

**Submission Number: NND.001.01369**

**Submission Of: Chris Dawson**

**Your Details**

Email address:

Phone:

Preferred means of contact: Email

What is your submission based on? I am making this submission based on my professional knowledge, qualifications or experience or on behalf of a group or organisation

What is your area of professional expertise? Advanced mathematics, modelling, empirical climate science, statistics, engineering, international finance, forestry, agribusiness, hydrogeology

If you are lodging your submission on behalf of a group or organisation, what is the name of the group or organisation? Cool Futures Funds Management - Due Diligence Division

**Your Submission**

In your experience, what areas of the bushfire emergency response worked well?

In your experience, what areas of the bushfire emergency response didn't work well?

In your experience, what needs to change to improve arrangements for preparation, mitigation, response and recovery coordination for national natural disaster arrangements in Australia?

About the authors of this submission

██████████, built Australia's Greenhouse Office forestry and agricultural carbon accounting system (FullCAM) for the Kyoto Protocol used in the Paris Agreement to incorporate:

The reasons for believing Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming (CAGW) are purely theoretical. CAGW is a theory based on basic physics models and very large computerized models. That's why there is no empirical evidence for it, and why we cannot simply point to some evidence and convince everyone that it is true. But it is also why CAGW cannot be falsified by empirical evidence.

Chris Dawson, Cool Futures Funds Management - Climate and Energy Due Diligence Initiative:

Quality due diligence is essential for an informed market, and for the body politic to function optimally. Similarly, guidelines on director's fiduciary obligations on climate and energy are ambiguous, bureaucratic and disturbing. For example, the terms 'climate', 'climate change', 'global warming', 'climate science' are not defined; and the relevant scientific literature is not cited. This lack of definition and information leads to a climate of uncertainty and fear for many company directors and public servants.

Introduction

"(In keeping) Australians safe ... we need to learn from the Black Summer bushfires how ... we can work better ... to better protect and equip Australians for living in hotter, drier and longer summers ... (where we) acknowledge ... climate change (and) the broader impact of our summers getting longer, drier and hotter and is focussed on practical action that has a direct link to making Australians safer ...

... That's why we need to look at what actions should be taken to enhance our preparedness, resilience and recovery through the actions of all levels of government and the community, for the environment we are living in ...

... The overwhelming majority of the actions to protect Australians from bushfires are undertaken at a State level. Everything from resourcing our fire services and hazard reduction, to land clearing and planning laws."

Prime Minister Scott Morrison, at the release of the Terms of Reference.

As is being shown with the Coronavirus, science, data, information and models underlying the questions and assumptions must also be subject to thorough due diligence so that the likelihood of failing "...to better protect and equip Australians ... (and to) enhance our preparedness, resilience and recovery through the actions of all levels of government and the community, for the environment we are living in ..." is significantly reduced.

Although there are many questions this Royal Commission must address, none of these can be addressed properly unless high resolution due diligence is carried out. The history, science, engineering, motivations and public policies in relation to wildfires past, present and future must be reviewed dispassionately and scientifically.

The authors believe that the application of our distinctive approach and skill set will assist and enhance the capacity of the Royal Commission to fulfil some of its key Terms of Reference obligations in this regard.

Our due diligence approach to public policy formulation and implementation and evaluation involves in part, the process of questioning underlying assumptions, and answering unasked questions.

For this Royal Commission the following assumptions and questions represent some but not all of what we have questioned and answered:

Have the recommendations from previous wildfire Royal Commissions concerning fuel load reductions been followed? What conclusions can be drawn from adherence or otherwise, to the fuel load reduction burns and subsequent wildfire intensity?

Under the Paris Agreement, does the way carbon dioxide emissions are accounted for from a wildfire, differ to accounting for this from a fuel reduction burn?

If so, how and why?

Is there any evidence this difference in accounting procedures reduces or increases the level of fuel reduction burns?

As no one among the public, the policy-making ministers, the bureaucrats, the corporate and management class, the public intellectuals, or indeed our journalists, has ever seen and understood the empirical evidence in support of Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming (CAGW), why is it acknowledged by the Royal Commission to be so?

Why do the climate scientists believe in CAGW?

Is there any empirical evidence underlying this belief in the real world?

Shouldn't the Royal Commission should see the evidence for climate change, so as to realistically factor in the future of wildfires under climate change in terms of natural versus CAGW; and in terms of the magnitude, timing and sign of such climate change?

Is it true that the reasons for believing CAGW are purely theoretical; that CAGW is simply a theory built on basic physics models and large computerized models. That's why there is no empirical evidence for it, and why we cannot simply point to some evidence and convince everyone that it is true. But it is also why CAGW cannot be falsified by empirical evidence.

When we "... acknowledge ... our summers getting longer, drier and hotter" we ask, longer, drier and hotter than what?

As measured how? Using the raw data? Calibrating the modern instantaneous thermometers with old thermometers run in parallel? Comparing apples with apples?

Hotter and dryer than all previous wildfires as reviewed by Royal Commissions?

We have examined these and many more fundamental high resolution questions of relevance.

We are happy to present via Zoom or similar and look forward to the opportunity to do so.

**Is there anything else you would like to tell the Royal Commission?**

Public Policy formulation is currently and unfortunately evidence and due diligence free.

The right questions are not asked and flawed policies prevail.

A Royal Commission can ask the right questions if it knows what they are or seeks them out.

As is being shown with the Coronavirus, science, data, information and models underlying the questions and assumptions must also be subject to thorough due diligence so that the likelihood of failing "...to better protect and equip Australians ... (and to) enhance our preparedness, resilience and recovery through the actions of all levels of government and the community, for the environment we are living in ..." is significantly reduced.

Although there are many questions this Royal Commission must address, none of these can be addressed properly unless high resolution due diligence is carried out. The history, science, engineering, motivations and public policies in relation to wildfires past, present and future must be reviewed dispassionately and scientifically.

The authors believe that the application of our distinctive approach and skill set will assist and enhance the capacity of the Royal Commission to fulfil some of its key Terms of Reference obligations in this regard.

Our due diligence approach to public policy formulation and implementation and evaluation involves in part, the process of questioning underlying assumptions, and answering unasked questions.

Although we don't expect you'll want too many questions towards the truth, surprise us and we'll surprise you.

We are happy to present via Zoom or similar and look forward to the opportunity to do so.

**Do you agree to your submission being published?** Yes I agree to my submission being published in my name