community in 2011-12).

Functional areas

Overview

The core functional areas and operational activities as identified by the QRA are divided into distinct teams / functional areas:

1. Operations (57 personnel including permanent staff, interchange staff and contractors) which includes assessment compliance, value for money, acquittal and inspections, benchmarking, progress reporting, and regional liaison;
2. ICT & Innovation (24 personnel including permanent staff, interchange staff and contractors) including records and information, registration, and GIS (Geographic Information System) mapping in addition to ICT & Innovation functions;
3. Audit & Assurance (14 personnel including permanent staff, interchange staff and contractors) which includes human resource functions in addition to audit and assurance and reporting functions;
4. Interface Management (10 personnel including permanent staff and interchange staff); and
5. Strategic Policy (six personnel including permanent staff and interchange staff).

There are a number of activities undertaken by each group throughout the disaster lifecycle (Figure 11 – refer to Appendix A.5 for an overview of relevant functions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Functional Area</th>
<th>Activities and Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility and Value for Money</td>
<td>Submission Assessment Eligibility &gt; Value for Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review: NDRRA Determination and VFM Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>Mobilise 50% Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% Complete Validation / performance assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress payments (up to 90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Report 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validate &amp; payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validate &amp; payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Submission eligibility &amp; VFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validation of progress payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process control &amp; check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review general ledger transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validate: scope vs. spend vs. delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquittal / Audit</td>
<td>Quarterly reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual acquittal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old &amp; Commonwealth Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QRA – Certify expenditure with NDRRA Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMA NDRRA progress tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QAO – State certification for EMA &amp; ANAO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Functional areas and activities undertaken

---

40 Adapted from the QRA Reconstruction and Governance Report, June 2015.
Key projects and other activities

Overview
The Authority’s role within the broader natural disaster management and prevention framework within government has formally and informally evolved over time to encompass a number of activities, functions and projects that span the natural disaster management lifecycle.

Prevention: Hazard-mapping and development of guidelines
The QRA has undertaken a number of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Queensland communities, including:

- Mapping of Queensland floodplains;
- Flood hazard mapping for 104 communities;
- Development of guidelines for wind-resistant housing; more resilient electrical infrastructure; rebuilding in storm-tide prone areas; and planning for a stronger more resilient Queensland;
- Training on NDRRA guidelines and assessment processes; and
- Engagement with local governments through site visits and training in readiness for events.

Response: Activation and assessment

Activation
As previously identified, the QRA is responsible for managing the activation of NDRRA funding, on advice and information received from relevant administering agencies.

The Authority also is responsible for the coordination across government for proposals for exceptional circumstances under Category D of NDRRA.

Assessment
It is considered that the collection of accurate, early assessment of information is critical for the prioritisation of short and immediate-term recovery and reconstruction efforts.

In some cases, the QRA seeks to adopt a model of forward deployment; officers will be diverted from ordinary roles and deployed to LGAs that are expected to be impacted to provide on-the-ground immediate support in the aftermath of an event.

As part of this, QRA resources support QFES in undertaking Rapid Damage Assessments, which allows for the provision of real-time housing and property damage data to the relevant oversight and coordination committees and groups (refer to Response and Recovery: Data Collection).

Data transmitted from the damage site is also used to populate the QRA’s grants management system and NDRRA funding submission; the QRA facilitates access for local government to relevant policy and engineering advice in order to develop estimates of infrastructure damage and determine NDRRA (or SDRA) eligibility.
The QRA has provided post-disaster damage assessment assistance to 35 local governments, conducting more than 16,200 assessments since 2013.41

Response and Recovery: NDRRA Eligibility and Value for Money

NDRRA policy leadership

The QRA has adopted an advocate role in the design and clarification of the NDRRA funding arrangements on behalf of the Queensland Government. Key activities have historically included:

- Request for a trial of the use of day labour under the Value for Money Day Labour Pricing Model (refer to Value for Money);
- Negotiation around changes to arrangements concerning local government-owned plant and equipment;
- Participating in the Queensland Government’s response to the Productivity Commission Inquiry Report into Natural Disaster Funding Arrangements; and
- Representing the Queensland Government in negotiations with EMA around a move towards an upfront grants model.

Value for Money

The Authority adopts a crucial coordination, monitoring and assurance function in ensuring value for money outcomes are achieved for the state and Commonwealth governments across the reconstruction program; as identified previously, one of the core strategic objectives of the organisation is to deliver ‘best practice in the expenditure of public reconstruction funds’.

Aligned to the State Procurement Policy, the requirements of the NDDRA and operating under the principles of transparency, efficiency and effectiveness, a key mechanism to achieving this was the development of the Value for Money Strategy and associated Assurance Framework. Assessment under the framework seeks to address two identified risks - readiness of the funding recipient and the proposed project – through seven key processes:

1. Centralised reporting and common reporting structure;
2. Risk-based assurance of existing local value for money strategies and processes;
3. Local prioritisation balanced with whole-of-state considerations;
4. Devolution of procurement and delivery to the responsible entities best positioned to address the risks identified;
5. Transparent accountabilities across the program for value for money outcomes;
6. Collaborative engagement with delivery organisations to optimise probability of achieving value for money outcomes; and
7. Establishment of external scope and cost references, including through price benchmarking, and review.42

The Strategy and its implementation has been endorsed by the Inspectorate.

41 (Briefing Information: The QRA and natural disaster arrangements, May 2015).
Benchmarking

To support the Value for Money Strategy and improve transparency in cost estimations of NDRRA works, the QRA has developed a benchmarking process to enable the validation of cost estimates through a review of actual costs based on historical contract data.

The QRA are capable of producing estimated activity rates for common restoration activities delivered under NDRRA by leveraging input rates (estimated rates used for individual units in reconstruction), together with scope and quantity information. These are validated against output rates (reflective of the actual cost of works that have been delivered), which are also used to account for variation in delivery methods and identify and quantify changes in scope and delivery of works outside the acceptable thresholds.

Eligibility of council day labour

The NDRRA seeks to minimise cost-shifting of reconstruction responsibilities to higher levels of government; an underlying principle of the funding is that lower levels of government exhaust their own resources prior to accessing assistance from higher levels.43 Local governments are precluded under the guidelines from claiming expenditure relating to their internal workforces (‘day labour’) undertaking reconstruction works which has, at times, led to a perverse incentive to contract out reconstruction works even where it results in a more costly or time-delayed reconstruction program.44 There is also evidence to suggest that these costs have been included in submissions and incorrectly reimbursed on some occasions, particularly inter-jurisdictionally. 45

In consultation with the Local Government Association of Queensland (LGAQ), the QRA developed the ‘Value for Money Day Labour Pricing Model’ to identify the potential cost savings that could be realised through the utilisation of internal local government workforces in circumstances where it represents value for money.

In 2012, the Commonwealth approved trial eligibility criteria that allowed for use of day labour for 2010 and 2011 event recovery works (including those re-damaged in 2012) where value for money outcomes could be demonstrated. The trial was subsequently extended to the reconstruction program relating to 2012 and 2013 events, but was not approved for extension to 2014 natural disaster events.

Analysis undertaken by the QRA and commissioned independently confirmed that the trial would lead to indicative savings of $160 million.

The Queensland Government recently accepted the interim solution proposed by the Commonwealth government; local governments are entitled to seek reimbursement for day labour if comparatively better value to contractors can be demonstrated and oversight and assurance conditions met. In the longer-term, the Commonwealth government has proposed a shift towards an ‘upfront’ natural disaster recovery funding model, providing state and local governments with greater autonomy in the delivery of reconstruction works.


44 This was supported by the Productivity Commission Inquiry Report into Natural Disaster Funding Arrangements; Finding 2.5 highlighted that restrictions on reimbursement for day labour was a key driver for ‘wasteful spending’ and, whilst limiting the scope for cost-shifting, imposed administrative costs and acts as an impediment to efficient and cost-effective reconstruction.

45 Clause 5.2.5 of the Determination precludes ‘amounts attributable to salaries or wages or other ongoing administrative expenditure for which the State would have been liable even though the eligible measure had not been carried out’.
Betterment

‘The intent of betterment is to increase the resilience of Australian communities to natural disasters, while at the same time reducing future expenditure on asset restoration, reducing incidents, injuries and fatalities during and after natural disasters, and improving asset utility during and after natural disasters’ – Guideline 7, NDRRA Determination 2012

As identified previously, a key criterion of NDRRA funding is the replacement or restoration of the eligible asset to its pre-disaster condition in accordance with current building and engineering standards. In effect, this precludes the restoration or replacement of the asset to a more disaster-resilient standard (or ‘betterment’) unless the Commonwealth is satisfied that it is a cost-effective solution that will mitigate the impact of future natural disasters.46 Only one project has been approved by the Commonwealth under these arrangements since 2007, and as a result, some vulnerable assets have received repeated funding for repair.

In recognition of the need for a more streamlined and effective approvals process for betterment, and as provided for under the NPA, the QRA developed the Framework for Betterment and reached an agreement with the Commonwealth in 2013 for a jointly funded Queensland Betterment Fund (Fund); the Commonwealth contributed $40 million to the fund to be used towards the betterment of local government assets impacted by 2013 events, matched by the state.

The application process for betterment funding aligned to the NDRRA submission, approval and acquittal process, with additional detail required to assess the betterment component. There were approximately 1,434 submissions to the Fund from 47 local governments, to an estimated total cost of $1.19 billion. Submissions were assessed against the Framework which encompassed eligibility and value for money criteria, including a benefit analysis of the financial and non-financial aspects of the proposal.

More than 230 submissions were approved (16% of total submissions) across a total project cost of approximately $170 million; around 161 of these projects have been completed as at 28 February 2015 ($44 million in betterment funding47 with a total project cost of $99 million).

Response and Recovery: Data Collection and Information Sharing

The QRA has developed a number of tools and systems for the collection and sharing of information relevant to disaster events. Some of these tools, which are described in greater detail below, have also been adopted by other government departments and agencies.

DARMsys™

In partnership with relevant stakeholders, the QRA has produced mapping and other geospatial information products to advise and assist the relevant decision-making and coordination bodies during the Response and Recovery phases of a disaster event.

46 Clause 3.6.8.

47 Betterment costs are marginal costs relating to the difference between the cost of restoration or replacement to a pre-disaster standard compared to a more disaster-resilient standard; the former costs are eligible under Category B of NDRRA, whilst the marginal cost may be eligible for betterment funding (Framework for Betterment, 2013).
Developed in consultation with QFES, the DARMsys™ is a data collection system that allows for a standardised, consistent methodology of damage assessment across the state. Utilised by ‘on-the-ground’ QFES and QRA resources through the use of handheld GPS receivers, the tool is used to capture damage assessment data shortly after a natural disaster event in relation to commercial, residential and council infrastructure, which allows for more targeted, strategic response and recovery operations, as well as enhanced monitoring of reconstruction progress following a natural disaster event.

The capability of DARMsys™ was further tailored and enhanced in regards to the collection of data on damaged infrastructure; i-DARM enables local government to commence data collection immediately following an event, which is considered to expedite the NDRRA submission and approval process.

**Crowd-sourcing Application**

To assist with the collection and collation of real-time data during the Response phase of an event, the QRA developed a crowd-sourcing application that leverages social media to track, collate and map images of damage in real time that are assessed remotely by a trained damage assessor; the resultant identification of the most severely damaged areas allows for more effective resource deployment.

The useability and functionality of this application is currently under review, and the QRA is working in conjunction with QPS to consider its implementation as a disaster management tool.

**QRA Deployment Application**

The QRA Deployment Application (App) was developed to provide deployed resources with access to key information in impacted areas, including: emergency and operations contacts; administration, logistics and financial information; workplace health and safety information; communications and reporting information; and Rapid Damage Assessment information.

The App also provides the capability for resources to ‘check in’, providing the QRA with an additional level of oversight over progress and safety of employees.

**Digital image collection**

The QRA utilises an in-house image storing system with the capability to geographically map photographs and compare post-disaster images with restored assets. The Authority continues to improve this capability, to allow for an easier non-map based interface search capability, automated loading, and integration with other QRA systems.

**Reporting dashboards**

In the aftermath of TC Marcia, the QRA developed reporting ‘dashboards’ to provide a coordinated and consistent source of information to relevant stakeholders that continued past the Response phase into the short-term Recovery phase (Figure 12).
Recovery: Delivery and Monitoring

Grants Management and Reporting System (GMRS)

In recognition of the challenges faced with the scale and scope of funding under management, the GMRS was developed by the QRA to provide a seamless system for application, assessment, auditing and archiving of grant submissions, with the capability to allow for direct electronic upload of submissions by local governments.

Subsequent to its development, the GMRS has been leveraged by a number of other grant funding programs and government agencies, and further opportunities are being considered.

Recovery: Assurance and Acquittal

725 project

As identified previously, the Queensland Auditor-General issued a qualified audit opinion in 2012 in relation to $968 million in NDRRA funding expended in response to natural disaster events occurring from 2008 to 2010; $924 million related to recovery and reconstruction works undertaken by local government, with the remaining $44 million attributable to hardship payments incurred by the state government. On this basis, the Commonwealth withheld the proportionate reimbursement of the qualified expenditure (approximately $725 million).

The QRA has undertaken the ‘725 Project’ to address the audit qualification; in conjunction with local government, the QRA sought to collate additional, sufficient information to allow an assessment of pre-disaster condition and related post-disaster reparation (and thus eligibility of funding) on a sample basis. Over a period of 15 months, the QRA reviewed submissions representing $764 million (83%) of the total expenditure subject to the audit qualification, and found that over $600 million was eligible expenditure under NDRRA criteria.

Subject to final sign-off and provision of an unqualified audit opinion by the Queensland Audit Office (QAO), the proposed extrapolation of these findings over the relevant claims (over $800 million in eligible submissions) could lead to the reimbursement of around $600 million in funding by the Commonwealth. At this time, the Auditor-General has advised that the proposal presents a reasonable approach to the conclusion of the audit.
3.4 Governance and partnerships

Internal

Reporting directly to the Minister responsible for reconstruction and to the Queensland Reconstruction Board (Board), the structure of the organisation aligns to its core functions (Figure 13) and is modelled on the delivery of a major infrastructure construction project. The structure is noted to have adapted over time in response to the Authority’s functional requirements.

![Figure 13: QRA organisational structure](image)

In accordance with the QRA Act (2011), the board consists of a chairperson, two Commonwealth and an LGAQ representative, along with three other members, the Board has direct oversight over the Authority carries the legislative responsibility of setting the strategic priorities of the Authority and ensuring that it performs its function and exercises its power appropriately. The Board is also responsible for providing recommendations to the Minister around priorities for community infrastructure and the need for the declaration of declared projects and reconstruction areas.

---

48 (QRA: Operational Arrangements 2014).

49 Adapted from The Queensland Reconstruction Authority and natural disaster arrangements and information provided by the QRA.

50 It is noted that given the cessation of the NPA, the two Commonwealth government members have since resigned.

51 Section 29 QRA Act.
The Authority is led by a CEO. The Interface Management Group (10 personnel) is the key support function for responsible Minister, the Board and the CEO, and is also responsible for a range of activities including: strategic policy, planning and publications; communications, media and engagement; and records management.

**Performance monitoring and reporting**

The QRA itself reports to the Minister on a monthly basis, and also provides a monthly briefing to a number of key state and Commonwealth government partners and stakeholders, including: QAQ; QTT; the Queensland Ombudsman; the Crime and Misconduct Commission; EMA; the Inspectorate; and the Commonwealth National Disaster Recovery Taskforce (Taskforce).

**Relationship with the Commonwealth**

**Overview**

The Authority’s relationship with the Commonwealth is predominantly driven by the governance arrangements of its key touch point: NDRRA funding, which is governed by the Determination (refer to section 2.4) and the NPA.

**National Partnership Agreement**

Given the scale and scope of Queensland’s recovery operations following the 2010 and 2011 natural disaster events, it was considered that the related NDRRA funding should be subject to a higher degree of transparency and assurance within the Queensland context. Entered into in February 2013, the NPA provides further definition around the governance arrangements for the delivery of and acquittal against the NDRRA program.

The NPA ceased on 30 June 2015.

**Scope and key provisions**

The NPA applies to reconstruction and recovery activities relating to the flood and cyclone events between November 2010 and January 2013 (refer to Appendix A.4); the reconstruction program associated with these events is expected for completion in FY15.

Together with imposing more stringent reporting and auditing requirements, the NPA provides for a number of key agreements and inclusions relevant to the in-scope events, including:

- Exemption from the requirement to seek approval for a restoration or replacement project estimated to be more than $1 million (clause 47);
- Agreed inclusion of sporting, recreational or community facilities as eligible public assets (clause 49);
- Commonwealth agreement to expedite Category C and D requests (clause 50);

---

52 The incumbent is Frankie Carroll, who was appointed in September 2014 after serving as the Deputy CEO and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) since the Authority’s inception in 2011.

53 As at May 2015. Refer to Section 3.5 for more information around the resourcing requirements of the organisation.

54 It should be noted that the Inspectorate ceased operations on 30 June 2015, however it is anticipated that the Commonwealth will still require a form of monthly reporting under the funding arrangements moving forward.

55 The Victorian government entered into a similar agreement in relation to the natural disaster events of 2010 and 2011.

56 Where the restoration or replacement of an essential public asset is estimated to be more than $1 million, clause 3.6.2 of the Determination requires the State to seek Commonwealth approval and establish that the asset is an integral and necessary part of health, education, transport, justice or welfare infrastructure which, if lost or damaged, would severely disrupt the normal functioning of a community and would be restored or replaced as a matter of urgency.
• Foundation for the establishment of the Framework for Betterment (clause 51), as highlighted previously; and
• Agreement to extend the day labour trial to January 2013 events (clause 52).

Inspectorate and Taskforce

The NPA also provides for the establishment of the Inspectorate to achieve a greater degree of oversight over reconstruction activities within Queensland and provide an additional level of checks and balances in the expenditure of public funds, predominantly through the establishment of an agreed audit plan. The Inspectorate is supported by the Taskforce.

The powers of the Inspectorate and Taskforce are broad, allowing for submission-level audits of Queensland’s reconstruction program from the source to the point of final expenditure. This was seen to have impacted on the operations and functioning of the QRA in a number of aspects, such as:

• Interpretation of the NDRRA guidelines that can be inconsistent with QRA’s approach, leading to greater uncertainty and reimbursement risk; for example, the Inspectorate deemed the profit margin of DTMR’s commercial business unit (RoadTek) to be ineligible, equating to a loss in reimbursement of approximately $100 million.

• The administrative and resourcing burden associated with additional auditing requirements; the QRA provided information on 210 sampled submissions ($3.5 billion in total project cost) and responded to 800 related queries of varying complexity. The Authority also provided access to QRA’s internal records management system and specialist engineering staff to provide detailed project explanations.

• Additional reporting requirements; the QRA produces weekly, monthly and ad-hoc reports and attends monthly Governance and bimonthly Inspectorate meetings.

The Inspectorate ceased operations at the end of the NPA on 30 June 2015, with the Taskforce to be subsumed into EMA. This also triggered the two Commonwealth representatives to step down from the QRA Board.

Relationship with local and state government

Overview

As outlined previously in section 2.3, the disaster management lifecycle in Queensland is governed by a complex network of stakeholders operating across multiple and multi-tiered groups and committees.

Functions and activities undertaken by the QRA relating to the entirety of the disaster management lifecycle involve varying interfaces with other local and state government agencies. In addition, the administration of NDRRA funding, in particular the reconstruction program, involves the management and coordination of a significant number of stakeholders across a vast geographic area, requiring multiple points of contact with asset owners of varying maturity.

QDMA Arrangements

The QRA is a member of four of the five Functional Recovery Groups (excluding the Human and Social Recovery Group), but does not hold a formal role on any of the cross-government, strategic decision-making bodies or committees governing disaster management in Queensland (such as the SDCG or Disaster Resilience Strategy Management Groups).\(^{57}\)

\(^{57}\) It is noted that the incumbent CEO of the QRA may be involved in these committees at times due to his recent appointment as the SRC.
Operational delivery

The QRA has historically adopted a program management approach that mirrors a major infrastructure construction delivery model, with direct linkages to the service delivery agents through the Regional Liaison Officer (RLO) positions across the state. Made up of technical specialists, these resources are responsible for the coordination of reconstruction efforts for local governments, providing advice, expertise and practical assistance, as well as engaging in the Prevention phase through site visits and training in readiness for events.

A specialised indigenous council engagement strategy has also been developed by the Authority, in recognition of the different geographic and social factors and capacity and capability challenges faced by these local governments.

Funding arrangements and Memoranda of Understanding

The QRA will determine the provision of advance payments to the delivery agents in conjunction with the consideration and approval of submissions. To expedite the reconstruction process, both state and local government agencies are required to have a funding agreement with the Authority in place for the release of advance payments.

Where restoration or replacement of a public asset is commenced by state or local government prior to approval, the relevant stakeholder retains the risk associated with the outcome of the funding application.

Performance monitoring and reporting

To support and align to Commonwealth reporting requirements, state agencies may be required to provide monthly reports to the QRA outlining actual and estimated expenditure under a three-year forecast period, by relief measure and by event.

State agencies are also required to complete a certified end of financial year NDRRA Expenditure Report, by relief measure per event, with an audited certification by the Chief Executive Officer or Director-General and evidence of expenditure approval and actual expenditure against the approved amount by financial year.

3.5 Resource profile

Overview

The level of resourcing and required capabilities varies in accordance with the scale of each the functional activities undertaken by the QRA, which, in turn, is dependent on natural disaster events, the volume and type of submissions, and the lifecycle of the NDRRA reconstruction program. As at 30 June 2015, the current staffing level of QRA was 98 FTEs which has been budgeted to remain consistent in the 2016 financial year. These FTEs are dispersed across the five operational areas identified in the organisational structure provided in Figure 14.

---

58 For Queensland departments and agencies, this will take the form of a Memorandum of Agreement which outlines the guidelines for the release of funding.

59 (Queensland Budget 2015-16, Service Delivery Statements, Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, July 2015)
The QRA has historically utilised a resourcing blend of internal personnel, state government interchange resources, technical and specialist contractors and, at times, Australian Defence Force personnel. This was seen to enable a more flexible workforce to adapt and respond to changes in demand for particular activities, within the context of a temporary organisation. This flexibility is reflected in the number of employees over the period 2012 to 2014 as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(September 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Employee profile FY12 to FY14**

Historically, contractors have been leveraged in two key ways: technical specialists to work with local government affected by natural disaster events; and procurement and contract specialists to review and provide advice on value for money considerations and state

---

60 Adapted from information provided by the QRA.
61 Pursuant to s.184 Public Service Act 2008.
62 Based on information contained in the 2012 and 2014 QRA Annual Reports and information provided directly from the QRA.
Purchasing Policy. Contractors engaged included (but have not been limited to): road and infrastructure engineers and site inspectors; quantity surveyors; construction, program and / or project managers; NDRRA compliance officers, cost auditors and independent verifiers; benchmarking analysis; geographic information systems analysis; financial reporting and assurance advisors; legal advisors; and procurement advisors.

**Staff satisfaction**

Agency engagement and job engagement and satisfaction was rated highly (89% positive) by QRA employees in the 2015 Working for Queensland Employee Opinion Survey, representing an uplift since 2014 (14 and 9 points respectively).

Perceptions around work-life balance and adequacy of resourcing had the highest positive change since the previous year, rising by 32 points to 76% and by 30 points to 75% positive responses respectively. However, less than 30% of employees felt that their job was secure (23 percentage points lower than the Queensland public sector average) and, whilst exhibiting a significant improvement to the previous year (up 15 percentage points), only around half of the workforce indicated that they experienced limited to no issues with workload and health, predominantly driven by perceptions of being overloaded with work.

3.6 Financial arrangements

The operations of the QRA are funded through Queensland Government grants. Excluding revenue and expenditure relating to NDRRA grants, the operational expenditure of the Authority in FY14 was approximately $31.45 million (less than 1% of grant funding administered), an increase from $29.30 million and $27.02 million in FY13 and FY12 respectively. The operating result for the relevant financial year is largely dependent on the timing of advance receipts of NDRRA grants. Figure 15 and Table 4 depict the changes in operating expenditure by expense category over the financial years 2012 to 2014.

![Figure 15: Operating expenditure by expense category, FY12 to FY14](image_url)

63 Inclusive of employees staffed on interchange arrangements – the Authority is invoiced for wages, salaries and on costs by home agencies.

64 Based on information contained in the 2012 and 2014 QRA Annual Reports.
The compound annual growth rate (CAGR) shows significant variance across the various expense categories further reinforcing the flexibility of the QRA’s structure. The variances in operating expenditure are dependent on a number of factors including, but not limited to, volume and severity of NDRRA activations, volume of grants processed, and staff mix of permanent, interchange and contracted employees.

The total variance across the three years is an increase in operating expenditure of 8% per annum. Over the same period, the total grants expenses for the QRA increased by an average of 36% per annum indicating the operating costs represent a decreasing percentage of total grants administered.

Preliminary estimates in the 2015-16 Queensland State Budget handed down in July 2015 indicate that an increase in operating expenditure to $32.7 million is expected for the 2015 financial year, representing 4% growth on 2014. In 2015-16, operating expenses are budgeted to decrease by 8.3% due to a decrease in grants, lower anticipated acquittals and the return of unexpended non-NDRRA grant funding.
04 Operational performance

4.1 Overview

The QRA’s historical and current performance was assessed against ten key focus areas under four broad functional dimensions that align to the QRA’s overarching objectives and functions, including:

- **Finance**: prioritisation, grants administration; and value for money;
- **Relationships**: community engagement and liaison; and stakeholder management;
- **Coordination**: data collection and distribution; and coordination, monitoring and planning; and
- **Corporate**: resourcing; governance; and risk management.

Insights drawn directly from stakeholder surveys are highlighted throughout this section and include reference to how many responses were received for each question. Full results can be seen at Appendix A.1. Qualitative insights were further sourced through interviews with members of each Functional Recovery Group Chair and a number of other nominated personnel agreed by the Steering Committee.

4.2 Key consultation messages

In consultation with the Project Steering Committee, a list of priority stakeholder agencies and individuals were identified for inclusion in the stakeholder consultation program. In summary, 13 stakeholders or stakeholder agencies were interviewed with the majority of these being current chairs of the five Functional Recovery Groups. Further details on the key individuals and agencies involved in the stakeholder consultation are available in Appendix A.3.

Discussions held with stakeholders were wide-ranging but structured across the following key topic areas:

- The role and function of the QRA;
- Gaps or overlaps in functions provided by different entities across the broader natural disaster event and recovery lifecycle; and
- Future direction of the QRA.

The key findings from the stakeholder consultations are summarised in the following tables.
### Key Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>• Recognition of the strength and effectiveness of current and past leadership of the QRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observations that the QRA has ‘traded on personal relationships’ to be able to create an impact on key stakeholders and make things happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognition that the current legislative framework and mandate for QRA is wide-ranging and has been influenced by external factors including the political landscape and frequency and severity of natural disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It has been the strength and drive of the leadership of the QRA that has determined to some degree the focus and scope of QRA’s activities throughout the disaster management and prevention lifecycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibre and capability of QRA people</td>
<td>• QRA is recognised as a high calibre, dynamic and professional organisation that has consistently demonstrated the ability to innovate and contribute to improvements across the disaster management and prevention lifecycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There was also acknowledgement of the benefits to the QRA and the broader disaster management system of QRA’s resourcing model where they are able to draw upon specific skills and capabilities from the external market as and when required. Further to this, the flexible resourcing model allows QRA to ramp up and down its resourcing (both capacity and capability) at different stages of the lifecycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation for getting things done</td>
<td>• Stakeholders interviewed consistently described the QRA as being able to ‘get things done’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Notably, a number of stakeholders cited examples of situations where the QRA had stepped in and performed tasks that should have been performed elsewhere (i.e. by a line agency or through an alternative arrangement) but that QRA had an ‘opportunistic’ or ‘can do’ culture of identifying a gap and filling it. Examples given related to their role in flood mapping, creating disaster management dashboard reports for briefings with Ministers, the media and other key stakeholders and bush fire mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Whilst this ability to be dynamic and shift resources to deal with emerging needs and priorities was identified as a strength, there was recognition of the need to ensure that this opportunism does not lead to duplication with other agencies or a situation where line agencies no longer fulfil their responsibilities because they become dependent or reliant on the QRA to step in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to expedite access to funding</td>
<td>• Stakeholders consistently noted that a key strength of the QRA was its ability to get access to and effectively acquit against NDRRA funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Identified key strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central agencies reported a sense of assurance and confidence knowing that QRA was navigating this process on behalf of Queensland.</td>
<td>• Central agencies reported a sense of assurance and confidence knowing that QRA was navigating this process on behalf of Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders identified that the systems that have been developed by the QRA has been of useful in keeping stakeholders informed and expediting the grants process.</td>
<td>• Stakeholders identified that the systems that have been developed by the QRA has been of useful in keeping stakeholders informed and expediting the grants process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line agencies and local government acknowledged that without the QRA, they would have had significantly more challenges in getting timely access to funding which has been critical in the aftermath of major natural disasters, particularly in unlocking special categories of NDRRA funding. One stakeholder commented that ‘without the QRA, we would be stuffed…’.</td>
<td>• Line agencies and local government acknowledged that without the QRA, they would have had significantly more challenges in getting timely access to funding which has been critical in the aftermath of major natural disasters, particularly in unlocking special categories of NDRRA funding. One stakeholder commented that ‘without the QRA, we would be stuffed…’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QRA are in a unique position in that they have both a system-wide, strategic view of the disaster management and prevention landscape both at a National and state level as well as local, tactical knowledge of regional and remote Queensland communities.</td>
<td>• The QRA are in a unique position in that they have both a system-wide, strategic view of the disaster management and prevention landscape both at a National and state level as well as local, tactical knowledge of regional and remote Queensland communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role and strength of the RLO model was acknowledged by key stakeholders. One stakeholder referred to it as an ‘intelligence network’ that was ‘critical’ following a major disaster event.</td>
<td>• The role and strength of the RLO model was acknowledged by key stakeholders. One stakeholder referred to it as an ‘intelligence network’ that was ‘critical’ following a major disaster event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QRA is recognised and respected by its stakeholders for the pivotal role it plays in working with local governments during response and recovery following a natural disaster. The QRA will provide additional assistance to those communities which do not have the resources / skills to access recovery funding. The QRA note this as the ‘no one gets left behind’.</td>
<td>• The QRA is recognised and respected by its stakeholders for the pivotal role it plays in working with local governments during response and recovery following a natural disaster. The QRA will provide additional assistance to those communities which do not have the resources / skills to access recovery funding. The QRA note this as the ‘no one gets left behind’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One stakeholder noted that the ‘QRA has the knowledge of our local communities…they know how local government operates and can work effectively with them but at the same time they have the relationships we need with the Commonwealth’.</td>
<td>• One stakeholder noted that the ‘QRA has the knowledge of our local communities…they know how local government operates and can work effectively with them but at the same time they have the relationships we need with the Commonwealth’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders recognised the key influencing role the QRA had played in driving pragmatic value for money outcomes for Queensland. For example, a number of stakeholders referred to the pivotal role the QRA played in the day labour ruling for local government.</td>
<td>• Stakeholders recognised the key influencing role the QRA had played in driving pragmatic value for money outcomes for Queensland. For example, a number of stakeholders referred to the pivotal role the QRA played in the day labour ruling for local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders viewed the QRA as critical in mitigating the financial risk of the state by providing assurance in NDRRA eligibility and acquitting against outstanding funds.</td>
<td>• Stakeholders viewed the QRA as critical in mitigating the financial risk of the state by providing assurance in NDRRA eligibility and acquitting against outstanding funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Opportunities for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for clarity on role and scope of the QRA</td>
<td>• A number of stakeholders highlighted the need for greater clarity on the role and scope of the QRA. There was acknowledgement that the QRA Act was hastily prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the wake of the 2011 floods and that the powers it covers are wide ranging and open to interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Whilst there was not a lot of support for a review or refinement of the legislation, there was recognition of benefits to the QRA and the broader disaster management and prevention system from having greater clarity on the QRA’s role and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders sought clarity on the following aspects of the role of the QRA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the Preparation and Prevention phases of the natural disaster lifecycle. In particular the QRA’s role in resilience and mitigation policy and delivery program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the Response phase of the natural disaster lifecycle, their role in forward deployment of resources and assistance in Rapid Damage Assessment and data collection / dissemination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the prioritisation of natural disaster resilience/ mitigation or recovery projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In leading ongoing negotiations with the Commonwealth government in relation to future natural disaster funding arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- On their role within existing QDMA structures for example, the ongoing role of the QRA CEO as the SRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This clarity will help to identify potential gaps in the system and any real or perceived areas of duplication or overlap with other agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications – particularly regarding the QRA’s role</td>
<td>• Related to the need to clarify the role and scope of the QRA, it is important to ensure that there is consistent communication regarding this to key stakeholders as part of a stakeholder management and education process. Currently, there is inconsistent information available both specifically regarding the QRA and around disaster management arrangements and responsibilities more broadly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some stakeholders also reported that the QRA could do a better job of communicating with stakeholders regarding changes to Commonwealth funding arrangements, such as around funding criteria revisions. Those stakeholders that made this comment noted that the QRA was at times ‘the messenger’ in terms of passing on information on decisions taken at the Commonwealth level (and beyond QRA’s control) so this feedback was needed to be considered in this context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on key individuals</td>
<td>• As noted above, the QRA has attracted and continues to attract high calibre, dynamic and progressive professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders have noted that it is the leadership, influencing and relationship skills of key senior leaders in the QRA (past and present) that has been instrumental to the overall effectiveness of the Authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Identified opportunities for improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A key challenge with the current situation is that there is a heavy reliance on personal relationships. One stakeholder noted that there is ‘significant ambiguity’ in the broader disaster management system across Queensland and that this ‘reliance on personal relationships’ has been key to ‘making it work’ but the ‘system’ needed to be strengthened so that, in the event there was a change in personnel, the QRA could continue to operate effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Avoiding duplication across the system     | - As noted above, the QRA’s key strength in being dynamic and opportunistic in dealing with emerging needs and priorities has historically led to some situations of perceived or real duplication of role particularly with other line agencies.  
- There is recognition that in some cases, the QRA has ‘filled a gap’ effectively particularly in situations where there has been a need for a rapid response (for example creating data dashboards for tracking and reporting on progress in the immediate aftermath of a natural disaster event) however there is recognition that this opportunism has led to scope creep regarding the role of the QRA and potential passivity or learned helplessness on the part of the line agency that would usually have responsibility for that function.  
- There is need to clarify the role and scope of the QRA and identify where it can best focus its capability and capacity for the benefit of the wider disaster management system in Queensland. |

### 4.3 Finance

#### Prioritisation

Prioritisation undertaken by the QRA in the current environment is limited; stakeholders believe that prioritisation resides with the asset owners with some involvement from the QRA where their specialist knowledge is of benefit

#### Historical performance

At the time of the QRA’s establishment, Queensland was inundated by significant natural disaster events that were affecting the majority of the state. At the time, there was concern that the state would not have capacity to effectively prioritise the scarce resources to the most significantly affected communities. In this context, one of the QRA’s enacted legislative functions is to ‘decide the priorities for community infrastructure and community services needed for the protection, rebuilding and recovery of affected communities’.

The Authority’s involvement in prioritisation has been limited to date. Many stakeholders considered that the task of prioritisation resides with the asset owners. Although it was agreed by a number of stakeholders that the QRA plays a role in prioritising the allocation of funding for recovery and rebuilding (87% positive and 6% negative responses across 58 survey respondents). It was observed by some stakeholders that the QRA may have limited involvement in prioritisation in the current environment, however the authority to perform that
function is necessary in times of significant disaster activity. It was further observed that the independence of the QRA as a statutory authority and the whole of government perspective the Authority has puts it in a strong position to perform prioritisation when required.

This is consistent with the QRA’s approach to date. The role of the QRA in the prioritisation of projects includes:

- **Significant events** – significant events such as the Grantham community rebuild have required prioritisation input from the QRA. This input included assistance in the prioritisation of major reconstruction activities from a project management perspective.

- **Eligibility** – the QRA has a role in assessing eligibility for NDRRA funding and assisting local government and partners. In this regard the QRA assists in the prioritisation of key works.

- **Forward deployment of QRA personnel** – in the lead up to an event, the QRA will deploy resources to areas likely to be affected. Subsequent to the event, they will redeploy the resources to the most significantly impacted areas to assist asset owners in assessing the damage of their assets and likelihood of eligibility for NDRRA funding. As part of this, the QRA has developed a number of supporting technologies that assist in the identification of the more severely impacted areas, to support the deployment of disaster management resources in the most efficient and effective manner. \(^65\)

- **Betterment** – state and local government delivery agents retain the primary responsibility in determining priority projects to submit for betterment funding. However, given the financial constraints of the funding pool, the QRA played a role in the prioritisation of projects to receive betterment funding, based on value for money and other assessment criteria, as well as its own available data (for example, the historical frequency with which a particular asset is damaged and the associated reconstruction funding that has been provided). However, the Productivity Commission Report noted that whilst some information is available on assessment criteria for betterment funding, it is not clear how these criteria are used to rank and select competing betterment projects. \(^66\)

**Key considerations and learnings**

The current environment has not required the QRA to have a significant role in prioritisation, however it is believed that the Authority is well placed to perform this function as and when required. A lack of clarity among some stakeholder groups as to the role the QRA has in prioritisation indicates there may be an opportunity to provide greater definition around this aspect of their role moving forward.

If within scope of the role moving forward, there may also be an opportunity to enhance the transparency in the prioritisation the QRA undertakes around the allocation of funding to betterment projects (if a similar pool of funding is re-established depending on future NDRRA arrangements).

---

\(^65\) Refer to **Response: Activation and assessment and Response and Recovery: Data Collection and Information Sharing**.

\(^66\) Whilst not specific to the QRA, the report further considered that if betterment funding is to be used more extensively, transparent and robust arrangements should be in place for selection criteria, publication of submissions and decisions, and relative merit assessment and prioritisation based on cost-benefit analysis.
Grants administration

Grants administration is widely perceived to be a core function that the QRA performs effectively, and has been well supported by operational improvement and systems development to improve the efficiency of relevant activities.

Survey Results

The QRA plays a role in expediting recovery through its assessment of funding applications.

- **Agree / Strongly Agree:** 86%
- **Disagree / Strongly disagree:** 9%

The QRA has been key to supporting recovery in my community through facilitating access to disaster-related funding.

- **Agree / Strongly Agree:** 84%
- **Disagree / Strongly disagree:** 7%

The QRA has appropriate processes in place to manage the administration of NDRRA funding.

- **Agree / Strongly Agree:** 82%
- **Disagree / Strongly disagree:** 5%

Survey Results

The QRA provides sufficient guidance and technical support on funding application processes.

- **Agree / Strongly Agree:** 80%
- **Disagree / Strongly disagree:** 6%

The QRA provides sufficient guidance and technical support on funding assessment and validation processes.

- **Agree / Strongly Agree:** 77%
- **Disagree / Strongly disagree:** 12%

The QRA facilitates the efficient distribution of funding.

- **Agree / Strongly Agree:** 68%
- **Disagree / Strongly disagree:** 16%

**Figure 16: Survey response – grants administration**

Stakeholder survey results relating to grants administration indicate that involvement in grants administration is one of the clearest roles for the Authority in the mind of stakeholders with 86% agreeing or strongly agreeing that the QRA has a role in expediting recovery through its assessment of funding applications (Figure 16). Strong results were also received in relation to support for communities in accessing funding.

Historical performance

NDRRA and SDRA funding for state recovery and relief has been unprecedented in magnitude and required a new level of administrative rigour to provide state and Commonwealth governments with an appropriate level of comfort. The QRA manages a program of NDRRA reconstruction works valued at over $13.5 billion related to natural disaster events from 2009 to 2014. While the Authority is the ultimate administrator of all NDRRA funding, the level of involvement varies between funding category.

In this context, the coordination and distribution of financial assistance for affected communities is at the core of the QRA’s legislative functions. Evidence suggests that the QRA’s systems, processes and relationships have been employed to achieve strong results in grants administration. Key aspects of the QRA’s performance include:
Role in the approval and acquittal process for NDRRA funding;
Provision of advice and communication to key stakeholders around NDRRA funding;
Implementation of the 725 project to address the qualified audit opinion associated with $968 million in NDRRA claims;\(^{67}\) and
Key projects to support the grants administration process, including process improvement and systems development.

Applications and acquittals

In March 2015, the QRA lodged to the Commonwealth government, the largest acquittal claim in Australian history of $5.7 billion of works representing over 1,500 NDRRA submissions. Figure 17 indicates the volume of funding that has been processed and acquitted by the QRA.

- $18.25 billion: Submissions received by the Authority to 30 April 2015.
- $18.13 billion: Submissions processed by the Authority to 30 April 2015.
- $13.57 billion: Estimated total works relating to natural disaster events from 2009 to 2015.
- $10.7 billion: Acquitted to the Commonwealth.
- $2.8 billion: Still to be acquitted to the Commonwealth.
- $2+ billion: Commonwealth funding potentially at risk.

Figure 17: Volume of NDRRA submissions

Stakeholders expressed generally positive opinions during consultations and through the survey results in relation to the QRA’s role in grants administration (Figure 16). Stakeholders commonly consider that the QRA’s role in processing applications and acquitting grant funding is at the core of the Authority’s functions, although not all agreed that the QRA facilitates the distribution of funding in an efficient manner (68% positive and 16% negative across 57 survey respondents). Notable observations in regard to grant processing expressed during consultations include:

- The QRA provides the state with a level of comfort over the grants acquittal process. Some stakeholders consider that the extent of funding that has been successfully acquitted with the Commonwealth government justifies the QRA’s existence alone.
- Appreciation of the role the QRA plays in ‘unlocking’ grant funding (particularly Category D funding) under the NDRRA which is attributed to the knowledge and relationships the QRA retains.

Grant funding advice

Respondents to the survey generally considered that the QRA provides sufficient guidance and technical support around funding application processes (80% positive), as well as assessment and validation (77% positive) (Figure 16).

However, a criticism of the QRA which was noted by some stakeholders is in regard to the consistent and timely communication of changes to grant funding criteria. While stakeholders acknowledge that the QRA does not have control over the Commonwealth government’s

---

\(^{67}\) Refer to Recovery: Assurance and Acquittal.
decision to change funding criteria, inconsistent messaging from different parts of the QRA to departments and local governments has been a source of some confusion and frustration.

**725 project**

As identified previously, the QRA has played a significant role in the ‘725 project’ to obtain reimbursement from the Commonwealth for natural disaster related expenditure incurred by the state. While the Authority has not yet been successful in obtaining reimbursement, QTT in particular expressed its appreciation for the efforts of the QRA in trying to obtain reimbursement.

**Internal processes**

In order to achieve faster processing times, the QRA undertook operational improvements which have reduced average processing time from fifteen weeks to seven weeks. This was achieved through eliminating unnecessary processes, the use of the RLO and Acquittal Program Manager networks, and strategic scheduling.

The QRA also attributes its process efficiencies to the agility of its structure allowing for resources to be easily realigned to suit business needs (particularly through the transition from assessment to acquittal).

The QRA has further developed a series of strategies, frameworks and guidelines to assist agencies such as the Submission Guide for NDRRA Funding Applicants.

**Systems development**

The QRA developed the GMRS for the purposes of managing grant funding. Such has been the success of the system that other government entities have sought the QRA to develop, implement and support similar systems to manage royalties, grant reporting and tracking, natural disaster relief appeals, tax subsidies, and customer relationships.

Some stakeholders indicated during consultations that they would appreciate QRA assistance in developing systems for them however they also questioned if the development of such systems was within the scope of the Authority.

**Key considerations and learnings**

The QRA is perceived to perform well on its legislative function to ‘coordinate and distribute financial assistance for affected communities’. The future operation of this function will need to consider and adapt to any proposed changes in the NDRRA funding model.

Consideration may need to be given as to whether the experience and capabilities of the QRA can be further leveraged to assist and support other agencies’ grants administration processes.

Importantly, any future focus areas should not compromise the Authority’s ability to coordinate and distribute financial assistance to affected communities.

**Value for money**

The QRA has been largely effective in providing assurance around value for money in the natural disaster reconstruction program, driving change in policy and technologies to support the achievement of these outcomes.

---

68 Refer to Recovery: Assurance and Acquittal.
Stakeholders recognised a role for the QRA in achieving value for money outcomes; 88% of survey respondents agreed that the QRA has a role to play in contributing to Value for Money outcomes in natural disaster reconstruction, although fewer understood how the QRA contributes to the achievement of this (61% positive), with only 58% agreeing that the Authority is effective in driving these outcomes (12% negative response) (Figure 18).

Historical performance

There has been a particular focus on achieving value for money in the expenditure of NDRRA funding on public infrastructure reconstruction on both a state and Commonwealth level, given the scale and scope of the damage caused by natural disaster events in recent years. The NPA provided for a greater level of Commonwealth scrutiny and oversight; the Inspectorate was established to oversee the Queensland reconstruction program to ‘provide assurance that value for money is being achieved in the expenditure of both Commonwealth and state funds during the recovery phase’.

Although not explicitly defined as a core function in the overarching legislation, the QRA has adopted an assessment and assurance role with respect to value for money outcomes achieved by the NDRRA-funded reconstruction program, forming part of a broader strategy around acqittal risk mitigation. As identified previously, the QRA developed, implemented and monitored on a project-specific basis a value for money framework applicable to NDRRA submissions that has been endorsed by the Commonwealth. Described as an ‘innovative disaster management mechanism’ by the World Bank in 2011, the framework subjects reconstruction project approvals to standard and context-specific criteria and progressive review throughout, and was also a core criteria in the assessment of submissions for betterment funding. In addition, the QRA also developed benchmarking capability to assist in determining and validating damage estimates.

As at July 2015, the QRA had approved $13.31 billion of project submissions, while $4.84 billion in projects were deemed ineligible that may otherwise have been subject to reimbursement by the state and Commonwealth governments. In addition, the achievement of value for money was fundamental to negotiations around the eligibility of day labour; analysis of the trial indicated potential savings of up to $160 million.

Since the inception of the Authority, all NDRRA claims submitted to date have been subject to an unqualified audit opinion by the Queensland Auditor-General. The ANAO Report undertaken

---

in November 2013 found that there had been no projects audited by the Inspectorate that had been determined not to represent value for money, however, it was considered that a significant proportion of approved projects had included expenditure that was deemed ineligible under the NDRRA, which adversely impacted on value for money being delivered by the relevant projects.\footnote{In its submission to the Productivity Commission Report, the Inspectorate stated that it had identified approximately $100 million in ineligible expenditure.} As previously noted, this largely arose from inconsistencies in the interpretation of the guidelines between the QRA and the Inspectorate.

Consultation with Queensland Treasury and Trade, the Department of Transport and Main Roads and the LGAQ during targeted consultation for this review indicated that the QRA’s focus and assistance with the application of value for money was highly valued. Interestingly, stakeholders rated the QRA at a lower level than most areas of assessment when it came to considering whether the QRA was effective in driving value for money outcomes associated with recovery and rebuilding programs. This may in part be due to the fact that the technical solutions themselves are developed by asset owners rather than the QRA.

**Key considerations and learnings**

The results of stakeholder surveys indicate that most believe the QRA has a role to play in contributing to value for money, however, fewer stakeholders understood how the QRA is currently contributing to value for money or that the Authority has been effective in achieving those outcomes.

Delivery agents at both the local and state government level remain the key mechanisms for determining and achieving value for money outcomes on a project-specific basis. As such, the ability of the QRA to drive and achieve value for money outcomes is integrally linked with stakeholder management and its ability to influence other key parties and partners in the delivery of the reconstruction program.

In addition, the relationship between the Authority and the state and Commonwealth Governments will influence its ability to continue to lead and drive NDRRA policy around the achievement of more innovative value for money outcomes (such as around the eligibility of day labour).
4.4 Relationships

Community engagement and liaison

The community engagement and liaison undertaken by the QRA is multi-faceted and is viewed positively by key partners; however, activity has been largely limited to government stakeholders in the infrastructure and reconstruction space.

Survey Results (n=63)

I know who to talk to at the QRA when I need their assistance.

89% Agree / Strongly Agree
5% Disagree / Strongly disagree

Survey Results (n=62)

My community and / or organisation identifies with the QRA as playing a key role in the recovery and rebuilding process.

81% Agree / Strongly Agree
12% Disagree / Strongly disagree

Survey Results (n=58)

I have found the QRA to be reliable and responsive in how they have managed my requests for assistance.

80% Agree / Strongly Agree
7% Disagree / Strongly disagree

Figure 19: Survey response – community engagement and liaison

The accessibility and helpfulness of the QRA’s resources is highlighted in survey results with 80% of survey respondents agreeing that the QRA is reliable and responsive to requests for assistance and 89% agreeing that they ‘know who to talk to’ when assistance is required (Figure 19).

Historical performance

The capability and capacity to engage with communities impacted by natural disaster events influences the overall effectiveness of the delivery of assistance and services, as well as the speed with which a community can recover from natural disaster events. The size, volume and variety of natural disasters that have struck Queensland between 2009 and 2015 have resulted in most local governments and many state departments requiring some level of assistance. The 2014 QRA Annual Report provides an indication of the volume of agencies receiving NDRRA and Non-NDRRA grants via the Authority in the 2013 and 2014 financial years.

- 73 local government Authorities receiving NDRRA grants
- 22 State government agencies received NDRRA grants
- 3 State government agencies received non-NDRRA grants.

Community engagement and liaison is a multi-faceted activity which the QRA performs in a number of ways:

- **Community engagement activities**: in the World Bank Report, the QRA was recognised for a number of community engagement activities it undertakes, including conducting workshops with state and local governments in order to enhance their understanding of the role of the QRA and inform them about the preparation of local recovery plans.
- **Provision of expertise and advice ‘on-the-ground’**: RLOs provide direct engineering and project management experience to support local governments, whilst the Regional Liaison Team is responsible for coordinating reconstruction for individual councils.
• **Relationship management with key stakeholders: strong relationships are important to the QRA and the way it engages with communities.** This was reinforced by stakeholders during consultations and through the survey results where 89% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement ‘I know who to talk to at the QRA when I need their assistance’.  

• **Development of supporting technologies:** the QRA introduced the i-Darm system to expedite NDRRA funding submissions and minimise the administrative burden on local government. The QRA also deployed officers post-disaster to assist local governments with damage assessments.  

• **Communication and distribution of information:** the Rapid Damage Assessment Dashboard is another tool used in liaison with key stakeholders (typically those at the strategic level). The dashboard consolidates the information of various stakeholders and facilitates efficient and effective communication during the Response phase of the disaster management lifecycle.  

Stakeholders advised during consultations that the QRA’s personnel have strong communication skills with departments and local governments. Those at the local government level were particularly appreciative of the face to face interaction with the Authority and noted having a cooperative working relationship with its personnel. Another strength which was observed by stakeholders was around the on-the-ground experience the QRA possesses which informed the advice provided at all levels of Government.  

A perception of fluidity in the QRA’s workforce has frustrated some stakeholders who feel they have had to bring multiple QRA representatives ‘up to speed’ on their area. A number of stakeholders remarked that the QRA’s active approach to performance management led to changing personnel. This aspect was seen positively, however, there has also been a perception that the QRA could be more inclusive and consultative with stakeholders before making decisions which affect them.  

**Key considerations and learnings**  
Although some opportunities for improvement were identified by stakeholders, the QRA has developed strong relationships with key delivery partners and other government stakeholders through multi-faceted community engagement, including ‘on-the-ground’ support and expertise; stakeholder feedback indicates high levels of satisfaction with the Authority’s engagement with them.  

However, this engagement has largely been (informally) limited to government delivery agents within the infrastructure reconstruction space to date (not including support provided to undertake Rapid Damage Assessments in the aftermath of an event).
Stakeholder management

As identified previously, the Authority has been effective in developing and retaining strong linkages with key stakeholders; however, these are based on individual relationships to a degree and could be further enhanced through greater definition of the authority and scope afforded to the QRA.

The results of the stakeholder survey indicate that stakeholders are unclear on the QRA’s role beyond the interaction they have following a natural disaster, with 84% of respondents clear on the QRA’s role in the natural disaster recovery context, but only 58% clear on the QRA’s lines and limits of authority, with 17% negative (Figure 20).

Historical performance

The impact of recent natural disaster events in Queensland requires a whole of government response to recovery and reconstruction. The QRA possesses a strong knowledge base both horizontally and vertically across government; they have detailed knowledge ‘on-the-ground’ through their interaction with local governments and knowledge at the strategic level through their relationships and interactions with senior figures and committees in the disaster management process.

Beyond the observations noted previously in community engagement and liaison, key strengths of the QRA identified by stakeholders in relation to stakeholder management included:

- **Relationship building capabilities**: stakeholders are appreciative of the robust discussions and constructive challenges that occur with the QRA while still maintaining cooperative relationships.
- **The ability of the organisation to unlock funding that would otherwise have been difficult to achieve**: most notably Category D funding under the NDRRA provisions and reimbursement for day labour which was previously not permitted.
- **Its system-wide view of the natural disaster management ecosystem**: the Authority is in a position to have both a strategic and tactical perspective on disaster management activities and has identified gaps as a result of this position for which it will assume responsibility if a more appropriate line agency is not identified. Some stakeholders considered the Authority to be ‘constructively opportunistic’ in its approach to filling functional gaps.

Many stakeholders were not aware of the role the QRA has outside of the interactions the specific stakeholder has with the Authority and believed the Authority could benefit from enhanced communication of their roles, functions and capabilities. Similarly, some stakeholders observed that they were not informed by the QRA of the systems and data the Authority processes.
In terms of delineation between relevant government agencies, stakeholders were often unclear on the Authority’s role and responsibilities. Some stakeholders consider that the constructive opportunism noted above is impacting on the QRA’s role clarity, and some of these responsibilities should be assumed by the most appropriate line agency with a heightened accountability placed on these agencies to deliver on expectations.

Retained knowledge and existing relationships of key personnel was also raised as a key area of risk in the ongoing effectiveness of the QRA. Appropriate procedures and succession plans should be further considered.

The Authority maintains a record of all complaints received since establishment which is published each month in the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Reconstruction & Governance Report. Table 7 shows the distribution of complaints received by location since 2011. In summary, the QRA has received a total of 33 complaints since its establishment in 2011 which are all noted to have been resolved. This is considered to be a very minor volume of complaints given the scale and complexity of QRA operations since 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of complaint</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balonne Shire Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcoo Shire Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundaberg Regional Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Shire Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentaria Shire Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers Regional Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Coast Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Regional Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich City Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowanyama Aboriginal Shire Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockyer Valley Regional Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maranoa Regional Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreton Bay Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Burnett Regional Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toowoomba Regional Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitsunday Regional Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Complaints received by location 2011 to 2015

Key considerations and learnings

The QRA has developed strong relationships with key stakeholders, which has helped minimise possible boundary or coordination tensions with other agencies caused by the QRA organically broadening its scope of activities.

However, as identified by stakeholders, this has been based on the strength of individual relationships and networks to some degree; greater definition of the Authority and scope afforded to the QRA, including identification of key relationships within the natural disaster management context, should lead to greater role clarity and provide support to relationships with key stakeholders.
4.5 Coordination

Data collection and distribution

The QRA has performed a wide range of data collection and distribution activities across the disaster management lifecycle through largely informal and opportunistic means, to address identified needs and perceived service gaps. There are however opportunities to provide a more holistic data collection and distribution model that can be used to drive improved insight in monitoring and risk-based planning activities.

Survey Results (n=57)
The QRA provides my organisation with timely access to information regarding progress with our disaster recovery program expenditure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree / Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree / Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Results (n=54)
The QRA measures the right things when it comes to the performance of our disaster recovery program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree / Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree / Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the survey issued to key stakeholders suggests that whilst the QRA provides timely access to information (67% positive response), further work could be undertaken in the measurement and distribution of information around the performance of the disaster recovery program (only 44% positive response with a further 13% negative) (Figure 21).

Historical performance

The QRA has historically played a key role in the coordination, collation and distribution of data relating to natural disaster events. The Authority undertakes a range of activities throughout the disaster management lifecycle, including:

- Development of supporting technologies, including DARMsys™ and i-DARM, crowdsourcing application, and digital image technology;71
- Resourcing support for the collection of on-the-ground data during the Response phase;72
- Collation and distribution of data through reporting dashboards to inform Government decision-making through the short-term recovery phase;
- Collation and validation of information relating to NDRRA claims, including reporting to the Commonwealth; and
- Collection of historical costing data to benchmark and validate costing estimates.73

One of the statutory functions of the Authority relates to the development of a data sharing arrangement across all levels of government to enable information sharing to support the protection, rebuilding and recovery of affected communities. To date, the majority of the

71 Refer to Response and Recovery: Data Collection and Information Sharing.
72 Refer to Response: Activation and assessment.
73 As discussed previously in Value for Money. Refer also to Response and Recovery: NDRRA Eligibility and Value for Money.
activities undertaken by the Authority in this space have been ad-hoc and/or developed informally and proactively in response to identified needs or perceived gaps in service delivery.

There is a belief among some stakeholders that the QRA may have acted beyond their scope in some of these circumstances (for example, the development of supporting systems), potentially completing functions that should be performed by other agencies (for example, Rapid Damage Assessments). Stakeholders do however recognise and commend the Authority for the value and quality of the work produced.

The Authority’s position as a separate entity sitting across Government that continues into the Recovery phase of the disaster management lifecycle was recognised as particularly critical and a key driver of its ability to effectively and efficiently collate and distribute a ‘single source of truth’.75

Key considerations and learnings

The consistent and quick collation and distribution of data is considered critical within the disaster management context, and it was widely recognised that the ability to undertake and ensure effective natural disaster mitigation activities is dependent on having a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of historical disaster events, to better prepare for future events to ensure resilience of communities and assets. Similarly, with the Commonwealth exploring an upfront grant funding model, stakeholders highlighted that use of existing data and more effective and efficient data collation will be required to guide and inform associated processes, particularly where there is an identified gap (i.e. collecting additional data where there is an identified need).

Some considered that opportunities exist to further strengthen and leverage the data collection and distribution activities undertaken by the QRA; for example, leveraging existing technologies to apply within the broader disaster management landscape (to social and community funding), or entering into academic partnerships to better utilise the historical data relating to disaster events that is captured and retained by the QRA.

However, this will require greater clarity of the role of the QRA in data collection, collation and distribution within the broader disaster management framework (in particular within the Prevention and Response phases), with a more defined mandate and scope to undertake or support such activities to minimise boundary or coordination issues with other agencies.

Coordination, monitoring and planning

The QRA has performed strongly in the management of its core grant administration function and is widely recognised as the lead in the development and influencing of NDRRA policy, however a lack of clarity around its role in mitigation and resilience coordination and planning has constrained activities undertaken historically.

---

74 A number of stakeholders noted that the QRA Act confers a broad scope and associated powers; to some, it was a question of whether the scope was appropriate rather than acting beyond its designated functions.

75 Whilst not making reference to the QRA, the Draft Report into TC Marcia and TC Nathan highlighted that greater integration of communication and data systems between key agencies was required, with the SDMP to include clear guidelines for internal communications management to reinforce the use of ‘single points of truth’ and consolidate conflicting or parallel sources of information.
The QRA has robust processes in place for assessing and monitoring the delivery of rebuilding programs that they are administering the funding for (e.g. NDRRA and others).

The QRA is a valued source of advice in relation to new approaches in flood mitigation, land use planning and building resilience against disaster events.

Fewer than half of respondents to the survey saw the QRA as a source of advice in relation to new approaches in flood mitigation, land use planning and building resilience against disaster events (49% positive) (Figure 22).

**Historical performance**

As identified previously, the primary function of the QRA is the coordination and monitoring of NDRRA activations, submissions and funding. In connection with this function, the Authority maintains an inspection program targeting projects where a significant amount of construction has been completed or is assessed as being in a high-risk category. These inspections aim to confirm NDRRA eligibility, value for money, and that the scope and cost are in line with submissions made.

As an extension of the coordination and monitoring function, the QRA has informally adopted a leadership and coordination function in negotiations with and submissions to the Commonwealth around NDRRA funding (for example, preparation of a proposal and advocacy around the eligibility of day labour, and coordination of the Queensland Government response to the Productivity Commission Report). Its ability to do so was seen to be driven by its cross-government reach, retained knowledge and on-the-ground, practical expertise. It was also recognised that it works with the DILGP on many of these matters.

In addition, the statutory functions of the QRA has broadened over time to explicitly encompass planning, coordination and implementation of measures to improve the resilience of communities for potential natural disaster events. Although the QRA has successfully undertaken a number of initiatives within this space, including flood hazard mapping, publication of relevant guidelines and allocation of betterment funding, many considered that the role of the QRA in regards to mitigation activities and the prevention phase of the lifecycle as uncertain and unclear, which appears to have constrained its ability to perform in this space to some extent.

**Key considerations and learnings**

The majority of stakeholders were supportive of the QRA providing technical leadership for future negotiations with the Commonwealth around financial assistance for natural disaster

---

76 Refer to Grants administration
77 Refer to Response and Recovery: NDRRA Eligibility and Value for Money.
events. In doing so, it was recognised that DPC and Queensland Treasury and Trade retain the key roles of representing Queensland’s interests in formal negotiations.

However, despite a broad and explicit statutory mandate, the role of the QRA with respect to mitigation, resilience and prevention was seen to be less clear in practice, despite strong linkages to the management of the betterment funded through the NDRRA. Some stakeholders consider that this activity duplicates the existing functions of the DILGP. Stakeholders noted that the DILGP have a historical role in the provision of community recovery and resilience however the capacity of the existing team (approximately four FTEs) to lead the whole of government resilience program beyond high level strategy and coordination is difficult given their existing areas of focus.

Stakeholder perspectives gathered through the consultation process conflicted; some were supportive of a strong role in resilience and a central role in the coordination of natural disaster management across the lifecycle, given the cross-government reach of the organisation and permanency of operations that ensures a consistent connection with affected communities. Others were concerned about duplicating roles and activities currently undertaken by other entities (such as the Inspector-General, QFES and QPS).

The absence of an agreed model for data storage and interrogation around event scenarios meant that there was a gap in Queensland’s capacity to undertake all hazards, risk-based planning activities. Most stakeholders considered that there was an opportunity for an improved level of risk analysis across social/human, economic and environmental dimensions to better inform all phases of the natural disaster management and recovery cycle.

### 4.6 Corporate

#### Resourcing

As a formerly temporary entity, the QRA has historically utilised interagency staff and contractors to enable a flexible workforce that can adapt and respond to changes in demand for particular activities and capabilities.

**Historical performance**

As identified previously, the level of resourcing and required capabilities varies in accordance with the scale of the reconstruction program and stage in the disaster management lifecycle and grants administration process.

Historically, the workforce has predominantly consisted of staff on interchange arrangements from other state agencies. This was particularly valued by stakeholders as a key mechanism to scale the workforce and capabilities of the QRA to meet the varied resourcing demands of the different phases of the disaster management lifecycle without incurring additional cost to the government. The flexibility in resourcing is also considered to have contributed to the high-performance culture by being able to hold employees accountable or return them to their home agency. A number of stakeholders also highlighted other benefits, including: the retained linkages back into line agencies; promotion of an innovative, dynamic organisation culture; and career growth opportunities for QRA people.

The Authority also leverages contractors to provide technical and specialist expertise ‘on-the-ground’ in relation to the reconstruction program, NDRRA funding, and procurement and contracts.

**Key considerations and learnings**

All stakeholders highlighted the need for an agile and flexible resourcing arrangement. As the Authority moves to a permanent structure, the ability of the organisation to surge to meet demand and cycle through the capabilities required by each stage of the grants administration lifecycle will need to be retained. It will also be important to ensure that any changes to the
resourcing model for the QRA that arise from the QRA becoming a permanent entity do not compromise the dynamic and innovative organisation culture and current strong levels of staff engagement within the QRA.

Governance

The current governance arrangements underpinning the operations of the QRA were generally considered to be operating effectively.

Historical Performance

With a program of work of over $13 billion, the existence of appropriate governance measures is necessary to ensure the appropriate use of public funds. The QRA has two distinct reporting lines, one through to the QRA Board, and another to the Minister responsible for Reconstruction, currently, the Deputy Premier. The high-level legislated functions of the Board are to set strategic priorities for the Authority, make recommendations to the Minister, and ensure the Authority appropriately, effectively, and efficiently performs its functions and exercises its powers.

Stakeholders provided a variety of opinions in regard to the QRA’s governance structure though few had strong views on the topic and believed that the current arrangements were operating effectively.

With respect to the existence of the QRA Board there is a lack of clarity among stakeholders surrounding the role of the Board. Some stakeholders believed that it does not have a significant impact on the operations of the Authority, others considered it necessary for an organisation that is responsible for such significant amounts of government funding, while others again stated that regardless of the Board’s function, it is important to reassure the public and government that appropriate processes are in place. Mixed opinions were noted from various stakeholders on the composition of the Board with regard to having Commonwealth and state political representation and the challenges this creates. The recent resignation of Commonwealth government representatives from the QRAs board goes some way to addressing some of these concerns.

The current arrangement with QRA as a statutory body was explored with stakeholders. Key strengths of the statutory body were noted to be the degree of real or perceived ‘independence’ from government which assists being able to take a system-wide view and work effectively with stakeholders across state and local government as well as the non-government sector. There is a further belief that a statutory body typically allows for a more nimble operating style with the ability to take action without requiring Ministerial approval. Some stakeholders noted that the QRA could sit within an existing line agency (notably the DPC or the DILGP) however there would need to be due consideration to the impacts of such a change on the agility and dynamism of the QRA as well as the ability to attract high calibre leadership if the QRA was to be ‘buried’ within a line agency.

However, whilst internal governance frameworks were considered to be relatively appropriate, as previously identified, the role of the QRA within the broader framework governing the responsibilities of respective entities in the disaster management lifecycle is relatively informal and unclear.

Whilst there is formalised and active involvement with functional recovery committees, there has been limited reference to the QRA in key documentation to date (such as previous State Disaster Management Plans, the QDMA, or the Disaster Management Regulation 2014), particularly with respect to involvement and interaction with strategic decision-making bodies such as the QDMC or SDCG. Its current association and involvement with these committees is

78 It is noted however that references to the role of the QRA have been included in the latest iteration: 2014-2015 Queensland State Disaster Management Plan (unpublished).
by circumstance and / or invitation only; the incumbent CEO of the QRA has recently been appointed as the SRC, who is statutorily required to regularly report to the QDMC.

**Key considerations and learnings**

The current governance arrangements that are embedded in the QRA are considered to be operating effectively and were not observed to have significantly impacted on the ability of the QRA to undertake its activities. Stakeholders believe that consideration will need to be given to the appropriate Board composition to support the QRA as it transitions to a permanent entity and its functions are settled.

As noted in section 3 of this Report, the QRA organisational structure has adapted as the functional requirements of the organisation have changed. As the operating environment and legislated functions additional organisational design changes will need to be undertaken.

Given the functions undertaken by the QRA across the disaster management lifecycle, consideration should be given as to the inclusion of the QRA as an observer within the QDMC and any recovery committees that are established going forward. To enable this, the involvement and / or participation of the QRA in QDMA committees and groups should be defined and formalised.

**Risk management**

*Core to the effective and efficient operations of the QRA is the identification and management of key risks. The QRA has implemented a range of processes, procedures, frameworks and systems combined with the Authority’s own internal assurance team to help mitigate the identified risks.*

**Historical Performance**

The QRA has identified the following three areas to be the significant risks to the Authority:

- Scope and cost risks in relation to the delivery of the scope of works;
- Delivery within timeframes in order to meet Commonwealth requirements; and
- Audit risks in order to obtain reimbursement for eligible expenditure.

In the monthly QRA Reconstruction & Governance Report, the Authority notes that some major functional areas of the Authority has responsibility for the management of significant program risk in accordance with Figure 23.
The Authority’s three risk areas align with stakeholder’s perception that the key focus area of the QRA should relate to coordination and management of financial arrangements associated with NDRRA. The mitigation of financial risks to the state of not being reimbursed by the Commonwealth for natural disaster reconstruction expenditure is a core task of the QRA. This further links with what stakeholders considered to be the core function of the Authority; the administration of NDRRA funding to government agencies.

As noted in Grants Administration above, the QRA has implemented a range of frameworks, processes, procedures and systems for the administration of grants funding which address the three identified risk areas and assist in reducing the financial risk exposure to the state. One of the most significant enablers of the QRA’s risk mitigation has been the development of the GMRS.

In the 2014 Annual Report, the QRA reported the establishment of an internal assurance function in relation to audit and risk issues for the Authority. The internal assurance function utilises qualified auditors seconded from the state in order to assist the Authority in discharging its responsibilities.

**Key considerations and learnings**

The QRA has undergone a process of identifying the key risks to the success of the Authority’s current objectives. In response to these risks, a variety of processes, procedures, frameworks and systems have been implemented to manage the risks which are supported by the Authority’s internal assurance team. The risk profile of the Authority could vary from that which it has now as the role of the QRA is changed and refined which may require an adaptation of the current mitigation strategies.

---

**Figure 23: Functional areas**

The Authority’s three risk areas align with stakeholder’s perception that the key focus area of the QRA should relate to coordination and management of financial arrangements associated with NDRRA. The mitigation of financial risks to the state of not being reimbursed by the Commonwealth for natural disaster reconstruction expenditure is a core task of the QRA. This further links with what stakeholders considered to be the core function of the Authority; the administration of NDRRA funding to government agencies.

As noted in Grants Administration above, the QRA has implemented a range of frameworks, processes, procedures and systems for the administration of grants funding which address the three identified risk areas and assist in reducing the financial risk exposure to the state. One of the most significant enablers of the QRA’s risk mitigation has been the development of the GMRS.

In the 2014 Annual Report, the QRA reported the establishment of an internal assurance function in relation to audit and risk issues for the Authority. The internal assurance function utilises qualified auditors seconded from the state in order to assist the Authority in discharging its responsibilities.

**Key considerations and learnings**

The QRA has undergone a process of identifying the key risks to the success of the Authority’s current objectives. In response to these risks, a variety of processes, procedures, frameworks and systems have been implemented to manage the risks which are supported by the Authority’s internal assurance team. The risk profile of the Authority could vary from that which it has now as the role of the QRA is changed and refined which may require an adaptation of the current mitigation strategies.
4.7 Summary

The following table provides a summary of the key observations and considerations that will inform the development of opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of the QRA as it moves forward. This will include recommendations for the ongoing role of the QRA, in consideration of the state’s broader mitigation, reconstruction and recovery framework for natural disasters, and in responding to emergent needs during natural disaster events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>The QRA has been effective in the development of appropriate systems and processes for the administration of grant funding, and commitment to value for money outcomes. It does not have a direct role in the prioritisation of recovery works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation</td>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>• The QRA has had limited involvement in prioritisation with the bulk of prioritisation considered to best reside with the asset owners. There are exceptions to this approach in the case of prioritisation of internal resources, significant events, and betterment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td>• Grants administration was consistently identified as a strength for the Authority and part of its core purpose which provides a degree of comfort to the state around its financial liabilities in respect of reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td>• The QRA is considered to have been effective in contributing Value for Money outcomes and promoting value for money initiatives through means such as the development of the day labour pricing model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations</td>
<td>• While the QRA may not have had an extensive active role in prioritisation, some stakeholders consider that the QRA is best placed to maintain prioritisation authority for use as and when required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is an opportunity for the QRA to provide greater transparency around the criteria behind its prioritisation activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Authority’s role in prioritisation may need to be more clearly defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• While it is generally agreed that the QRA has a role to play in achieving value for money in natural disaster reconstruction, there is less clarity on the specifics of how that role should be achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Activities Summary

### Relationships

The QRA has been largely effective in using their knowledge and capability to build collaborative relationships with stakeholder’s on-the-ground through to the Commonwealth government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community engagement and liaison Stakeholder management</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders have a consistently positive view of the Authority’s ability to establish and maintain relationships with stakeholders across Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The QRA’s system-wide view of the natural disaster management ecosystem and understanding across the various levels of government are notable strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timely and accurate communication of shifts in key policy settings (i.e. NDRRA funding models) by the QRA could be enhanced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Considerations

• Having appropriate frameworks in place to allow the success of the QRA to continue beyond its current management team.

• Communication and promotion of the Authority’s role, functions and capabilities as well as timely updates on developments in the wider local, state and national policy settings would be valued.

### Coordination

The QRA has been effective through the development of data systems and technologies, coordination of grant funding and its role in influencing NDRRA policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection and distribution Coordination monitoring and planning</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The QRA has developed a range of systems and technologies which have significantly enhanced data collection and reporting, particularly in the early stages of a natural disaster event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordination with respect of reconstruction funding is an observed strength of the Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Authority is recognised for playing a significant role in influencing NDRRA policy through timely and robust analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The QRA’s role in coordination of resilience, betterment and preparedness activities was an area of inconsistent opinion among stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Considerations

• Whether the QRA is the most appropriate owner and maintainer of these systems.

• Utilising academic partnerships may further enhance the collection and application of data to achieve further innovation in disaster preparedness and recovery.

• Expansion of the existing technologies beyond their current capabilities (for example, capture and reporting of environmental matters).

• Employing the data to assist in risk-based planning and impact analysis across key social/human, economic and environmental domains.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td><strong>The QRA is effective in adapting its workforce to suit the situations, maintaining governance processes that are appropriate to the political environment and implementing sound risk management processes.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations**
- The QRA has been able to utilise interagency staff and contractors to enable a flexible and high-performance workforce which adapts with the disaster management lifecycle.
- While governance arrangements are considered appropriate for the nature of the work the QRA is completing (particularly with regard to grants administration); there is some lack of clarity around the role of the Authority’s Board. In addition, the role of the QRA within the broader disaster management lifecycle is informal and / or undefined in current governance arrangements.
- The Authority has implemented a range of policies, frameworks and processes to cover key identified risks.

**Considerations**
- Maintaining an agile workforce as the Authority moves to a permanent structure.
- Composition of the Board as the Authority moves to a permanent structure.
- Consideration of the formalised inclusion and participation of the QRA in QDMA committees and groups as appropriate.
- The risk profile of the Authority as its functions are refined and adapted.

**Table 8: Operational performance summary**
5.1 International practices

Queensland is not alone in its exposure to disaster events. Around the globe, comparable organisations have been established which deal primarily with the recovery and reconstruction of communities which have experienced significant damage resulting from natural disaster events. The following table lists the comparable organisations which are described in further detail below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Governor’s Office of Storm Recovery (GOSR)</td>
<td>United states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reconstruction Agency (TRA)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat State Disaster Management Authority (GSDMA)</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Executing Agency (RREA)</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Comparable international organisations to the QRA

International organisation overviews

Case Study 1: The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA), New Zealand

The event

In February 2011, the city of Christchurch on the South Island of New Zealand experienced a magnitude 6.3 earthquake. The event claimed 185 lives, and damaged 168,000 homes, 500km of wastewater pipes and 1,000km of roads in the greater Christchurch area. In the city of Christchurch, 50% of central buildings and 34% of businesses were damaged. The total recovery costs were estimated at $40 billion in 2011 prices.79

The agency

CERA was established as a stand-alone department by the New Zealand government to lead and coordinate the recovery effort.

As part of the transition to long-term recovery arrangements, CERA transitioned from a stand-alone government department to an agency within the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet in February 2015. The purpose of this agency is to complete the recovery functions that will extend beyond April 2016 (being the expiry of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act (CER Act)). CERA is led by a Chief Executive who reports to the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery.

The CER Act allows for the making of Orders in Council to change provisions in current legislation and regulations that may impact on the recovery effort. A review panel was established as additional oversight to provide independent scrutiny and advice to the Minister on each draft order produced by CERA.

The roles of CERA have evolved as the focus has shifted from recovery to regeneration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles in 2011&lt;sup&gt;80&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Current roles&lt;sup&gt;81&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enable a focused, timely and expedited recovery of greater Christchurch.</td>
<td>• Provide leadership and coordination for the ongoing recovery effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enable community participation in the planning of the recovery of greater Christchurch.</td>
<td>• Focus on economic recovery, restoring local communities and ensuring the right structures are in place for recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enable information to be gathered about any land, structure or infrastructure affected by the Canterbury earthquakes.</td>
<td>• Enable an effective and timely recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate, coordinate and direct the planning, rebuilding and recovery of affected communities in greater Christchurch, including the repair and rebuilding of land, infrastructure and other property.</td>
<td>• Work closely with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury – collectively referred to as their ‘strategic partners’ – and engage with local communities of greater Christchurch, and the private and business sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restore the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of greater Christchurch communities.</td>
<td>• Keep people and communities informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide leadership and coordination for the ongoing recovery effort.</td>
<td>• Administer the CER Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Historic and current roles for CERA

Case Study 2: The Governor’s Office of Storm Recovery (GOSR), United states

The event

In October 2012, the New York metropolitan region experienced unprecedented damage as a result of Superstorm Sandy. The event resulted in the deaths of 60 people, damaged or destroyed 300,000 homes, cut power to 2 million people, and affected over 2,000 miles (3,200 km) of roads<sup>82</sup>.

The agency

The Governor’s Office of Storm Recovery (GOSR) was established in June 2013 to assist with the coordination of recovery and rebuilding work across New York State through a series of reconstruction, resilience and betterment programs (NY Rising Programs).

---

<sup>80</sup> (Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011.)

<sup>81</sup> (Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority Website. About CERA.)

<sup>82</sup> (The Governor’s Office of Storm Recovery. New York Rising: 2012-2014, 2014.)
The GOSR continues to manage the recovery effort and largely operates as an intermediary between federal agencies and communities. The NY Rising Programs extend across a number of recovery areas, including:

- Housing recovery – operating the housing recovery program to facilitate repairs, rehabilitation, mitigation and elevation for owners of single family homes. This program also includes supplementary funding to assist home owners with housing costs and acquisition by the state of homes if owners are interested.
- Small business – program that offers grants and low-interest loans to small businesses to repair or replace equipment or inventory or repair facilities damaged as a result of the three significant weather events that impacted the state.
- Community reconstruction – planning committees have been established in the communities hardest hit by the disaster events. These committees are able to apply for grants of up to $25 million to assist in implementing strategies that will support local recovery and resilience. GOSR provides staff support to the planning committees as part of the community reconstruction program.
- Infrastructure – assists with administering funding for a range of infrastructure reconstruction, betterment and resilience work across transportation, energy supply, coastal protection, weather detection and warning systems and emergency management programs.

A total of 132 staff operate the four key program areas for GOSR (as described above). These program areas are overseen by the Executive Director of the Governor’s Office of Storm Recovery.

Case Study 3: The Reconstruction Agency (TRA), Japan

The event

In March 2011, a magnitude 9.0 earthquake occurred off the North Eastern coast of Japan. The earthquake initiated a series of tsunami waves that devastated many coastal areas of the country and instigated the Fukushima nuclear accident - the second worst nuclear accident in the history of nuclear power. The event claimed the lives of approximately 18,500-20,000 people, caused extensive damage to roads, rail, electrical, water and sewage infrastructure including a dam burst close to Fukushima city.

The agency

TRA was established in February 2012 with a 10 year mandate under the Basic Act on Reconstruction. The agency is headed by the Prime Minister of Japan, led by the Minister for reconstruction, and employs over 330 people.

The Basic Act on Reconstruction 2011 outlines the following undertakings for TRA:

- Planning, drafting and overall coordination of measures for the reconstruction in response to the Great East Japan Earthquake;
- Implementation of measures for the reconstruction in response to the Great East Japan Earthquake; and
- Other necessary tasks for the reconstruction in response to the Great East Japan Earthquake.

In addition, TRA identifies its role as:

83 (Governor’s Office of Storm Recovery (GOSR) website. About. July 2015.)
84 (Japan earthquake and tsunami of 2011. (2015). In Encyclopaedia Britannica.)
85 (The Reconstruction Agency website. About Us.)
86 (Basic Act on Reconstruction in response to the Great East Japan Earthquake, June 2011, Article 12.)
• Accelerating structural reconstruction and revitalisation in the affected areas;
• Working closely with national and local governments and the private sector;
• Provision of essential human services (for example, construction of temporary housing);
• Promoting local economic revival through tax and investment incentives; and
• Supporting public-private reconstruction related initiatives in the region.

Case Study 4: Gujarat State Disaster Management Authority (GSDMA), India

The event
In January 2001, a magnitude 7.7 earthquake struck the Indian state of Gujarat near the Pakistani border. The event claimed more than 20,000 lives and destroyed hundreds of thousands of homes.87

The agency
GSDMA was established as a Society following the 2001 earthquake. The Authority’s role included implementing the rehabilitation and reconstruction program and planning and implementation of pre-disaster preparedness and mitigation activities.

In 2003, the Gujarat State Disaster Management Act was passed and the GSDMA was re-established as a statutory authority. The GSDMA is led by its CEO however it may be directed by the government when necessary.

The functions of the Authority per the Gujarat State Disaster Management Act include88:
• Act as the central planning, coordinating and monitoring body for disaster management and post-disaster reconstruction, rehabilitation, evaluation and assessment;
• Assist the state government in formulation of policy relating to emergency relief;
• Keeping government informed on progress and problems with disaster management;
• Disaster education and awareness;
• Collection and retention of disaster and disaster management data; and
• Development of disaster management plans and strategies.

Case Study 5: Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Executing Agency (RREA), Indonesia

The event
In December 2004, a magnitude 9.0 earthquake occurred off the West Coast of Northern Sumatra in the Indian Ocean. The event claimed an estimated 225,000 lives across a dozen countries with Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, Maldives and Thailand sustaining the most significant damage. In Indonesia alone, over 120,000 houses were destroyed, 14 sea ports were destroyed or damaged, and 120 bridges, 3,000km of road, 2,000 school buildings, 114 health centres and 60,000 ha of agricultural land were damaged.89

The agency
The RREA (locally known as BRR) was established as an agency within the Indonesian government in January 2005 to provide leadership and direction to the rebuilding efforts by national and international assistance agencies and to develop and implement the reconstruction master plan.

The duties of RREA include89:
• Formulate operating strategies and policies;

• Prepare work plans and budgets;
• Implement rehabilitation and reconstructions activities in cooperation with national and other/foreign parties;
• Implement procurement activities as per working regulations;
• Organise and Co-ordinate rehabilitation and reconstruction implemented by the Central government, local government and other related/foreign parties; and
• Ensure that integrity is preserved in the recovery and reconstruction budget and its use is free of corruption.

Summary of observations

A number of observations were made regarding the operations of international recovery agencies following the literature review. These observations where appropriate, have been categorised as better practice and highlight uncovered challenges to illustrate similarities and differences between the organisations and the QRA.

While each organisation operates in unique environments and has varying focus areas across the disaster management lifecycle, the observations do not highlight any significant gaps or deficiencies in the operations of the international organisations compared to the QRA.

Better practice

• Many organisations have a strong focus on integrating resilience and betterment into the reconstruction projects which is often built into the mandate of the organisations. An example of this is the NY Rising Community Reconstruction Program which has been recognised for engaging and empowering communities to rebuild better and stronger rather than just rebuilding what was lost.

• In connection with the transition away from a stand-alone department, a Transition Recovery Plan has been drafted by CERA which includes proposals for the future roles, responsibilities and powers required to empower other government agencies to continue the regeneration of Christchurch. This Draft Transition Recovery Plan was published for public consultation.

Challenges

• Resourcing is a common area of challenge for international organisations. Both CERA and GOSR have experienced challenges in rapidly mobilising appropriately capable and experienced personnel. In addition, challenges were noted in retaining personnel with a high rate of turnover experienced by some organisations.

• Stakeholder management is an area of continual challenge. In its capacity as the intermediary between funding providers and funding recipients, GOSR must manage the tensions between stakeholders ‘competing’ for grant funding.

• Developing economies and their reconstruction authorities are often challenged by availability of an appropriately skilled workforce, particularly in the construction of their recovery programs. Often, these agencies have a deeper role in the oversight of construction programs and funding allocation due to this limitation.

Similarities

• Each of the organisations play a role in the administration of disaster recovery and reconstruction funding with a mandate to ensure the appropriate use of public and donated funds.

• The use of other agency / department personnel is common and helps to maintain connections throughout government agencies.
• Most organisations were established with a pre-determined end date of between five years (CERA) and 10 years (TRA).
• In the case of CERA, the defined roles have evolved over time and it was anticipated in early 2015 that the functions would need to continue beyond the initially planned end date. As such, the department was restructured within government to accommodate the ongoing role.

Differences
• With the exception of GSDMA, the international organisations were established as stand-alone government departments or offices within an existing government department.
• Some organisations, including CERA and GSDMA have a defined role in assisting government with identifying and developing legislative and regulatory changes.
• TRA has been charged with providing tax incentives to private sector entities to assist in the economic recovery.
• GOSR has, in some situations, established planning sub-committees within communities that have suffered significant damage to assist with the recovery planning effort.
• The degree of involvement across the disaster management lifecycle varies. An example of this is TRA’s involvement in constructing temporary housing as part of the immediate disaster relief effort.
• Most organisations were established for discrete events, and the locations have not experienced the frequency of severe disaster events that Queensland has in recent years.

5.2 External reviews

A number of external reviews have been undertaken recently which are relevant to the operations of the QRA. An overview of the most significant finalised reviews and their implications for the QRA functions are outlined below.


Overview

Published in June 2011, the World Bank undertook a review in collaboration with the QRA to document the achievements and progress made in Queensland in comparison to global examples of reconstruction and risk reduction.

Key observations

The review was undertaken during the QRA’s infancy and remarks that the QRA will need to build on the comprehensive damage and loss assessment and monitoring systems to meet the demand for strategic planning, and assessment of sectoral and geographic gaps.

Many of the key observations in the report are relevant to the Commonwealth and state governments’ such as financial arrangements and good practices such as the establishment of a designated authority for reconstruction. The report also comments on the importance of communication and commends the QRA for its efforts in measuring progress and performance of the collective early and longer term disaster recovery operations being carried out.
Delivering an infrastructure plan for Queensland – Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.

Overview

Completed in June 2015, DILGP’s directions paper requests feedback on the key objectives, directions, and pipeline of Queensland infrastructure.

Key observations

One of the key observations in regard to infrastructure objectives is to provide for sustainability and resilience. It states that resilience should be built into infrastructure networks to lessen the social and economic costs associated with loss of critical infrastructure during and after extreme events.

Review of statutory appointments – Public Service Commission

Overview

Still to be published, the Public Service Commission’s review of statutory appointments has the objectives of providing a consolidated overview of the range of CEO leadership positions across the Queensland public sector and analysing the frameworks, accountability, independence and performance mechanisms for certain CEO positions.

Key observations

The report references the CEO of the QRA in the context of its extended term of operation and notes that there is an opportunity to put in place a more transparent accountability mechanism specifically regarding the performance and termination provisions of the role.

The Productivity Commission inquiry report into natural disaster funding arrangements – Productivity Commission

Overview

Submitted in December 2014, the Productivity Commission undertook a two volume inquiry into the efficacy of the current national natural disaster funding arrangements, including the priority of effective mitigation to reduce the impact of disasters on communities. The QRA has stated that if the 16 key recommendations of the inquiry were implemented, the effect on Queensland communities would be disastrous90.

Key observations

Key recommendations of the inquiry which are relevant to the QRA include that:

- The Commonwealth government should change the portion of cost sharing of community recovery and reconstruction to 50% (currently 75%);
- The small disaster criterion of $2 million be applied (currently 240,000 before indexation);
- The Commonwealth government gradually increase the amount of annual mitigation funding it provides to state and Territory governments to $200 million.
- State and Territory governments report on risk assessments in accordance with the National Emergency Risk Assessment Guidelines, transparent natural disaster liabilities in budgets, asset registers and asset management plans, including at the local government level, that incorporate natural disaster risk, and effective mechanisms to identify and prioritise mitigation spending based on cost-benefit analysis.
- All levels of government should make new and currently held natural hazard data publicly available unless it is not in the public interest and use private-sector providers where cost effective.

90 (The QRA and natural disaster arrangements – briefing information, May 2015)
• State and Territory Governments explore collaboration and partnerships with organisations, such as the Insurance Council of Australia for hazard data and claims data sharing.
• Governments task the Australia-New Zealand Emergency Management Committee with leading the development guidelines for the collection and dissemination of natural hazard mapping, modelling and metadata.
• State and Territory Governments clearly articulate the state-wide natural hazard risk appetite in land use planning policy frameworks by identifying the risks posed by natural hazards and specifying appropriate planning controls for each given level of risk.
• Within three years, the Australian government should develop and implement a framework for untied grants for community recovery assistance to state and Territory Governments.
• The Australian government should develop a formula for allocating mitigation funding to state and Territory governments on the basis of where such funding is likely to achieve the greatest net benefits, taking into account the future risks of natural disasters.

Uncertainty still exists around the future of Commonwealth government disaster funding arrangements. The QRA and DPC are leading engagement to further consider and discuss the details of funding proposals.

The Australian government Reconstruction Inspectorate’s Conduct of Value for Money Reviews of Flood Reconstruction Projects in Queensland – The Australian National Audit Office (ANAO)

Overview

Completed in November 2013, the review by the ANAO has the objective of examining the effectiveness of the Australian government Reconstruction Inspectorate in providing assurance that value for money is being achieved with respect to Queensland reconstruction projects.

Key observations

Some of the key recommendations in the report that were relevant to the QRA include recommending that:

• The Inspectorate and Taskforce obtain more timely and comprehensive information on project progress from the QRA;
• The Taskforce apply greater scrutiny to project cost data and develop the capacity to independently benchmark actual cost data for Queensland reconstruction projects;
• The Taskforce monitor revisions to scheduled project completion dates and raise issues with the QRA; and
• The Taskforce adopt a more pro-active approach to requesting timely progress and completion reporting documentation from the QRA.

The Inspectorate concluded its work on 30 June 2015 with the cessation of the NPA. As the future Commonwealth disaster funding arrangements have not been finalised, it is not known if the recommendations will be relevant going forward.

5.3 Summary

The QRA has been directly and indirectly subject to a broad range of external reviews which may have implications for the Authority’s future. These external reviews contribute to the future scope and functions in the following chapter.
6 Future scope and functions

6.1 Overview

The preceding chapters identified a number of observations which inform considerations around the ongoing role of the QRA within the state’s broader mitigation, reconstruction and recovery framework for disaster events.

The development of recommendations around the future scope of the Authority are created through an evaluation of potential functions against a range of design principles. Enabling operational components (such as resourcing and governance arrangements) are identified and addressed as part of the development of a high-level implementation plan.

6.2 Design principles

A range of design principles were established that were informed by the current and historical operational performance of the Authority, as well as a consideration of other emerging influencing factors (such as complementary reviews and international practices).

Developed in consultation with the Steering Committee and used to assess specific future state functions and recommendations for change, the design principles (Table 11) form the parameters that the ‘future state’ QRA operating model should satisfy in order to address specific issues and opportunities previously identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation</td>
<td>The future role of the QRA should align with the Queensland Government’s disaster objectives, policies and legislation such as the Disaster Management Strategic Policy Framework, the Queensland SDMP, the DM Act and the QRA Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Most effective agent to deliver</td>
<td>Any future role of the QRA should be considered in association with an assessment of its ability to deliver on that function. These considerations could include: corporate experience/knowledge; synergies with an existing function; duplication of roles amongst agencies; and minimising the requirement for additional full time resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Design principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3   | Maintains visibility of disaster recovery across government | Any future role of the QRA should further leverage its system wide view of recovery and reconstruction activities. This may include:  
- Improving information flows and distribution of data across government;  
- Improving the elapsed delivery time for recovery and reconstruction activities;  
- Providing greater visibility for key decision makers;  
- Minimising social, economic and environmental risks; and  
- Preserving Queensland's financial interest in disaster funding arrangements. |
| 4   | Preserves the core function of the QRA | The future scope of the QRA should not compromise its core functions or 'core business' as defined by its legislative responsibilities, specifically the coordination and distribution of financial assistance to affected communities. |
| 5   | Aligns with or leads best practice in disaster management | The future operating model and functions of the QRA should, where possible, build on learnings from better practices in disaster management and/or demonstrate innovative or leading practices in disaster management. |
| 6   | Promotes flexibility and agility | Any future role of the QRA should preserve the scalability and agility of the QRA. Resource flexibility has a track record of fostering a high performance culture and is paramount in allowing the QRA to effectively respond in times of disaster. This design principle also relates to promoting flexibility and agility in the broader disaster management system whereby collaboration is enhanced and resources are deployed and shared as needed to deal with events as and when they occur. |

6.3 Assessment of future scope

Overview

Stakeholder consultations and the assessment of the historical and current operational performance of the QRA highlighted that there is an opportunity to refocus and provide greater definition around the core role and scope of the QRA moving forward.

In this context, there are potentially some functions that the QRA has historically performed that could be better performed by other key agencies within the disaster management framework. In addition, there are a number of possible functions across the disaster management lifecycle (and in particular during the Prevention and Preparation phases) that could be incorporated into the scope of the Authority, some of which had been undertaken by the QRA in an ad hoc, partial or informal capacity previously.
These include a possible role in:

- Resilience and mitigation policy;
- State-wide disaster vulnerability and risk planning;
- Disaster readiness and preparation policy and guidance;
- Prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding;
- Technical support to Commonwealth negotiations in disaster recovery; and
- Sponsorship of whole-of-government disaster data collection and management

The potential opportunities noted above are illustrated in Figure 24.

**Figure 24: Potential future state functions**

In consultation with the Steering Committee, these functions were evaluated against each of the design principles to determine whether they ‘met’, ‘partially met’ or ‘did not meet’ the design principles, to better inform the development of recommendations around the future role of the QRA.

It is noted that any changes to the functions and responsibilities of the QRA may have an impact on existing disaster management frameworks, policies and guidelines, including for example the QDMA and SDMP.

**Business as usual**

**Context**

‘Business as usual’ presumes the retention of the current operating environment, roles and responsibilities, and scope of the QRA, with no divestment or expansion in service delivery.
Assessment

The business as usual model of the QRA was considered to partially or fully meet all of the design principles (Table 12). The QRA was recognised as an international leader on its core functions, however the less-defined, broader scope adopted by the Authority historically was seen to impact on its alignment with existing disaster management legislation and documentation, and its comparative effectiveness as a delivery agent to some extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation | Partially meets | • Partial alignment with existing legislation; as previously identified, the QRA has been seen by some stakeholders to have acted beyond its defined legislative scope.  
• Some alignment with government objectives (such as the SDMP), noting however that the role of the QRA was not previously well-defined in QDMA documentation. |
| Most effective agent to deliver | Partially meets | • As previously mentioned, the QRA is recognised as an effective delivery agent, particularly in terms of the coordination and distribution of financial assistance and NDDRA acquittal.  
• However, it was questioned whether the QRA is the most effective agent to deliver with respect to some activities undertaken (for example, on-the-ground Rapid Damage Assessment). |
| Maintains visibility of disaster recovery across government | Partially meets | • Existing activities provide coverage across government. The QRA has contributed to improved information flows and providing greater visibility to decision-makers through the adoption of certain functions (for example, dashboard reporting).  
• It was considered however, that its system-wide view could be further leveraged and its role across government as part of disaster management clarified and formalised. |
| Preserves the core function of the QRA | Meets | • The QRA has a demonstrated track record in the delivery of its current activities.  
• The QRA’s current activities are not considered to compromise its core functions. |
| Aligns with or leads best practice in disaster management | Meets | • No conflicting evidence from the international case studies of disaster management investigated as part of the current review. |
Promotes flexibility and agility

- As previously identified, the flexible resourcing model historically adopted by the QRA has created a dynamic and high performing culture.

Table 12: Business as usual

Other considerations
- If the business as usual model is to be retained, the role of the QRA will need to be clearly articulated and communicated across government to maximise the clarity of its role and minimise boundary or coordination issues with other stakeholders.
- Business as usual functions and operations may need to be reconsidered and reassessed following any proposed changes to the NDRRA funding model.

Resilience and mitigation policy and administration

Context
Stakeholders have highlighted an opportunity for a more comprehensive, better resourced and enhanced leadership role in resilience (including betterment) and disaster mitigation within the Queensland Government. Although this aligns with legislated functions under the QRA Act, the function is currently being undertaken by DILGP and other agencies in collaboration with other stakeholders, including the QRA. For example, DILGP has had carriage of the Queensland Strategy for Disaster Resilience which includes roles for the Queensland Government, local governments, Business and Individuals but DILGP has only a limited resource base of approximately 4 FTE to lead this activity and provide coordination, oversight and assistance to the Deputy Premier as the Minister responsible for reconstruction and administering the QRA Act.

The QRA could sponsor the development of resilience and mitigation policy, guidelines and prioritisation across government; this may encompass:
- Coordination of and contribution to whole of government resilience frameworks, asset management plans and resilience programs;
- Contributing historical data on events to supplement and support planning activities (both whole-of-government and agency-specific);
- Coordination of the development of a whole-of-government resilience guidelines to influence planning and prioritisation within the disaster management context; and
- Developing future policy settings that will guide future investment priorities for funding improved resilience outcomes across vulnerable communities and critical infrastructure assets.

This would best occur by consolidating the expertise within the Resilience and Recovery area of DILGP with the QRA to provide greater bandwidth and consolidation of capability and capacity. It should be noted that agencies would retain responsibility for the development of internal hazard or agency-specific policies or plans.

The resulting emphasis, coordination and whole-of-government focus on building community resilience and mitigation frameworks would assist in prioritising and developing projects that should reduce future recovery timeframes afforded by higher level of resilience.

Assessment
Where criteria were deemed applicable, leadership of resilience and mitigation policy was considered to partially or fully meet all of the design principles (Table 13:). The function strongly aligns to the defined legislative functions of the Authority and current activities being undertaken, however it was noted that, as an independent statutory authority, it would be more appropriate for the QRA to adopt a technical sponsorship / coordination role, rather than to develop the policy itself.
### Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Aligns to existing legislative functions under the QRA Act, in particular the planning, coordination and implementation of measures to improve the resilience of communities for potential disaster events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>As an independent statutory authority, the QRA may not be the most effective delivery agent in the development of government policy itself, but its system-wide view across government supports a coordination and leadership role that should be undertaken in partnership with departments and local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>The adoption of the function would enhance and maintain visibility of the disaster recovery management system across government, even during ‘peacetime’ (i.e. periods where there is limited or no disaster events and the recovery and reconstruction program is winding down).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>The leadership of the development of mitigation and resilience policy would align to and complement the core functions of the QRA, particularly when considering its historical role in the administration of betterment funding and wider prioritisation focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Equivalent authorities in other jurisdictions commonly adopt a role in betterment and resilience, including the development of policy. It should be noted that many of the international authorities are temporary entities; the permanency of the QRA will further strengthen the efficacy of this function as a permanent recovery body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>The QRA could adopt a technical sponsorship role under appropriate governance structures to draw in resources and contributions from agencies across government. The inclusion of this function would assist to smooth the workflow of permanent employees during ‘peacetime’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13: Resilience and mitigation policy

**Other considerations**

- Linked to and informed by the current core functions of the QRA, the coordination of mitigation and resilience policy is a ‘peacetime’ function that may complement the move...
towards a permanent structure, and enhance and leverage the position of the QRA as one of the key disaster management entities sitting across Government.

- The impact on DILGP around the possible adoption of this function by the QRA will need to be considered as part of implementation planning, particularly if it is determined that the QRA should play a role in the development of policy, in addition to providing technical sponsorship to policy development.
- There is a strong alignment between the adoption of this function and data collection and coordination. The realisation of benefits associated with enhanced resilience and mitigation practices could be more easily tracked and measured utilising the databases maintained by the QRA.

State-wide disaster vulnerability and risk-based planning

Context

It is understood that risk based all-hazards planning may be taking place within individual across Government departments, however there is limited visibility and oversight over this function at a state-wide level where the cumulative impacts above the District Disaster Management level are considered.

Beginning in the early phases of the disaster management lifecycle, the QRA could oversee state-wide planning around disaster vulnerability and risk. This may include:

- Coordination of hazard, multi-district and agency-specific risk planning and modelling activities to inform planning around disaster vulnerability and risk at a state level and align to whole-of-government resilience and mitigation strategies; and
- Leveraging existing data repositories to identify key areas of vulnerability (infrastructure, environmental, social/human and otherwise) across the state, including impact assessments at a state or regional level where multiple disaster districts are involved.

The QRA has a demonstrated track-record in delivering major research-based projects, and previously led the flood plain modelling project before divesting the responsibility to DNRM. The Authority’s capacity to draw from the experience at a local level and work across agencies supports a view that it could take an effective role as a technical advisor to support risk-based planning activity through an appropriate governance model involving state agencies and local government.

Assessment

The oversight and coordination of strategic disaster vulnerability and risk-based planning only partially meet the majority of the applicable criteria (Table 14:). The coordination and oversight of this type of planning is centred in the preliminary phases of the disaster management lifecycle, whilst the QRA has traditionally focused on response and recovery in ‘hard’ infrastructure; as such, there may be more effective delivery agents to oversee this function within Government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>There is a degree of alignment between the proposed function and legislated objectives in the context of planning for state-level impacts or impacts that involve multiple disaster districts. Given the QRA’s historical role in ‘hard’ infrastructure recovery, the extent to which social / human and environmental aspects and impacts should be taken into account as part of the planning should be considered further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most effective agent to deliver</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>QFES may be an alternative suitable delivery agent to oversee all-hazards planning across Government. It should be noted that agencies would retain responsibility for planning and response for specific hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintains visibility of disaster recovery across government</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>The coordination and oversight of state-wide disaster vulnerability and risk-based planning would increase visibility across Government, particularly in the preliminary phases of the disaster management lifecycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preserves the core function of the QRA</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Although less aligned to the Recovery phase of the disaster management lifecycle, the delivery of this function by the QRA may supplement and support its ability to effectively prioritise and distribute financial assistance; a state-wide framework or tool with visibility over disaster vulnerability and risks could be leveraged to assess the likely impact of a disaster event, which may also assist in expediting financial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aligns with or leads best practice in disaster management</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>International organisations considered as part of this Review were not undertaking similar functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotes flexibility and agility</td>
<td>Partially meets</td>
<td>Whilst a ‘peacetime’ function, it would likely be a significant task which may consume existing permanent employees and / or require additional resources through agency interchange. It would lend itself to a project based approach so the staff interchange and the external supplementation model for resources could be adopted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Coordination and oversight of all-hazards planning
Other considerations

- The identification of state-level areas of vulnerability at risk and the development and/or coordination of all-hazards planning would further complement any future role in disaster reliance and mitigation policy.
- Potential interfaces and/or duplication with activities undertaken by QFES and other hazard owners will need to be considered in the definition and adoption of this function.

Disaster readiness and preparation policy and guidance

Context

Although the QRA currently undertakes some preparation activities (such as engagement with local governments through site visits and training in readiness for events), the QRA could further capitalise on their on-the-ground knowledge of disaster events and provide a greater operational role in preparing local communities and governments for disaster events. This could include the ‘Get Ready’ program currently undertaken by DILGP but also rolling training programs on the funding environment for local governments to ensure that they have the appropriate skills and resources to apply for funding when a disaster occurs.

Assessment

The adoption of a stronger role in preparation policy and guidance by the QRA was not considered to align to the identified design principles (Table 15:).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>• Although the QRA has historically undertaken similar activities on an ad-hoc basis, involvement in operational policy governing emergency management was not considered to align to the QDMA or the QRA Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Most effective agent to deliver</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>• There are a number of other agencies across Government that would be better placed to undertake these activities (for example, QFES or DILGP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maintains visibility of disaster recovery across government</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>• Activities around preparation policy was not considered to support this design principle, given the operational nature of the function, as well as its position in the Preparation phase of the disaster management lifecycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Preserves the core function of the QRA</td>
<td>Does not meet</td>
<td>• The core function of the QRA predominantly relates to the assistance in the recovery of infrastructure from disaster events; although there are demonstrated linkages to resilience and mitigation policy, there is limited alignment to community preparation policy and guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Preparation policy and guidance

Other considerations

- Whilst it is not considered appropriate for the QRA to adopt a stronger role in this function, it should be noted that the QRA could still provide technical input into the development of hazard-specific and all-hazards preparation and operational policy development.

Prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding

Context

As identified previously, whilst grants administration is recognised as a key strength of the QRA, its role in the prioritisation of recovery funding has been historically limited outside of the prioritisation of internal resources, significant events and betterment projects. Although the legislation empowers the Authority to ‘decide the priorities for community infrastructure and community services needed for the protection, rebuilding and recovery of affected communities’, the QRA will only exercise this formal power in times of significant disaster activity. Formal direction by the Authority has not occurred, but it did use its powers of influence informally, to assist in setting priorities for recovery and reconstruction in the events of 2010/11.

Given its defined legislative responsibilities, the QRA could play a more active role in the prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding, including leveraging its system-wide view to develop a priority list of recovery projects according to a defined framework to target communities which are most in need. This will be particularly relevant and critical to the effective allocation of resources for disaster management in the event that there are significant changes to the NDRRA funding model. If it were to move to a grants based model with a pool of funding, this would place greater onus on the state to prioritise this pool of funding across sectors. This responsibility should ultimately sit with an independent body that can apply a system-wide view to the allocation and prioritisation task.

Assessment

The strengthening of the QRA’s role in the prioritisation of recovery funding consistently met the design principles and was strongly aligned to the current core functions that are being undertaken by the Authority (Table 16:). It should be noted that prioritisation refers to a disaster area-specific level across the state, rather than project-specific, with asset owners and LGAs entitled to and expected to prioritise within their own program of works.
### Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation</td>
<td>│ • Defined legislative function as outlined above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most effective agent to deliver</td>
<td>│ • The QRA has successfully delivered on a significant program of recovery and reconstruction works, and through the NDRRA activation and data collection and information sharing processes, has visibility over and capabilities to determine the most damage-affected communities during a disaster event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintains visibility of disaster recovery across government</td>
<td>│ • The adoption of this function would support visibility of recovery activity across Government as the QRA would be required to prioritise funding across multiple agencies and levels of Government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preserves the core function of the QRA</td>
<td>│ • The prioritisation of funding is strongly aligned to coordination and distribution of financial assistance to affected communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aligns with or leads best practice in disaster management</td>
<td>│ • Determining priorities for, and distributing government and donated funding is a common role for comparable organisations internationally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotes flexibility and agility</td>
<td>│ • The QRA has a demonstrated ability to flex its workforce to meet areas of demand; the adoption of this function would complement the current activities being undertaken in the coordination and distribution of funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16: Prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding

#### Other considerations
- The need for a stronger, cross-government role in the prioritisation of funding may become more critical if the Commonwealth moves towards an upfront, grant-based recovery funding model.
- The ability of the QRA to effectively prioritise and expedite access to financial assistance under a centrally distributed grant funding model would be supported by its potential role in the coordination of state-wide disaster vulnerability and risk planning, as identified above.

### Technical support to Commonwealth negotiations in disaster recovery

#### Context
The role of the QRA could be formalised with respect to the provision of technical advice and support to future negotiations with the Commonwealth in relation to disaster funding led by representatives of QTT and DPC. The QRA has an extensive track record in negotiating and dealing with the Commonwealth with respect to NDRRA funding (for example, around the
eligibility of day labour and liaison with the Inspectorate), and has a deep understanding of the evolving nature of the funding environment.

**Assessment**

The provision of technical support to Queensland Government leadership of Commonwealth negotiations in disaster recovery meets the design principles and strongly aligns to the core functions of the QRA (Table 17:).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• A technical advisor role to negotiations to determine disaster recovery funding strongly aligns to the Authority’s legislated intent of the coordination and management of the rebuilding and recovery of disaster-affected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Most effective agent to deliver</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• As the administrator of NDRRA funding, the QRA is best placed to provide technical advice into negotiations around the funding model. • It should be noted however, that the leadership of negotiations should be retained by DPC and QTT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maintains visibility of disaster recovery across government</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• This function would further leverage QRA’s system-wide view and on-the-ground knowledge of recovery and reconstruction activities (and in particular, related NDRRA funding) and would help preserve Queensland’s financial interests in disaster funding arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Preserves the core function of the QRA</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• As identified above, the role of a technical advisor leverages the Authority’s core function of the coordination and distribution of financial assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aligns with or leads best practice in disaster management</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• Comparable international organisations are typically established within government to oversee isolated / limited numbers of disaster events. Such support in ongoing disaster funding arrangements is less relevant in other jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Promotes flexibility and agility</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• The continuation of this role allows government to tap into expertise and respond to change whilst drawing from an existing and consistent resource base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: Technical support to Commonwealth negotiations in disaster recovery**

**Other considerations**

- The inclusion of the QRA in NDRRA negotiations will support its ability to effectively and efficiently adapt its operations to any changes in the funding model going forward.
Sponsorship of whole-of-government disaster data collection management

Context
The QRA has successfully developed databases and applications to assist in the collection of on-the-ground data in the past, however the QRA could undertake a formalised and more defined role in the development of supporting systems and collation of data to provide one consistent, consolidated view across the disaster management lifecycle and across government. The Authority would be responsible for setting the standards for data collection, and maintain a central repository of information accessible across Government.

It should be noted however, that a distinction was drawn between the deployment of resources to capture data (which would remain the responsibility of the hazard or asset owner), and the collation, reporting and management of that data.

This Review found that this is an area of significant ambiguity and opportunity to resolve given the importance of timely and accurate information during and immediately after across the recovery cycle and to better inform risk-based planning activities.

Assessment
The sponsorship of whole-of-government disaster data management and systems development was considered to meet all of the design principles (Table 18:). Stakeholders noted that there is an opportunity for a central repository for the collection and storage of validated disaster management data so that it can be accessed for an accurate and timely update on the disaster response and recovery progress and be used in risk-based planning activities.

It should be noted that appropriate data management and collection accountabilities and protocols would need to be established with those agencies that should have responsibility for data collection and then transfer data to the QRA-maintained central repository. The data collection and transfer would be best undertaken by the appropriate hazard and asset owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alignment with government disaster objectives, policies and legislation</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• The QRA is legislatively tasked with the responsibility of developing a data sharing arrangement across all levels of Government to support the efficient and effective exchange of information to facilitate the protection, rebuilding and recovery of affected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Most effective agent to deliver</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>• The QRA has a strong track record in development of supporting systems as well as the collation and reporting on disaster management data (for example, reporting dashboards).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It should be noted that the on-the-ground collection of data could be more effectively collected by other agencies, and has the potential to interfere with disaster response agencies (such as QFES).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Maintains visibility of disaster recovery across government

- The system-wide view of the QRA would support the delivery of this function, which would result in improved information flows and distribution of data across Government, as well as greater visibility and accessibility of key information (and a single and consistent point of truth) for key decision makers.

4 Preserves the core function of the QRA

- The coordination and management of disaster data strongly complements the QRA’s core function around the distribution of financial assistance.

5 Aligns with or leads best practice in disaster management

- Similar activities were not observed in comparable international organisations.

6 Promotes flexibility and agility

- The QRA would leverage responsible agencies in the collection of data.

Table 18: Whole-of-government disaster data collection management

Other considerations

- In order to extract the most value, although it would be collated and managed by the QRA, data should be available for use across government, and 'owned' by the relevant agency.

- Regardless of the defined role of the QRA moving forward in prevention and preparation activities, this data could be leveraged to inform the development of resilience and mitigation policies across government.

6.4 Summary

Based on an evaluation against the design principles, the future scope of the QRA should encompass key activities that are strongly aligned to its defined core functions (particularly within the response and recovery phase of the disaster management lifecycle), are related to the provision of financial assistance and coordination of the recovery and reconstruction program, and leverage its independent and system-wide view across government, including:

- A greater role in the prioritisation of distribution of recovery funding across the state when needed, and particularly if there is a move towards and upfront grant financial assistance model;

- A recognised and formalised role in the provision of technical support and advice to DPC and QTT to inform negotiations with the Commonwealth around disaster recovery arrangements; and

- The formal adoption of whole-of-government disaster data collation and management model with the QRA sponsoring the repository for this data.

Table 19 provides a consolidated view of the future state assessment for the QRA.
### Table 19 Assessment of potential future functions against design principles

Whilst it was recognised that the QRA may have a strategic role to play in the prevention and preparation phases of the disaster management lifecycle, further consideration and definition should be given to the exact nature of that role, specifically:

- Distinction of whether the function requires coordination / leadership / oversight, operational delivery and development and / or technical input and advice (for example, with respect to the development of resilience and mitigation policy across government); and
- Identification and clarification of any overlap, duplication or touch points with other delivery agents within the proposed space (for example, the respective roles and responsibilities of agencies, QFES, and the QRA with respect to hazards planning). It should be noted that although a proposed function may represent an identified ‘gap’ in service delivery, and / or may relate to activities historically undertaken by the QRA, that should not necessarily translate to the QRA formally undertaking that function moving forward.
7.1 Overview

The QRA have successfully, although at times informally, operated within a complex environment with multiple stakeholders and significant time and community pressures. The Authority was seen to be a trusted and reliable advisor by key stakeholders and partners, and it is broadly recognised that the QRA have effectively performed on their core functions, as well as undertaking a number of initiatives to address identified needs and service gaps within the disaster management lifecycle. The ability of the organisation to perform against its core functions moving forward cannot and should not be comprised.

However, given previous successes, the responsibilities and resources of the Authority could be augmented to target key areas and functions of disaster management where the QRA can add value. Its system-wide view of the disaster management lifecycle, independency as a statutory authority, and flexible operating model enable the QRA to provide unique insights into and support for activities across the span of the lifecycle, including prevention and preparation, particularly where cross-government coordination is required. However, the ability of the QRA to effectively deliver on its future responsibilities is dependent on establishing and communicating a clear mandate for the organisation across government within existing disaster management arrangements.

It is noted however, that the environment in which the QRA operates is fluid, and the future operations of the Authority are subject to a number of uncertain and variable factors (including the extent of the upcoming storm season and future disaster events, as well as proposed changes to Commonwealth financial assistance arrangements). Not only will these factors need to be taken into account in the consideration and implementation of recommendations contained within this Review, as the organisation moves towards a permanent structure, it will need to respond to these key changes to continue to play a highly regarded, relevant and valuable role within disaster management in Queensland.

7.2 Recommendations

The recommendations from the QRA effectiveness review are outlined below. These recommendations have been grouped according to the implementation timeframes derived by an assessment of the complexity of the change and the contribution the recommendations towards more effective disaster recovery and reconstruction arrangements involving the QRA.

Importantly, this Review and its recommendations have been developed in the context of a number of concurrent reviews (for example, the PSC review of statutory appointments and the DPC report into aspects of response & recovery initiatives) and fluidity in the wider Commonwealth-state funding arrangements for the NDRRA.

With this context in mind, the recommendations below are made based on the desire to provide as much clarity as possible around opportunities to improve the effectiveness of current functions and provide suggestions as to future focus areas for the QRA.
### Immediate Implementation (0-6 months)

1. **Recommendation 1: Greater role clarity in the Queensland disaster management framework.**
   
   Future state disaster management plans and frameworks should clearly articulate the desired future role of the QRA. The QRA’s scope should also be clearly communicated across government through periodic updates of current achievements and activities. This should include the development of clear mission and purpose statements for the QRA, following government’s consideration of these recommendations.

2. **Recommendation 2: Formalised role in established disaster management committees.**
   
   Representative(s) from the QRA should have a defined role and participate in QDMA committees and groups as appropriate, such as permanent representation as an observer within the QDMC and across Functional Recovery Groups, including any future CLT level Recovery Committees, given the current role of QRA’s CEO as the temporary State Recovery Coordinator.

3. **Recommendation 3: Core functions are preserved within the QRA.**
   
   Existing core functions of the QRA should be preserved where possible. This includes the QRA’s financial assurance and acquittal function.

4. **Recommendation 4: Technical leadership in Commonwealth government funding negotiations.**
   
   The QRA continue to work with DPC and QTT in providing technical support to Commonwealth government negotiations in disaster recovery funding to ensure that Queensland’s financial interests are preserved.

5. **Recommendation 5: NDRRA activations are retained.**
   
   Retain the current arrangements for NDRRA activations until the outcomes of the current Commonwealth government considerations around future natural disaster funding arrangements are known.

6. **Recommendation 6: Preservation as a statutory authority.**
   
   Retain the QRA as a statutory authority with an independent Board within the portfolio of the Deputy Premier until such a time that another Minister is appointed with responsibilities for Reconstruction and administering the QRA Act to allow it to continue to provide independent advice to the Queensland Government and its stakeholders on disaster management considerations, particularly relating to the prevention, recovery and reconstruction phases.

### Short Term Implementation (6-12 months)

7. **Recommendation 7: Undertake organisational design and workforce planning.**
   
   Undertake appropriate organisational design and workforce planning tasks to identify the future capability and capacity required by the QRA to undertake new or altered functions as a consequence on this Review.

8. **Recommendation 8: The QRA plan for succession.**
   
   Develop succession plans, role descriptions and standard operating procedures for the QRA’s Executive Leadership Team to preserve its performance in the event of employee turnover where these plans are not current or have not been developed.
Recommendation 9: Flexibility and performance is retained and promoted.
Preserve the flexibility and scalability of the QRA to respond to disaster events and promote high performance by maintaining interdepartmental transfers and flexible workforce practices.

Recommendation 10: State Disaster responsibilities are clarified and are current.
Further to Recommendation 1: revise state disaster management frameworks and plans including but not limited to the QDMA and SDMP to add further clarity to roles, responsibility and authority for all state government agencies and stakeholders across the disaster management lifecycle. This should include consolidation of legacy governance structures and reporting lines, to be consistent with the approved outcomes of this Review and other concurrent related Queensland Government reviews (such as the Community Recovery review and the Report into aspects of response and recovery initiatives TC Marcia & TC Nathan)\(^91\).

Recommendation 11: Sponsorship of state-wide disaster resilience and mitigation.
The QRA assume a lead sponsorship role in developing and coordinating disaster resilience and mitigation policy in Queensland, including expanded focus to support implementation of the State Resilience Strategy and associated policies (for example, betterment and mitigation). This should be completed in partnership with relevant Queensland Government departments and local government including DILGP who should continue to support their responsible Minister in the oversight of the QRA.
(Note – transfer of Resilience and Recovery resources from DILGP to the QRA could occur as soon as practicable should this recommendation be supported. DILGP will however require some resources to assist the Deputy Premier with QRA oversight).

Medium Term Implementation (12+ months)

Recommendation 12: Greater role in the prioritisation of disaster recovery funding.
Consideration is given to the QRA assuming greater responsibility for the prioritisation and distribution of recovery funding in the event that the Commonwealth government funding arrangements move towards a grants based model.

The QRA assume a lead sponsorship role for supporting state-wide disaster vulnerability and risk-based planning within an all-hazards framework in partnership with relevant state government agencies and local government.

Recommendation 14: Stewardship of whole of government disaster data collection and management.
The QRA assume stewardship for a central repository for the collection and storage of whole-of-government disaster management data and “lessons learned” to promote transparency, knowledge sharing, accountability and decision making.
It should be noted that appropriate data management and collection accountabilities and protocols will need to be established with those agencies that have responsibility for data collection and then transfer data to the QRA-maintained central repository.

\(^{91}\) These reviews are not finalised and are subject to change.
The suggested implementation plan (Figure 26) details key activities, timing and suggested accountabilities and lead agencies responsible for progressing the recommendations. There are a number of overarching factors and dependencies that will impact on the timing of the implementation plan. These include:

- The timing and outcomes of Commonwealth government disaster funding arrangements which will impact on the future functions of the QRA;
- The impact on capacity of the QRA to implement recommendations over the summer period which is typically subject to increased frequency of disaster events; and
- The recommendation’s implementation complexity and severity of change.

Each of the key recommendations has a varying degree of complexity and impact which are illustrated in Figure 25. Each option has therefore been classified as immediate, short or medium term opportunities for consideration by the Queensland Government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Recommended Lead Responsibility</th>
<th>0-6 months</th>
<th>6-12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Greater role clarity in the Queensland disaster management framework</td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>1.1 Determine future scope, roles, and functions in consideration of the flexibility required to respond to changes in funding arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>1.2 Document the new scope, roles, and functions of the QRA including amending or creating position descriptions where necessary.</td>
<td>Establish protocol for communicating current achievements and activities of the QRA across government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Formalised role in established disaster management committees</td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>2.1 Identify and document the committees (including formally elected sub-committees) and groups that operate in areas relevant to the QRA.</td>
<td>2.2 The QRA are formally identified as members within the committees and groups. This may include having a defined role within the QDMC, and functional recovery groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Core functions are preserved within the QRA</td>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>3.1 As part of the activities at recommendation 1, the QRA’s core functions are specifically identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Technical leadership in Commonwealth Government funding negotiations</td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>4.1 As part of the activities at recommendation 1, the QRA’s documented scope and functions formally recognise a role for the QRA in providing technical input and assisting the DPC and QT in Commonwealth Government funding negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Treasury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Queensland Reconstruction Authority Operational Review
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Recommended Lead Responsibility</th>
<th>0-6 months</th>
<th>6-12 months</th>
<th>6-12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NDRRA activations are retained</td>
<td>Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services</td>
<td>5.1 Maintain the NDRRA activations processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preservation as a Statutory Authority</td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Department of Infrastructure Local Government and Planning</td>
<td>6.1 Maintain the QRA as a Statutory Authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short-term implementation (6-12 months)**

<p>| 7 | Undertake organisational design and workforce planning. | QRA | 7.1 Upon agreement of the future role and functions of the QRA, undertake an organisational design and workforce planning exercise to align the QRA’s corporate structure to its role and functions. | |
| 8 | The QRA plan for succession | QRA | 8.1 Update and or create role descriptions and standard operating procedures for all key roles and processes. | |
| 9 | Flexibility and performance is retained and promoted | QRA | 9.1 Maintain and promote the current structures that enable flexibility and high performance. | |
| 10 | State Disaster responsibilities are clarified and are current | Department of Premier and Cabinet | 10.1 Identify and consolidate publicly available disaster recovery plans and strategies to reflect the roles and authority of each government department across the disaster lifecycle. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Recommended Lead Responsibility</th>
<th>0-6 months</th>
<th>6-12 months</th>
<th>6-12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sponsorship of state wide disaster resilience and mitigation</strong></td>
<td>Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning in consultation with Queensland Government Departments and the LGAQ</td>
<td><strong>12.1</strong> The QRA’s documented scope and functions be amended to include sponsorship of whole-of-government disaster data collection, management and innovation.</td>
<td><strong>12.2</strong> Transfer resilience and recovery resources from DILGP to the QRA as soon as practicable should this recommendation be supported. Identify and agree protocol for the future administration of resilience funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Greater role in the prioritisation of disaster recovery funding</strong></td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet Queensland Treasury and Trade QRA</td>
<td><strong>12.1</strong> The QRA’s documented scope and functions provide further definition to the Authority’s role in prioritisation subject to the future implementation of Productivity Commission recommendations in relation to Grant funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sponsorship of state-wide vulnerability and risk planning</strong></td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td><strong>13.1</strong> Identify key areas of state-wide vulnerability and risk planning to be sponsored by the QRA across disaster areas (all hazards lens including bushfires, flood etc.)</td>
<td><strong>13.2</strong> Undertake review of available vulnerability and risk planning information developed by Government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Recommended Lead Responsibility</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Stewardship of whole of government disaster data collection, management and innovation.</td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>14.1 Undertake a diagnostic of existing sources of disaster related data across Government agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>14.2 Develop a system capable of retaining the applicable data and being accessed by relevant users outside of the QRA and across Government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>14.3 Develop a process of integrating other relevant departments and agencies into the data collection system to create a live “single point of truth” and whole of government repository of disaster related data and information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 26 Proposed Implementation Plan*
Appendices
A.1 Survey results

A.1.1 Participant profile

Complete and relevant responses were received from 64 stakeholders in total, including:

- 23 local government representatives (36%); and
- 26 stakeholders (41%) across 21 state government departments and agencies.

Forty-three stakeholders (67%) that responded to the survey identified themselves as members of a Functional Recovery Group, 11 of which belonged to more than one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Recovery Group</th>
<th>Number of responses (% total respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human and Social Recovery Group</td>
<td>10 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Recovery Group</td>
<td>13 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Recovery Group</td>
<td>11 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Recovery Group</td>
<td>13 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Transport Recovery Group</td>
<td>18 (28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents (39, or 61%) were located in Brisbane.

A.1.2 Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority plays a role in prioritising the allocation of funding for recovery and rebuilding (n=58)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority plays a role in expediting recovery through its assessment of funding applications (n=59)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority has been key to supporting recovery in my community through facilitating access to NDRRA and other disaster-related funding (n=56)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority has appropriate processes in place to manage the administration of NDRRA funding (n=55)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority provides sufficient guidance and technical support on funding application processes <em>(n=54)</em></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority provides sufficient guidance and technical support on funding assessment and validation processes <em>(n=53)</em></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority facilitates the efficient distribution of funding <em>(n=57)</em></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority has a role to play in contributing to Value for Money outcomes for NDRRA and other government recovery and reconstruction funding sources <em>(n=58)</em></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how the Queensland Reconstruction Authority contributes to achieving Value for Money outcomes <em>(n=54)</em></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the Queensland Reconstruction Authority is effective in driving Value for Money outcomes associated with recovery and rebuilding programs <em>(n=57)</em></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.1.3 Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority has been instrumental in my organisation gaining access to appropriate disaster recovery and rebuilding funding following a natural disaster event <em>(n=47)</em></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My community and / or organisation identifies with the Queensland Reconstruction Authority as playing a key role in</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the recovery and rebuilding process (n=62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have found the Queensland Reconstruction Authority to be reliable and responsive in how they have managed my requests for assistance (n=59)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know who to talk to at the Queensland Reconstruction Authority when I need their assistance (n=58)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am clear on the Queensland Reconstruction Authority’s role in relation to disaster recovery (n=63)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am clear on the Queensland Reconstruction Authority’s lines and limit of authority (n=57)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am clear on how my organisation and the Queensland Reconstruction Authority work together on recovery following a natural disaster (n=64)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority is effective at managing its relationships with its key stakeholders (n=62)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the QRA</th>
<th>Number of responses (% respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering and distribution of natural disaster funding</td>
<td>54 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination, monitoring and planning</td>
<td>39 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and innovation in flood mitigation, betterment, land use planning and community resilience</td>
<td>21 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>13 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other roles cited by stakeholders included:

* A key future role of the QRA [sic] should be to help coordinate Queensland’s prevention and mitigation strategies for floods.

* Another bureaucracy that adds an additional level of administration [sic] to work with.

* Checking NDRRA claims before they go to the commonwealth [sic]
Coordinating public infrastructure reconstruction post disaster as a part of overall recovery operations.

Ensuring a coordinated and integrated response to disaster recovery and reconstruction across Queensland.

“Ensuring Queensland receives adequate funding from the Commonwealth for disaster relief and recovery. Building best practice disaster relief and recovery arrangements in Queensland”

I sense QRA may be involved in research and innovation to improve betterment and community resilience but have insufficient evidence to confirm this sense.

Lead agency for flood warning, network suitability and coordination of data

Negotiating and coordinating NDRRA policy and programs with the Commonwealth government.

Not really sure what they do.

QRA is well placed and has the capacity to take a whole of government leadership role in planning, prevention, response and recovery including betterment and mitigation of natural disasters

Recovery dashboard reporting in 2015

Working pro-actively with local government to achieve long term sustainable outcomes in matters relating to disaster recovery and mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on your understanding of the role, how effective was the Queensland Reconstruction Authority?</th>
<th>Extremely effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Not very effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering and distribution of natural disaster funding (n=54)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination, monitoring and planning (n=39)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and innovation in flood mitigation, betterment, land use planning and community resilience (n=21)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n=10)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.1.4 Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Queensland Reconstruction Authority provides my organisation with timely access to information regarding progress with our disaster recovery program expenditure (n=57)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Queensland Reconstruction Authority measures the right things when it comes to the performance of our disaster recovery program (n=54)

| Percentage | 9% | 35% | 43% | 8% | 4% |

The Queensland Reconstruction Authority has robust processes in place for assessing and monitoring the delivery of rebuilding programs that they are administering the funding for (e.g. NDRRA and others) (n=53)

| Percentage | 9% | 75% | 11% | 2% | 2% |

The Queensland Reconstruction Authority is a valued source of advice in relation to new approaches in flood mitigation, land use planning and building resilience against disaster events (n=49)

| Percentage | 14% | 35% | 35% | 10% | 6% |

### A.1.5 Strengths, opportunities for improvement, and future focus

**What does the Queensland Reconstruction Authority do well?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants administration and NDRRA coordination and leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QldRA does best when it focuses on managing and coordinating funds, and acting as a coordinator between agencies for NDRRA activations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aspects of administering NDRRA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with the Commonwealth and providing advice on how to identify funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QRA is also good at negotiating NDRRA programs with the Commonwealth government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QRA is good at providing a reporting linchpin between the state and Commonwealth governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The QRA are highly effective in informing stakeholders. They are very effective in ensuring the state gets the full allowable funding from the Commonwealth under NDRRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of NDRRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate state department discussions on NDRRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of training/support re NDRRA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provision of advice and specialist expertise**

- Finding expertise.
- Facilitating program work.
- Provision of timely and accurate advice.
Kirsty Beavington’s knowledge around NDRRA is exceptional. Without her we would be lost.

Support for local governments in managing recovery, in-depth technical knowledge of reconstruction ‘on-the-ground’, managing Queensland’s exposure to Commonwealth reimbursement, providing the Queensland Government with nation-leading expertise in natural disaster preparedness, relief and recovery.

The QRA appears to have an excellent group of employees with a variety of specialist skills sets and expertise in reconstruction operations and research who provide highly valuable data to support recovery operations.

**Oversight and coordination across government during key phases of the disaster management lifecycle**

- Maintains [sic] an oversight role, provide guidelines for recovery and resilience.
- The Authority is active in the disaster response stage and initial [sic] recovery.
- Coordinating an integrated [sic] response across [sic] Qld government to the recovery and reconstruction phases.
- Great communications and coordination when required and give great support during the recovery process.
- Coordination of RDA data.

**Other**

Reporting - works well when coordinated by QRA Reporting.

I’m not really sure. The area I oversee in our department does not get involved in NDRRA funding as we are not eligible to receive it. The monthly reporting post event may go on for too long - would be an idea to review this.

Ensuring that there is a consistent [sic] connection with affected communities.

From my perspective they are a value partner that maintains a focus on this important work. easy [sic] to loose [sic] focus with a large organisation.

Professional and competent, time conscious, responsive, media savvy, good at collating information, innovative thinking, good representational skills

Nothing that agencies already do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local government</th>
<th>Grants administration, including NDRRA oversight and leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administer NDRRA Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask the same questions relating to VfM and eligibility [sic] time and time again even after approvals have been given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-ordination of disaster recovery activities, negotiations with Commonwealth on NDRRA administration &amp; interpretation of guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limits Expenditure of Federal and state funds on Disaster Recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Communication and provision of advice and expertise 'on-the-ground'

- Communicates well with Council and works co-operatively with our staff.
- Communication and regular face-to-face liaison, on ground knowledge, and a source of advice.
  - Communication with Council Officers.
  - Providing advice on guidelines and processes.
- Liaise with local governments regarding events and processes.
  - Provide information, advice and support for Council deliver the reconstruction of Council Assets.
  - On-the-ground liaison support.
  - Provide advice and support.
  - Liaison and advice on claims process.
  - Regular and on-going contact with Council officers.
  - Respond to queries / liaise with partner organisations.
- The authority does communicate well through their RLO and provides fast processing of payments.
  - The relationship between QRA and Council has fostered and is continually improving since working with the last 2 RLO’s these officers have been brilliant in aiding council in all aspect through the stages of submission management.
  - Assigned officer - single point of contact”.

### Situational understanding and expertise

- Understanding the individual needs of local government.
- Understanding the special peculiarities of Western and Northern Council’s and how they work.
- Understanding of the extent of the natural disaster and the local circumstances relating to the recovery effort. Understanding the cash flow needs of the organisation.

### Other

- Provision of personnel on-the-ground early after an event to assist with identification and recording of damage.
  - Timely responses to queries.
  - Clear guidelines.

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication and reporting

- Good communication with key staff in our organisation on recovery processes and applications.
- Provides a single source of truth in the reconstruction and recovery effort.
- Communicate.
- Communicate with stakeholders.
Other

Post recovery,

It has developed significant expertise in disaster recovery processes and is a valued source of information on betterment and mitigation. Its experience over the past five years means it is well placed to lead and coordinate the state’s ongoing responsibilities in PPRR for natural disasters.

Coordination and bringing stakeholders together.

unsure, [sic] my connection has not extended that far.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there specific opportunities for improvement for the Queensland Reconstruction Authority?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State departments and agencies</td>
<td>Relationships with stakeholders, including communication and distribution of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear regular information updates to stakeholders on recovery processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A more inclusive, consultative approach with stakeholders. At times, QldRA makes decisions and undertakes courses of action without considering the roles of other government agencies. QldRA too often tries to dictate terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling other agencies greater and more timely access to the data, resources and expertise of the QRA in support of broader recovery activities undertaken by other agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The entire model in terms of its integration [sic] and support of agencies needs to be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role clarity and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QldRA should focus on its core functions of coordinating and administering distribution of NDRRA assistance rather than expand into functions that may be already provided by other government agencies.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some clarification of key accountabilities in disaster management arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to better transition from active involvement [sic] (where they can add value) to exit into other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Queensland’s long term flood mitigation and resilience by helping to have a well understood and coordinated flood risk management strategy for the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At times, there is a need to ensure better coordination between all of the affected bodies in a disaster, especially where there are policy changes, especially in ensuring understanding of the specific programs. This gets complex where there are Departments who ‘own’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>Resourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon this silo organization of consultant/labour hire staff that have changed regularly over the last 4 years and resource an appropriately qualified group of permanent staff as part of a relevant state government Department that can value add to this function and other planning and technical functions in between times of recovery. Focus on the direction the Federal government is going in relation to proactive preparedness and mitigation to allow better use of public money and less of a reliance on recovery post event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think the authority needs to have experienced civil engineers in local government and construction of public assets to better understand project objectives, project constraints, and value for money solutions. The authority also has too many levels of assessment and often staff is turned over resulting in lost information or recollection of discussion/decisions made with local governments. There is a lack of consistency in decisions made and often a lack of technical understanding.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More consistent approach to restoration works. Continuity of staff (continual changes create duplication of work for local government).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the NDRRA recovery process for their sectors, and the QRAA [sic] who is the administrator of the funding allocations.

Clarification of roles/responsibilities particularly between DLGIP [sic], IGEM and QRA.

Coordination of recovery function across domains (though recognise this is currently DLGIP [sic] function).

To be a standing member of the SDMG.

Other

"Continuing to ensure that QRA is an informed manager/coordinator of the NDRRA process through having appropriately technically experienced and skilled [sic] staff."

"QRAA [sic] could be clearer on performance indicators and clarity on what is expected with respect to non standard [sic] assistance schemes from the beginning [sic] of new programs.

I haven’t really been involved to a great extent with the QRA so difficult to say. In my role I have very little reliance on them. Our DG chairs the Building Recovery Group and we look to the QRA to provide updates and accurate intelligence that group members require and hence plan and work from. Other than that we contribute to the ongoing monthly reporting which for Marcia is becoming too long for us.

"Financial reimbursement of agency funds. Approvals or authorisation that projects are appropriate for funding.

Nothing specific.

Notings comes immediately to mind. they [sic] are a good organisation."
Over the last 3 years in dealing with Queensland Reconstruction Authority, the biggest hurdle in which has had to be overcome [sic] is the significant turn over in staff, and as a result the working relationship is not fostered, this is highlighted when queries are repeatedly asked.

Approval processes

Processes around obtaining approval for submissions can be time consuming & expensive. Interpretation of eligibility of proposed works can be varied depending on the officer within QRA & no certainty that works will be funded even if approval has been received for submissions.

*Timeliness of approvals, variations, and close outs needs to improve.*

  *Rationalization of application process.
  *Shorter funding approval timeframes.
  *Less levels of review.
  *Timeliness of some approvals.*

Yes - More timely responses to submissions and claims.

Yes, the minute detail in assessing payments for claims from events is very anal and the costs involved in responding to QRA queries regarding claims circa 5% over estimates is counter-productive and costs both organisations more than the amount in question.

Coordination

Co-ordination of betterment funding if the Commonwealth change the NDRRA arrangements [sic] to what has been recommended. I think the Authority is very much needed if the state takes responsibiltiy [sic] for 50% of the funding and the Commonwealth will supply a significant amount of funds for betterment then I believe [sic] it will have a major role.

Coordination of the Federal, state and local responsibilities and requirements.

"QRA is in a difficult situation because of the changing relationship between state and Federal governments and changing interpretations of the NDRRA guidelines. It would be of significant benefit to local government to have clarity, and for QRA to be able to speak for the state and Federal governments."

Work more closely with local government in developing long-term disaster management strategies.

Other

It would also be of great benefit for local government for the principles of eligibility, [sic] betterment, resilience, day labour, plant use, etc to be founded on engineering, common sense, and community benefit.

Nil.

Not really.
Building more resilient infrastructure rather like for like replacement*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear regular information updates to stakeholders on recovery processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued engagement on how to improve the process before, during and after any event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be at least an annual meeting of all key stakeholders to inform and update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication can always be improved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**

Pre event and during event management.

No.

None spring to mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future focus of the role of the QldRA</th>
<th>Number of responses (% respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritising community infrastructure and community services</td>
<td>22 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating community responses during rebuilding and recovery</td>
<td>25 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating community engagement with functional recovery groups and/or government agencies</td>
<td>26 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking and reporting on recovery and rebuilding progress</td>
<td>46 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information on rebuilding and recovery with key stakeholders</td>
<td>41 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating and distributing financial assistance for recovery and rebuilding</td>
<td><strong>48 (75%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a source of advice on issues relating to flood mitigation, betterment, land use planning and building community resilience in relation to potential disaster events</td>
<td>28 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice research on natural disaster readiness, response and recovery</td>
<td>23 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a centralised coordinator for all functions of research and analysis, risk modification, readiness, response and recovery</td>
<td>19 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders also suggested other areas for future focus, including:

Abandon QRA and have the functions provided back within the relevant state government Department that deals with Council’s day to day on other relevant matters of disaster response and recovery.

“Coordinate Recovery Coordination group across pillars in affected area”.

coordination [sic] of flood risk management for better flood mitigation and resilience.

I believe that the QRA are very well placed to focus on rebuilding and reconstruction efforts but that broader community engagement, resilience and recovery is outside their are [sic] of proven expertise.
identification [sic] and co-ordination of betterment funding in association with the local Authority to better utilise Federal, state and local funding.

Other general comments included:

- Working relationships with QldRA staff are very good, always accessible and helpful.
  Good work.

- The ability of the QRA to develop and implement a coordinated response to flood warning in Queensland would be a welcome function in the future.

- Are there other options to having a QRA? Does it need to exist at all or can its work be done by a govt [sic] dept? [sic]

- "However its role, objectives, governance, funding, functions and responsibilities are unclear and uncertain which if not addressed will create problems for the state’s emergency response / recovery framework.

- A period of incremental growth and influence building has left it slightly outside the established emergency framework, there is the real risk of duplication, its relationship with the regional councils is uncertain, can be abrupt in dealings with other agencies."

- There is a wonderful opportunity for the QRA to develop relationships and engage with other agencies and government departments with advice that may assist prevention, preparation and response activities as well as reconstruction.

- Future direction & role of QRA will be dependent on outcome of current review of NDRRA arrangements by the Commonwealth government.

- I believe it would be a backward step to dis-band the authority taking into account the new arrangements [sic] proposed by the commonwealth. [sic]

- "local governments have the least capacity to pay and require certainty. Councils need QRA to be able to be certain at time of submission and not leave Councils with unfunded work after construction.

- The QRA processes are overly complex and it costs the Shire and the broader Australian Community a lot of Money [sic] to comply with these processes. My guess would be an extra 5% of the gross program costs in preparing documentation and responding to queries. This is a very high governance cost.

- QRA appreciates the value of close working relations with its stakeholders and its approach in this regard is an exemplar for other departments and agencies to follow.

- "As a peak industry body, my organisation does not seek nor require funding from the QRA in times of disaster.

- We interact through communication on improving resilience, immediate relief and recovery at times of natural disaster impacting on our members, their operations and their staff and communities."

- QRA seems like a well run efficient organisation.

- "QRA is a very important agency, I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback.

- Clarity of roles and function is of such significance that it would greatly enhance the effectiveness of the DM system.

- This survey was filled out from the view of a monitoring agency, not actually involved in recovery. It is based on the monitoring of reports that are of interest to the Office, and interactions over policy issues where work has required this. The evidence base for this response is therefore limited.
A.2 Consultation briefing materials
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Queensland Reconstruction Authority Operational Review
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1-July-2015
B. Other Key Stakeholders

Other key stakeholders participating in stakeholder interviews and/or the online survey are provided below. Where appropriate, stakeholders are identified by functional recovery group.

**Human and Social Recovery Group**
- Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services
- Queensland Treasury
- Department of Housing and Public Works
- Queensland Health (including Mental Health)
- Department of Human Services (Central)
- Queensland Fire and Emergency Services
- Salvation Army
- UnitingCare Queensland
- Local Government Association of Queensland
- Queensland Council of Social Services

**Economic Recovery Group**
- Queensland Department of State Development

**Environment Recovery Group**
- Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation
- Queensland Reconstruction Authority
- Department of Transport and Main Roads
- Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy

**Building Recovery Group**
- Department of Housing and Public Works
- Queensland Treasury
- South Burnett Regional Council
- Tweed Regional Council
- Department of Environment and Heritage Protection
- Department of Education and Training
- Department of Energy and Water Supply
- Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Services
- Queensland Building and Construction Commission
- Housing Industry Association
- Queensland Reconstruction Authority
- Queensland Health
- Queensland Local Government Association
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet

**Roads and Transport Recovery Group**
- Department of Transport and Main Roads
- Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy
- Queensland Reconstruction Authority
- Queensland Resources Council
- Queensland Rural Adjustment Authority

**Other Members**
- Mayor’s Recovery Coordinator
- AgForce
- Australian Bankers’ Association
- Australian Industry Group
- Australian National Retailers Association
- Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association
- Business NSW
- Bundaberg Regional Council
- Central Highlands Regional Council
- Credit Providers Association Australia
- Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland
- Chartered Accountants Australia
- Department of Employment (Queensland)
- Department of Environment and Heritage Protection
- Queensland Building和Construction Commission
- Queensland Reconstruction Authority
- Queensland Health
- Queensland Local Government Association
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Review of Queensland Reconstruction Authority – June 2015
## A.3 Schedule of consultation stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role / representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damien Walker</td>
<td>Building Recovery Group Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing &amp; Public Works</td>
<td>Other membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Edwards</td>
<td>Economic Recovery Group Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State Development</td>
<td>Other membership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Recovery group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Stewart</td>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Newton</td>
<td>Former CEO of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte Brisbane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Hallam</td>
<td>Members of all Recovery Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association of Queensland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iain Mackenzie</td>
<td>Inspector General Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector General Emergency Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Beadle</td>
<td>Department of Infrastructure Local Government and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Infrastructure Local Government and Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Connell for Jim Murphy and Leigh Pickering</td>
<td>Queensland Treasury and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Treasury and Trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Dunning for Michael Hogan</td>
<td>Human and Social Recovery Group Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Parton</td>
<td>Queensland Reconstruction Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Reconstruction Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Scales</td>
<td>Roads and Recovery Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport &amp; Main Roads</td>
<td>Other membership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara O’Shea for Jon Black</td>
<td>Environment Recovery Group Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment &amp; Heritage Protection</td>
<td>Other membership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Recovery Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A.4 NDRRA activations (2009 – current)

### Key

- **PHAS** – Personal Hardship Assistance Scheme (formerly known as Disaster Relief Assistance Scheme)
- **CDO** – Counter Disaster Operations
- **ESSR** – Essential Services & Safety Reconnections
- **REPA** – Restoration of Essential Public Assets
- **Loans** – Natural Disaster Assistance (Concessional Loans) and / or Essential Working Capital Loans Scheme
- **SB** – Small business
- **PP** – Primary producers
- **NFP** – Not-profit organisations
- **FS** – Freight subsidy
- **SDA** – Special Disaster Assistance (Clean-up and Recovery Grants)
- **CRP** – Community Recovery Package
- **EDAS** – Exceptional Disaster Assistance Scheme
- **NPA** – Disaster events to which the NPA is applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaster event</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Relief measures activated</th>
<th>$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Nathan and associated rainfall and flooding</td>
<td>11 - 15 March 2015</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA Loans (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Tropical Cyclone Marcia and South East Queensland trough</td>
<td>19 - 22 February 2015</td>
<td>PHAS CDO</td>
<td>ESSR REPA Loans (PP, SB, NFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Queensland Severe Weather and Flooding</td>
<td>8 – 15 February 2015</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Eastern Queensland Heavy Rainfall and Flooding</td>
<td>21 – 29 January 2015</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster event</td>
<td>Time period</td>
<td>Relief measures activated</td>
<td>$ value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Queensland Heavy Rainfall and Flooding</td>
<td>5 – 18 January 2015</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queensland Heavy Rainfall and Flooding</td>
<td>8 – 14 December 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Severe Thunderstorm</td>
<td>27 November 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Ita and Associated Rainfall and Flooding</td>
<td>11 April 2014</td>
<td>PHAS</td>
<td>ESSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loans (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast and Southern Queensland Trough</td>
<td>26 - 30 March 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Gillian</td>
<td>10 - 11 March 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western Queensland Flooding and Rainfall</td>
<td>18 - 28 February 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Queensland Monsoonal Rainfall and Flooding</td>
<td>7 - 9th February 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Fletcher and Associated Rainfall and Flooding</td>
<td>2nd February 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far North Queensland Peninsula Flooding</td>
<td>27-31 January 2014</td>
<td>REPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Dylan</td>
<td>31 January 2014</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Stradbroke Island Fires</td>
<td>29 December 2013</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013 events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longreach Flood&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18 February 2013</td>
<td>REPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster event</td>
<td>Time period</td>
<td>Relief measures activated</td>
<td>$ value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Southern Queensland Low&lt;sup&gt;93&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25 February – 5 March 2013</td>
<td>PHAS CDO REPA ESSR</td>
<td>SDA (PP, SB, NFP) EDAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Oswald and Associated Rainfall and Flooding&lt;sup&gt;NPA&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21-29 January 2013</td>
<td>PHAS CDO REPA Loans (PP, SB) FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Queensland Wildfires</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Northern Queensland Bushfires</td>
<td>Late October to December 2012</td>
<td>CDO Loans (PP) FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012 events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Low&lt;sup&gt;NPA&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22 March 2012</td>
<td>PHAS CDO ESSR Loans (SB, NFP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Rainfall &amp; Flooding, Northern &amp; Far Northern Queensland&lt;sup&gt;NPA&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15 March 2012</td>
<td>PHAS CDO ESSR REPA Loans (SB, NFP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Storms &amp; Flooding &amp; East Coast Hybrid Low&lt;sup&gt;NPA&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24 February – 7 March 2012</td>
<td>PHAS CDO ESSR REPA Loans (PP, SB, NFP) FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Low Far Northern Queensland&lt;sup&gt;NPA&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 – 4 February 2012</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Queensland Tropical Low&lt;sup&gt;NPA&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27 January – February 2012</td>
<td>PHAS CDO ESSR REPA Loans (PP, SB, NFP)</td>
<td>SDA (PP, SB, NFP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>93</sup> Pending agreement to extend NPA to two additional 2013 events.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaster event</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Relief measures activated</th>
<th>$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Queensland Heavy Rainfall and Flooding</td>
<td>23 - 26 January 2012</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Queensland Flooding</td>
<td>November - December 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised Heavy Rainfall Northern Queensland</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Bushfires</td>
<td>August - November 2011</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>Loan (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011 events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Flooding</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>PHAS CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Monsoonal Flooding</td>
<td>28 February – March 2011</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA Loans (PP, SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Tropical Cyclone Yasi</td>
<td>2 February 2011</td>
<td>PHAS CDO</td>
<td>ESSR REPA Loans (PP, SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Flooding and Tropical Cyclones Tasha and</td>
<td>November 2010 – February 2011</td>
<td>PHAS CDO</td>
<td>ESSR REPA Loans (PP, SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-2011 events managed by the Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Queensland Flooding</td>
<td>9 – 12 October 2010</td>
<td>PHAS CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Queensland Low and Associated Flooding</td>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>REPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster event</td>
<td>Time period</td>
<td>Relief measures activated</td>
<td>$ value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Monsoonal Flooding and Tropical Cyclones Olga, Neville, Ului and Paul</td>
<td>January to April 2010</td>
<td>PHAS CDO, REPA Loans (PP, SB), REPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Central and South West Queensland Flooding</td>
<td>22 December 2009 to 8 January 2010</td>
<td>CDO, REPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Queensland Flooding</td>
<td>20-25 November 2009</td>
<td>CDO, REPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Bushfires</td>
<td>September – October 2009</td>
<td>PHAS CDO, REPA Loans (PP, SB), FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A.5 High-level overview of NDRRA submission process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility criteria is aligned with the Determination</td>
<td>A compliance assessment is undertaken of all submissions for eligibility in line with the NDRRA determination and the Queensland guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money Strategy</td>
<td>Assessment of the outcomes of an individual reconstruction project against how it has contributed to the advancement of government priorities, including consideration of cost and non-cost factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-ground progress inspections</td>
<td>Inspections undertaken throughout the life of the program to ensure delivery is in line with approved scope and value for money guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% reviews</td>
<td>Sample check by project to ensure the efficient and eligible delivery of works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% reviews</td>
<td>Final inspection of works completed, including documentation of treatments by experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close out report including 10% retention</td>
<td>Declaration by the delivery agent of the final delivery of eligible works and a report on achievement against value for money criteria established at the commencement of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.6 Functional Recovery Group members and functions\textsuperscript{94}

**Economic Recovery Group**

**Chair:** Department of State Development

**Functions:**
- Assessing impact on key economic assets
- Stimulating the renewal and growth of the economy within the affected area and the state
- Facilitating business, industry and regional economic recovery and renewal
- Facilitating business assistance, access to funds and loans and employer subsidies
- Ensuring businesses and industry groups and affected communities are involved in the decision making process
- Recovering from the intangible effects of an event (for example loss of business confidence and quality of life etc.).
- The functional lead agency for economic recovery is the Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (DEEDI).

**Other members:**
- Disaster Recovery Coordinator
- AgForce
- Australian Bankers’ Association
- Australian Industry Group
- Australian National Retail Association
- Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association
- Banana Shire Council
- Bundaberg Regional Council
- Central Highlands Regional Council
- Certified Practising Accountants Australia
- Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland
- Cherbourg Aboriginal Shire Council
- Department of Employment (Australian government)
- Fraser Coast Regional Council
- GasFields Commission Queensland
- Gladstone Ports Corporation
- Gladstone Regional Council
- Gympie Regional Council
- Institute of Chartered Accountants
- Insurance Council of Australia
- Isaac Regional Council
- Local Government Association of Queensland
- Livingstone Shire Council
- North Burnett Regional Council
- Queensland Farmers Federation
- Queensland Reconstruction Authority

\textsuperscript{94} (Queensland Recovery Guidelines, 2011).
Environment Recovery Group
Chair: Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

Functions:
• Identifying and advising on environmental and cultural heritage impacts and risks caused by the event and response operations (for example, air quality, water quality, soil and groundwater, landscapes, ecosystems and wildlife, heritage places and indigenous cultural heritage)
• Rehabilitating, conserving and supporting the natural recovery of impacted (or at risk) terrestrial, aquatic and marine ecosystems, wildlife, landscapes and natural resources
• Recovering and conserving impacted or at risk cultural heritage values and heritage places
• Supporting long-term community sustainability needs (for example, reinstating environmental protections and ecosystem services, and advancing Ecologically Sustainable Development principles in built environment recovery, economic recovery and waste management)
• Ensuring environmental bodies, affected communities and interest groups are involved in the decision making process.

Other members:
• Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation
• Queensland Reconstruction Authority
• Department of Transport and Main Roads
• Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing
• Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships
• Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
• Department of the Premier and Cabinet
• Department of State Development
• Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
• Department of Natural Resources and Mines
• Department of Energy and Water Supply
Human and Social Recovery Group

Chair: Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services

Functions:
- Community support and the restoration of community support services and networks
- Supporting individuals and households
- Social impact and needs assessment and monitoring
- Personal support and information
- Physical health and emotional support
- Psychological, spiritual, cultural and social wellbeing support
- Public safety and education support
- Activities that ensure affected communities and interest groups are involved in the decision making process
- Temporary accommodation
- Financial assistance to meet immediate individual needs and uninsured household loss and damage.

Other members:
- Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Queensland Treasury and Trade
- Department of Housing and PublicWorks
- Department of Education and Training
- Queensland Health (including Mental Health)
- Department of Human Services (Centrelink)
- Australian Red Cross
- St Vincent de Paul
- Salvation Army
- UnitingCare Community
- Local Government Association of Queensland
- Queensland Council of Social Services.

Roads and Transport Recovery Group

Chair: Department of Transport and Main Roads

Functions:
- Assessing damage to housing stock, commercial and industrial buildings and structures, rural structures, and infrastructure facilities
- Coordinating building safety inspection services and securing damaged buildings and structures
- Coordinating demolition of unsafe buildings and structures
- Coordinating repair and rebuilding matters of housing stock
- Coordinating disposal of hazardous material and debris
- Coordinating recovery of utility (water, power and telecommunications) infrastructure, which is normally undertaken by infrastructure owners and operators (for example, Telstra and Energex, etc.)
- Coordinating restoration of public schools and public building infrastructure, sporting facilities and public playgrounds
- Coordinating the restoration of damaged dam structures
- Coordinating recovery of road and other transport infrastructure
• Prioritising repair and reconstruction activities, where appropriate
• Ensuring industry groups and affected communities are involved in the decision making process
• Considering mitigation measures (for example, flood risk reduction) when planning for rebuilding and reconstruction.

**Other members:**
• Department of Transport and Main Roads (Corporate Operations)
• Department of Transport and Main Roads (Safety and Regulation)
• Department of Transport and Main Roads (Infrastructure Management and Delivery)
• Department of Transport and Main Roads (Maritime Safety Queensland)
• Agforce
• Queensland Rail
• Queensland Trucking Association
• Queensland Resources Council
• Local Government Association of Queensland
• Queensland Reconstruction Authority
• Department of Agriculture and Fisheries

**Building Recovery Group**

**Chair:** Department of Housing and Public Works

**Functions:**
• As noted at Roads and Transport Recovery Group.

**Other members:**
• Department of Housing and Public Works (Building and Asset Services)
• Department of Housing and Public Works (Housing Services)
• Department of Housing and Public Works (Strategic Asset Management)
• Department of Housing and Public Works (Disaster Preparedness)
• Department of Education and Training
• Public Safety Business Agency
• Master Builders Queensland
• Master Electricians Australia
• Queensland Building and Construction Commission
• Housing Industry Association
• Queensland Reconstruction Authority
• Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
• Insurance Council of Australia
• Queensland Health
• Local Government Association of Queensland
• Department of the Premier and Cabinet
A.7 Glossary of terms

ANAO
Australian National Audit Office

ANAO Report
Australian government Reconstruction Inspectorate’s Conduct of Value for Money Reviews of Flood Reconstruction Projects in Queensland, ANAO

App
QRA Deployment Application

Authority
Queensland Reconstruction Authority

Betterment
An increase in the resilience of an asset to natural disasters

A provision in the NDRRA that allows reimbursement of a portion of the cost to restore an essential public asset damaged by an eligible disaster event to a more disaster-resilient state

Board
Queensland Reconstruction Board

CAGR
Compound Annual Growth Rate

CDO
Counter Disaster Operations

CEO
Chief Executive Officer

CER Act
Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act

CERA
The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (New Zealand)

CFO
Chief Financial Officer

CRP
Community Recovery Package

CRR
Community Recovery Review undertaken by the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services

DAF
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries

DCCSDS
Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services

DDCC
District Disaster Coordination Centre

DDMG
District Disaster Management Group

DEHP
Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

DEWS
Department of Energy and Water Supply

Determination
Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements Determination 2012: Version 1

DHPW
Department of Housing and Public Works

DILGP
Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

DNRM
Department of Natural Resources and Mines

DM Act
Disaster Management Act 2003

---

95 This review is not finalised and is subject to change.
Natural disaster  A serious disruption to a community or region caused by the impact of a naturally occurring rapid onset event that threatens or causes death, injury or damage to property or the environment, and which requires significant and coordinated multi-agency and community response. Such serious disruption can be caused by any one, or a combination, of the following natural hazards: bushfire; earthquake; flood; storm; cyclone; storm surge; landslide; tsunami; meteorite strike; or tornado.96

96 As defined by the NDRRA Determination 2012: Version 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSBA</td>
<td>Public Safety Business Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAO</td>
<td>Queensland Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAS</td>
<td>Queensland Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDMA</td>
<td>Queensland Disaster Management Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDMC</td>
<td>Queensland Disaster Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFES</td>
<td>Queensland Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Queensland Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Queensland Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRA</td>
<td>Queensland Reconstruction Authority (note: also referred to as QldRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRAA</td>
<td>Queensland Rural Adjustment Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QRA Act</td>
<td>Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011 (Qld)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTT</td>
<td>Queensland Treasury and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPA</td>
<td>Restoration of Essential Public Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report into TC Marcia and Nathan</td>
<td>Draft Report into Aspects of Response and Recovery Initiatives: TC Marcia and TC Nathan, DPC (Draft at May 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLO</td>
<td>Regional Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RREA</td>
<td>The Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Executing Agency (Indonesia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDRA</td>
<td>State Disaster Relief Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>State Disaster Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCC</td>
<td>State Disaster Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCG</td>
<td>State Disaster Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMP</td>
<td>State Disaster Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>State Recovery Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taskforce</td>
<td>Commonwealth National Disaster Recovery Taskforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Tropical Cyclone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>The Reconstruction Agency (Japan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A.9 Terms of reference

Terms of Reference

Queensland Reconstruction Authority (QldRA)

Operational Review

The Queensland Government is conducting a review of the QldRA’s operations. The Review will have regard to the original intent when the QldRA was initially established and the changed role undertaken by the QldRA since its establishment.

Scope

The Review will deliver an assessment of:

1. The effectiveness of QldRA’s operations since commencement in 2011
2. The ongoing role of the QldRA, in consideration of the state’s broader reconstruction and recovery framework and requirements.

Terms of Reference

The Review will examine the QldRA’s functionality, and consider, but not be limited to, the following:

1. The effectiveness of QldRA’s operations since commencement in 2011:
   a. An assessment of the current governance arrangements and the impacts of Commonwealth cessation of the National Partnership Agreement
   b. An assessment of the roles of the QldRA in line with functions identified in the QRA Act.
2. The ongoing role of the QldRA, in consideration of the state’s broader preparation, mitigation, reconstruction and recovery framework for disasters, and in responding to emergent needs during disaster events:
   a. Development of possible options for the future role of QldRA, taking into account an inter-jurisdictional comparison and ‘world’s best practice’ in research, preparation, mitigation, response, recovery and reconstruction for an all hazards approach to disasters
   b. An assessment of the process of Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements activations
   c. An assessment of the governance arrangements required to support QldRA’s ongoing role. This would include consideration of:
      i. any potential duplication with other Queensland Government agencies
      ii. how QldRA could complement the existing disaster preparation, response, relief and recovery functions of other government agencies
      iii. appropriate inter-government arrangements
   d. Consideration of possible pathways for the consolidation of the preparation, planning and implementation of disaster mitigation functions and implications on funding.

Consultation

The review will involve a number of stakeholders, who as a minimum, will be consulted during the course of the review (the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Queensland Treasury, the QldRA (including current and past senior executives and directors), Directors-General of key government departments involved in disaster management, with particular emphasis on
response and recovery and key external stakeholders such as the Local Government Association of Queensland.

Consideration will be given to the other reviews occurring across government, including the Department of the Premier and Cabinet review of aspects of response / recovery to Tropical Cyclones Marcia and Nathan, the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services’ review of Community Recovery Arrangements, the review of the Disaster Management Act 2003 and the development of an improved state disaster risk register, and the Public Service Commission’s review of statutory positions.

**Timeframe**

The Review will:

a) Commence by the end of May 2015,

b) Provide an Interim Report in two months from review commencement,

c) Produce a Final Report to the Deputy Premier by the end of August 2015, and

d) Report to Cabinet by 30 September 2015.