

## Substantive points raised in our submission

We used the framework outlined by the Commissioners and reflected upon “what worked well”, “what didn’t work well” and “what should change” in response to the fires looking across the areas of preparedness, resilience and adaptation, response, and recovery.

	Preparedness	Response	Resilience and Adaptation	Recovery
<b>What worked well</b>	Availability of Climate science/Meteorological information.	<p>The substantive and prolonged firefighting mobilisation;</p> <p>That there were some dedicated firefighting efforts to protect environmental assets;</p> <p>The active wildlife rescue and care efforts.</p>	<p>Australia’s protected area network provided increased resilience;</p> <p>Some effective community and environment engagement programs.</p>	<p>The Commonwealth’s establishment of the Threatened Species advisory group &amp; the Ministerial roundtables added transparency/direction to recovery efforts;</p> <p>The efforts of agency staff and other ecologists in carrying out novel wildlife protection and recovery activities;</p> <p>That some logging operations were curtailed in response to the fires.</p>
<b>What didn’t work well</b>	The Commonwealth Government was slow to escalate involvement despite apparent risks.	<p>Loss of lives, livelihoods and property;</p> <p>Catastrophic damage to natural areas and loss of species;</p> <p>The Commonwealth did not fulfil its obligations in relation to protecting Matters of National Environmental Significance;</p> <p>There is an implicit Commonwealth bias against funding the early protection of Matters of National Environmental Significance;</p> <p>The overall Commonwealth investment in fire suppression is no longer matched to the level of risk (especially in regards to natural assets).</p>	<p>Failure in Australia’s overarching climate mitigation efforts;</p> <p>Failures in Australia’s overarching environmental administration, regulation and enforcement have failed to stem environmental decline resulting in further reduced resilience;</p> <p>Lack of national-level fire risk assessment for Matters of National Environmental Significance;</p> <p>Lack of investment into protected areas, invasive species management, and ecological resilience building activities;</p> <p>Logging increasing fire frequency, intensity and severity;</p> <p>Insufficient monitoring and species/ecosystem</p>	<p>Funding directed to environmental funding activities has been slow and insufficient;</p> <p>Post-fire surveying has been limited and non-systematic;</p> <p>There have not yet been any substantive post-fire environmental policy changes.</p>

			<p>specific science;</p> <p>Lack of framework to assess performance;</p> <p>Lack of integration of climate mitigation, resilience-building and biodiversity conservation/restoration objectives.</p>	
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--