|  |
| --- |
| National Landcare  Programme  Stakeholder survey |
|  |
| Department of the Environment and Energy  Department of Agriculture and Water Resources |
| final survey report |
| November 2016 |

Acknowledgements

This project is funded through the Australian Government’s National Landcare Programme.

This work was completed with the assistance of David Perfrement and Claudia Cooney from the Biodiversity Conservation Division within the Australian Government Department of the Environment and Energy; and Marc Kelly from Sustainable Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Division within the Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources.

**ARTD consultancy team**

Fiona Christian

Florent Gomez-Bonnet

Erum Rasheed

Melanie Scott

Contents

[Tables and figures iv](#_Toc468723461)

[Abbreviations and acronyms vii](#_Toc468723462)

[Executive summary viii](#_Toc468723463)

[1. Survey approach, methodology and distribution strategy 1](#_Toc468723464)

[1.1 Background 1](#_Toc468723465)

[1.2 Objectives 1](#_Toc468723466)

[1.3 The survey 2](#_Toc468723467)

[2. Respondents 4](#_Toc468723468)

[2.1 Who the respondents are 4](#_Toc468723469)

[2.2 How the respondents relate to the National Landcare Programme 8](#_Toc468723470)

[3. NLP objectives and priorities 15](#_Toc468723471)

[3.1 NLP objectives 15](#_Toc468723472)

[3.2 Stakeholder priorities 18](#_Toc468723473)

[3.3 Suggested changes to NLP objectives and priorities 22](#_Toc468723474)

[4. Community engagement 24](#_Toc468723475)

[4.1 Community participation 24](#_Toc468723476)

[4.2 Stakeholder participation 25](#_Toc468723477)

[5. NLP processes 30](#_Toc468723478)

[5.1 Appropriateness of NLP funding mechanism 30](#_Toc468723479)

[5.2 Communication and advice provided 30](#_Toc468723480)

[5.3 Simplicity of processes 33](#_Toc468723481)

[5.4 Application and MERI processes 33](#_Toc468723482)

[6. Project outcomes and beneficiaries 44](#_Toc468723483)

[6.1 Outcomes 44](#_Toc468723484)

[6.2 Beneficiaries 49](#_Toc468723485)

[7. Future of the NLP 51](#_Toc468723486)

[7.1 What stakeholders want to retain 51](#_Toc468723487)

[7.2 Areas for improvement identified by stakeholders 52](#_Toc468723488)

[Appendix 1. NLP stakeholder survey questionnaire 57](#_Toc468723489)

Tables and figures

Tables

[Table 1. Other stakeholder group (Direct NLP grant recipients) 5](#_Toc468723490)

[Table 2. Association with NRM groups (NRM local groups) 5](#_Toc468723491)

[Table 3. Identification as Indigenous organisation (all respondents) 6](#_Toc468723492)

[Table 4. Involvement in NLP sub-programmes (all respondents) 9](#_Toc468723493)

[Table 5. Income streams other than the NLP (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding and direct NLP grant recipients) 12](#_Toc468723494)

[Table 6. Other income streams NLP funded projects benefit from (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding and direct NLP grantees) 13](#_Toc468723495)

[Table 7. Partnering (co-investing) with other stakeholders in delivery of NLP funded projects (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding and direct NLP grantees) 14](#_Toc468723496)

[Table 8. NLP objectives and priorities 16](#_Toc468723497)

[Table 9. NLP priorities relating to respondents’ NRM priorities (all respondents) 20](#_Toc468723498)

[Table 10. Response rate to the question about what to change – NLP objectives and priorities (all stakeholder groups) 22](#_Toc468723499)

[Table 11. Opportunities for community participation (NRM regional organisations) 24](#_Toc468723500)

[Table 12. Suggestions considered/ taken on board (NRM local groups, industry, state or local government) 26](#_Toc468723501)

[Table 13. Priorities and threats addressed by projects undertaken by local regional bodies (NRM local groups, industry, state or local government) 29](#_Toc468723502)

[Table 14. NLP implementation (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 30](#_Toc468723503)

[Table 15. Communication about NLP processes (NRM regional organisations and direct grantees) 31](#_Toc468723504)

[Table 16. Documents submitted as part of NLP funding application (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 34](#_Toc468723505)

[Table 17. Number of people involved in filling in the application form (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 36](#_Toc468723506)

[Table 18. Total time all people spent filling in the application form (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 36](#_Toc468723507)

[Table 19. Response rate to the question about what to change – Application process (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 37](#_Toc468723508)

[Table 20. Number of people involved in completing the MERI plan (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 39](#_Toc468723509)

[Table 21. Total time spent developing the MERI plan (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 39](#_Toc468723510)

[Table 22. Total time spent finalising the MERI plan (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 40](#_Toc468723511)

[Table 23. MERI plan feedback (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 41](#_Toc468723512)

[Table 24. Time and cost of developing and implementing the MERI plan compared to benefits generated (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 42](#_Toc468723513)

[Table 25. Response rate to the question about what to change – MERI requirements (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 42](#_Toc468723514)

[Table 26. Impact of NLP (all respondents) 46](#_Toc468723515)

[Table 27. Indirect impact of NLP (all respondents) 48](#_Toc468723516)

[Table 28. Benefits to stakeholder groups 50](#_Toc468723517)

[Table 29. Response rate to the question about what not to change (all respondents) 51](#_Toc468723518)

[Table 30. Response rate to the question about what to change – Program delivery approach (all respondents) 53](#_Toc468723519)

[Table 31. Response rate to the question about what to change – Other aspects (all respondents) 55](#_Toc468723520)

Figures

[Figure 1. Respondents by stakeholder group 4](#_Toc468723521)

[Figure 2. Distribution of respondents by jurisdictions 7](#_Toc468723522)

[Figure 3. Change in NRM priorities over the past 2 years (all respondents) 19](#_Toc468723523)

[Figure 4. Community participation (NRM regional organisations only) 25](#_Toc468723524)

[Figure 5. Community engagement: level of engagement and of satisfaction (NRM local groups, industry, state or local government) 27](#_Toc468723525)

[Figure 6. Stakeholders seeking advice and helpfulness of information provided (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 32](#_Toc468723526)

[Figure 7. Simplicity of NLP processes (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 33](#_Toc468723527)

[Figure 8. Preferred NLP funding application requirement (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients) 34](#_Toc468723528)

[Figure 9. Number of projects that would have gone ahead without NLP funding (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding or direct NLP grant recipients) 44](#_Toc468723529)

Abbreviations and acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ACT | Australian Capital Territory |
| IPA | Indigenous Protected Areas |
| MERI | Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement |
| MERIT | Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement Tool |
| NLP | National Landcare Programme |
| NRM | Natural Resources Management |
| NSW | New South Wales |
| NT | Northern Territory |
| Qld | Queensland |
| Tas | Tasmania |
| Vic | Victoria |
| WA | Western Australia |
| WoC | Working on Country |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Executive summary

Background

The Australian Government invests in activities to achieve outcomes relating to environmental protection, natural resources management (NRM) and sustainable agriculture. The National Landcare Programme (NLP) is a key part of the Australian Government’s commitment to natural resource management. The program supports local and long-term environmental, sustainable agriculture and Indigenous outcomes.

On 2 March 2016, the Australian Government undertook to review the NLP, to examine the appropriateness and effectiveness of the programme. The review is being conducted jointly by the Departments of the Environment and Energy and Agriculture and Water Resources, in consultation with the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. The review will be completed by the end of this year.

To inform the review of the NLP, the Department of the Environment contracted ARTD Consultants in June 2016 to conduct a survey of NRM stakeholders to gain the views of those stakeholders on the program, its delivery and operation, and on program outcomes that are not available via other data sources.

The NLP stakeholder survey

The NLP stakeholder survey elicited the experiences and attitudes of stakeholders across the following themes:

* Alignment of programs to local, regional and national NRM priorities
* Stakeholder engagement in program activities
* Current program outcomes and beneficiaries, including landscape and practice change results
* Current NRM program processes for applications, contracting, delivery, monitoring and reporting, including about the monitoring, evaluation, reporting and improvement (MERI) framework
* Future program objectives and priorities for funded projects, and improvements to program planning, delivery and MERI.

The NLP stakeholder survey was designed to gather feedback from a broad range of stakeholders across five main stakeholder groups:

1. NRM regional organisations (56 regional organisations directly funded by the NLP)
2. NRM local groups (funded by the 56 regional organisations)
3. Direct NLP grant recipients
4. Industry groups
5. State or local government.

The results of the 2016 NLP stakeholder survey are presented in this report.

The online survey was implemented between Thursday 15 September and Friday 14 October and collected a total of 916 responses, showing a very high level of engagement from the sector.

Half of the responses were received from NRM local groups (31%) and NRM regional organisations (21%), but all stakeholder groups were well represented: 12 per cent were direct NLP grant recipients, another 12 per cent were industry groups, 10 per cent state or local governments and 14 per cent belonged to the ‘other’ stakeholder group. Out of the direct NLP grant recipients, 69 per cent of them also identified as NRM local groups, thus further increasing feedback provided from the perspective of NRM local groups. Only four per cent of the respondents were from an Indigenous organisation.

In terms of involvement in the NLP, respondents were mostly involved (i.e. participated in, applied for funding or received funding) in the regional stream (41%), Landcare networks (38%), 20 Million Trees (37%), Sustainable Agriculture Small Grants (37%) and   
25th Anniversary Landcare Grants (36%). Out of NRM local group respondents, more than half (58%) applied for NLP funding through an NRM regional organisation, and the majority of them (86%) also received funding through an NRM regional organisation.

Key findings

Stakeholders are aware of the NLP objectives and feel that they are aligned with the Australian Government priorities as well as their own

The vast majority of respondents are aware of the NLP objectives (91% agree or tend to agree).

Most stakeholders from NRM regional organisations confirmed that their NLP funded projects aligned with their Regional NRM Plan (95% agree or tend to agree); and close to three quarters of them felt that it allowed enough autonomy in setting regional and local priorities (72% agree or tend to agree).

Most stakeholders from NRM local groups, direct NLP grant recipients and other stakeholders also felt that NLP objectives align with their own NRM priorities (respectively 87%, 90% and 86% agree or tend to agree). Of those NRM local groups who did receive funding, 82% said that the funding met their groups’ needs and priorities.

Industry stakeholders felt that NLP funding helps the industry improve sustainability (84% agree or tend to agree); and in turn that improving sustainability helps the industry improve profitability (94%) and access to markets (91%).

When presented with the list of NLP priorities, most respondents across all groups felt that their own NRM priorities were very or somewhat related to each of these NLP priorities (over two thirds of all respondents felt that each one was very or somewhat related). There were however two priorities with which respondents’ NRM priorities related to a lesser extent:

* Build Indigenous knowledge and participation, to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity: only 69 per cent of all respondents felt that their NRM priorities related to this NLP priority, with the lowest proportion among industry groups (53%).
* Protecting or conserving Matters of National Environmental Significance including management of World Heritage Areas, Ramsar wetlands, national heritage etc.: 79 per cent of all respondents identified that their NRM priorities related to this NLP priority, with the lowest proportion among industry groups (68%).

Most stakeholders’ NRM priorities have not changed recently: 86 per cent of all respondents reported their priorities have either not changed at all or not changed very much over the past two years.

NRM regional organisations provided opportunities for community stakeholders to participate and incorporated community priorities in regional NRM planning

Over two thirds of respondents from NRM regional organisations reported having provided a lot or a moderate number of opportunities for community participation, with more opportunities for delivering NLP funded projects (69% provided a lot of opportunities) compared to planning (39%) and priority setting (33%). Stakeholder groups most likely to be involved in planning were: state or local government (81%), Indigenous groups (72%) and Landcare groups (71%); and those most likely to be involved in delivery were Landcare groups (89%), land managers/ owners (89%), Indigenous groups (83%), state or local government (77%), local community members (76%), farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups (74%) and non-government organisations (74%).

Almost all NRM regional organisation respondents reported that they were able to incorporate community priorities in regional planning (97%) through community consultations that involved existing committees, focus groups, forums and surveys.

Stakeholders were satisfied with the level of community engagement

Over half of the respondents from NRM local groups, industry and state or local government indicated that they were somewhat or very engaged in the delivery of projects (61%, 52% and 65% respectively). The majority of state or local government stakeholders were also engaged in planning (60% very or somewhat engaged) and developing the regional NRM plan (58%). A lower proportion of these stakeholder groups reported being engaged in priority setting of NLP funds delivered by regions (39% for NRM local groups, 27% for industry groups and 43% for state or local government).

However, the majority of these stakeholders were satisfied with the level of engagement for each of these four aspects (over 60% very or somewhat satisfied for each group), meaning that stakeholders were also satisfied with being less involved in priority setting. The majority of stakeholders from each of these groups felt that their suggestions were considered and potentially taken on board.

Of those stakeholders from NRM local groups, industry and state or local government who were engaged in projects with NRM regional organisations through NLP funding, most (over 80%) identified that the projects focused on protection and restoration of ecosystem function, resilience and biodiversity; or building community awareness of biodiversity values, skills, participation and knowledge. Less than half reported that the projects undertaken related to building Indigenous knowledge and participation, promoting conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity; and reducing the loss of natural habitats, degradation and fragmentation.

Most NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipient respondents felt that NLP is well implemented

Stakeholders from NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients provided feedback about NLP application, funding and reporting processes.

The majority of NRM regional organisations stakeholders and direct NLP grant recipient respondents felt that

* requirements were well communicated to their organisations (87% across both groups for the application requirements and 87% again for the funding requirements)
* NLP processes were simple, in particular completing the funding application (61% across both groups) and finalising the contract (67% across both groups).

However, the views on monitoring and reporting requirements are substantially different between the two stakeholder groups, perhaps reflecting their differing requirements: 64 per cent of NRM regional organisations stakeholders found monitoring and reporting requirements not very simple or not simple at all compared to just 36 per cent of the direct NLP grant recipients.

With regard to the implementation of the NLP, stakeholders from both groups felt that the NLP encourages cooperation between government and stakeholders (90% of NRM regional organisation respondents and 88% of direct NLP grant recipient respondents); and that the current funding mechanisms are the best way to deliver NLP objectives (respectively, 83% and 73%).

The proportion of respondents seeking advice or feedback from the Department on various aspects of their projects was much higher among NRM regional organisations stakeholders compared to direct NLP grant recipients – the majority of whom did not seek any advice. Most respondents (over 90%) from both groups who sought advice found it to be helpful.

NRM regional organisations committed greater resources to filling in the application form and completing the MERI plan than direct NLP grant recipients

A higher proportion of NRM regional organisations stakeholders submitted both an application form and a MERI plan than did direct NLP grant recipients (respectively 82% and 52%).

NRM regional organisations stakeholders spent more time filling in the application form and completing the MERI plan compared to direct NLP grant recipients. The majority of respondents from NRM regional organisations reported spending more than 20 hours filling in the application form (16% between 20 and 40 hours, and 63% more than 40 hours); and most of them reported spending more than two weeks developing the MERI plan (47% between 2 and 4 weeks, and 31% more than 4 weeks). This compares with the majority of direct NLP grant recipients spending less than 20 hours filling in the application form (73%) and less than 2 weeks developing the MERI plan (81%).

Most respondents of both stakeholder groups responded positively to the usefulness of MERI (79% agree or tend to agree) and their understanding of what needed to be included in the plan (82%). They had less consistent views on MERI being a useful communication tool (53% agree or tend to agree), capturing practice change well (53%) and capturing agricultural outcomes well (54%). Stakeholders were also split in regards to the amount of time spent on the MERI plan compared to the benefits generated.

Finally, most stakeholders showed a preference for the application form followed by the MERI plan (compared to using both as the funding application or MERI plan only), with greater support among direct NLP grant recipients (75%) compared to NRM regional organisations stakeholders (58%).

The vast majority of NRM stakeholders felt that the NLP had positive direct and indirect impacts

A large majority of respondents across all groups felt NLP has resulted in improved landscape management (86% agree or tend to agree); increased adoption of sustainable management practices (86%); and enhanced social and institutional capacity for sustainable management practices (82%).

Most respondents across all groups also felt that the NLP has indirectly benefited capacity building (92%), environmental health (90%), community engagement (89%) and sustainable agriculture (87%).

Stakeholders identified the following groups as the main beneficiaries of NLP projects: land managers/ owners (73% of all stakeholders identified significant or moderate benefits for this group), farming, forestry, fishing and aquaculture industry groups (61%) and local community groups (60%).

More than half of the respondents who received NLP funding reported that none of their projects would have gone ahead without the NLP funding.

Stakeholders are very supportive of the NLP, in particular its community engagement focus, multiyear timeframe and the NLP brand

When asked about the one thing they would not change in the NLP, stakeholders identified a range of strengths. The most frequently mentioned was the regional delivery model (mostly mentioned by stakeholders from NRM regional organisations, with some mentions by NRM local groups). Engagement with and involvement of the local community was the second most frequent aspect stakeholders wanted to retain. Other key strengths of the programme included the multiyear timeframe offering some certainty, the continuation of funding and the NLP brand.

Stakeholders identified some areas for improvement around NLP processes and had some diverging views about the programme delivery approach

Stakeholders also had the opportunity to identify areas for improvement around key aspects of the programme design and delivery.

Stakeholders from NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients suggested that the application and MERI process should be made simpler and more streamlined. Stakeholders asked for more lead time for the application process and suggested forms be improved. With regard to MERI, some stakeholders reported that they would benefit from more information about requirements.

All stakeholder groups provided feedback about the program delivery approach, NLP objectives and priorities. Stakeholders had a range of views about the program delivery approach. The most frequent feedback overall was to continue and expand funding over time (including some ongoing or follow-up funding). Some stakeholders, in particular NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients, felt that no change was required to the delivery approach or that the regional delivery model should be further strengthened. Other stakeholders, in particular from NRM local groups, were critical about the regional delivery model; and some others identified that the small grants could be improved. Finally, some stakeholders, in particular from NRM local groups and industry advocated for ongoing funding for Landcare programs and networks.

With regard to NLP objectives and priorities, the majority of stakeholders providing qualitative feedback felt that these were working fine. When they identified areas for improvement, stakeholders suggested better alignment with local, regional or subregional priorities; more community participation; and more focus on sustainable agriculture.

Other areas for improvements identified by stakeholders included providing more funding; reducing reporting; ensuring more regional or local influence in decision-making; and expanding the timeframe towards long term support.

# Survey approach, methodology and distribution strategy

## Background

Under the Natural Heritage Trust Act of Australia 1997, the Australian Government is investing in activities to achieve outcomes in matters relating to environmental protection, natural resources management and sustainable agriculture. The two programs associated with this funding are the National Landcare Programme (NLP) and its predecessor, Caring for our Country Phase Two (C4oC2). The majority of funding through the National Landcare Programme is committed until 2017-18, with funding and the approach beyond that time period to be determined by Government.

## Objectives

The survey gathered feedback from NRM stakeholders on the NLP to inform future design and delivery of the programme. Results from the survey will inform the review of the NLP conducted by the Department, along with other work streams (budget analysis, internal analysis and review of delivery arrangements).

The survey elicited the experiences and attitudes of stakeholders across the following themes:

* Alignment of programs to local, regional and national NRM priorities
* Stakeholder engagement in program activities
* Current program outcomes and beneficiaries, including landscape and practice change results
* Current NRM program processes for applications, contracting, delivery, monitoring and reporting, including the monitoring, evaluation, reporting and improvement (MERI) framework
* Future program objectives and priorities for funded projects, and improvements to program planning, delivery and MERI.

Other areas of interest identified during the inception meeting included:

* Administrative and funding arrangements (how does it work in practice, how engaged are local organisations in the planning, how well communicated are NLP requirements down to local organisations)
* Additional benefits to local communities: social well-being, health, community engagement, etc.
* Leveraging, co-investments from partnerships with businesses, Indigenous groups, local communities, private conservation groups, etc.

## The survey

### Design

#### Stakeholder groups

The NLP stakeholder survey was designed to gather feedback from a broad range of stakeholders across 5 main stakeholder groups:

1. NRM regional organisations (56 regional organisations directly funded by the NLP)
2. NRM local groups (funded by the 56 regional organisations)
3. Direct NLP grant recipients
4. Industry groups
5. State or local government.

In the first question of the survey, respondents were asked to identify the stakeholder groups they most closely associate with. For those respondents who did not fit the description of the 5 stakeholder groups, they had the option to select an ‘Other group’ response option that would generate a default list of questions.

#### Survey structure

The survey questions respondents were asked depended on the stakeholder group selected in the first question.

Survey questions were organised across six sections:

1. Your details
2. National Landcare Programme objectives and priorities
3. National Landcare Programme processes
4. Community engagement
5. Project outcomes and beneficiaries
6. Future of the National Landcare Programme

### Distribution

The survey was delivered online via the Department of Environment and Energy survey tool CitizenSpace. The tool allows consistency across all online surveys developed by the Department and ensures accessibility; however it also has some limitations in terms of survey layout (due to accessibility requirements), survey design (in particular for elaborate skip logics) and data extraction.

The survey was disseminated via a generic link through

* email to key contacts through the Department of Environment and Energy, the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet
* the National Landcare Programme website
* the Department of Environment and Energy’s Facebook page
* the National Landcare Conference on 21-23 September in Melbourne
* the National Landcare Programme Twitter account
* the Department of Environment Facebook account
* the National Regional Landcare Facilitator Network.

Survey contacts were also invited to forward the survey link to other interested stakeholders.

The initial email list had 1,110 contacts – excluding duplicates and contacts without email addresses. Out of those, 122 email addresses bounced or were no longer active, 19 contacts had left the office with some being replaced (16 added contacts) and 5 contacts opted out, making a valid total of 980 contact email addresses.

The survey was open for over 4 weeks, from Thursday 15 September to Friday 14 October 2016. Three reminders were sent to the key contacts with email addresses on Thursday 29 September, Thursday 6 October and Thursday 13 October.

### Analysis and reporting

Survey results were extracted from CitizenSpace on Tuesday 18 October after the survey had been closed.

The overall approach for the analysis and reporting is to present responses to questions across all respondent groups as the overall feedback, then by stakeholder group to identify any meaningful differences.

Results are presented question by question following a similar structure to the survey, starting with questions asked to all respondents then questions asked only to specific stakeholder groups, e.g. NRM local groups.

The Departments will also be provided with a clean dataset, allowing for further exploration of the data, such as looking at responses from respondents involved in specific direct grant programmes. These types of analyses may be of interest for the management of these individual programmes, but go beyond the overall feedback sought for the National Landcare Programme as a whole.


# Respondents

## Who the respondents are

### NRM local groups and NRM regional organisations made up half of the responses, but all stakeholder groups were well represented

A total of 916 stakeholders responded to the survey. Stakeholders from NRM local groups and NRM regional organisations together made up half of the responses (respectively 31% and 21% of responses). However, all the other groups were well represented: direct NLP grant recipients made 12 per cent of the responses, Industry groups 12 per cent, state or local government 10 per cent and the ‘other’ group 14 per cent.

Figure 1. Respondents by stakeholder group



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 1’ Which of the following stakeholder groups do you belong to?’

Notes: Other stakeholder groups include: individuals (n=32), businesses including agricultural interests (n=27), wildlife/ animal care groups (n=19), Landcare groups (n=17) and Other environment community groups (n=16).

Respondents who identified themselves as Direct NLP grantees (109, 12% of all responses) had the opportunity to identify any other stakeholder group they belonged to. Most of them indicated they belonged to an NRM local group (69%), followed by Industry groups (27%) and NRM regional organisations (3%) (Table 1).

Table 1. Other stakeholder group (Direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | Percent |
| NRM regional organisations | 3 | 3% |
| NRM local groups | 61 | 69% |
| Industry groups | 24 | 27% |
| Total | 88 | 100% |
| Missing | 21 |  |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 2 ‘Which other stakeholder group do you belong to?’, n=88

Among the respondents who identified themselves primarily as NRM local groups, 70 per cent of them associated mostly with Landcare and other ‘care’ groups such as Bushcare, Rivercare or Coastcare (Table 2).

Table 2. Association with NRM groups (NRM local groups)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | Percent |
| Landcare groups and other ‘care’ groups | 195 | 70% |
| ‘Friends of’ groups and other community environment groups | 31 | 11% |
| Individual land managers working in the landcare/ NRM sector | 34 | 12% |
| Research entity (includes schools/ university) | 3 | 1% |
| Other | 14 | 5% |
| Total | 277 | 100% |
| Missing | 1 |  |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 7 ‘Which of the following NRM groups are you associated with?’, n=277

### Only four per cent of respondents were from Indigenous organisations

Across all stakeholder groups, 39 respondents were from Indigenous organisations, making up four per cent of all responses. The highest proportion was among other stakeholders (12%).

Table 3. Identification as Indigenous organisation (all respondents)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | Percent | Total (n) | Missing (n) |
| NRM regional organisations | 5 | 2% | 194 | 1 |
| NRM local groups | 4 | 1% | 277 | 1 |
| Direct NLP recipients | 8 | 7% | 107 | 2 |
| Industry groups | 2 | 1% | 111 | 0 |
| State or local government | 5 | 5% | 94 | 0 |
| Other | 15 | 12% | 128 | 1 |
| Total | 39 | 4% | 911 | 5 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 1 ‘Does your organisation identify as an Indigenous organisation?’, n=911

### Responses were received from all NRM regions

In terms of geographic coverage, responses were received from stakeholders operating in all States and Territories (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Distribution of respondents by jurisdictions



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 9 ‘What is/ are the main NRM region/regions you operate within?’, n=916 (multiple responses were permitted for this question)

## How the respondents relate to the National Landcare Programme

### The majority of respondents were involved in the Regional stream

In terms of involvement in the NLP, the programmes that stakeholders were mostly involved with (participated in, applied for funding but didn’t receive it or received funding) were:

* Regional stream: 41 per cent of all participants – with a much higher proportion, as expected, among NRM regional organisations (81%)
* Landcare networks (38%)
* 20 Million Trees (37%)
* Sustainable Agriculture Small Grants (37%)
* 25th Anniversary Landcare Grants (36%)
* Clean Up and Keep Australia Beautiful (15%).

Respondents from Indigenous organisations had a much higher involvement in a different range of programmes than all respondents, with the majority involved in Indigenous targeted grants, although mainstream programmes were well represented:

* Indigenous Protected Area (48%)
* Working on Country Rangers supplementation (29%)
* Clean Up and Keep Australia Beautiful (29%)
* Regional Stream (26%)
* 20 Million Trees (23%)
* 25th Anniversary Landcare Grants (20%).

| Table 4. Involvement in NLP sub-programmes (all respondents) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Involvement in NLP sub-programmes**  (Participated in, applied for funding but didn’t receive it and received funding) | **NRM regional organisations** | | **NRM local groups** | | **Direct NLP recipients** | | **Industry groups** | | **State or local government** | | **Other** | | **Total** | | **Indigenous organisations** | |
|  | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Regional Stream | 152 | 81% | 82 | 35% | 20 | 22% | 17 | 18% | 25 | 31% | 28 | 25% | 324 | 41% | 9 | 26% |
| Cumberland Conservation Corridor | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% | 3 | 3% | 7 | 1% | 0 | 0% |
| Kimberly Cane Toad Clean Up | 4 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 2% | 6 | 1% | 0 | 0% |
| Coastal River Recovery Initiatives | 7 | 6% | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% | 2 | 3% | 3 | 3% | 15 | 2% | 0 | 0% |
| Dandenong Ranges Programme | 6 | 5% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 9 | 1% | 0 | 0% |
| Whales and Dolphin protection | 0 | 0% | 2 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 2 | 2% | 6 | 1% | 0 | 0% |
| Clean Up and Keep Australia Beautiful grants | 17 | 13% | 35 | 18% | 11 | 13% | 7 | 8% | 12 | 16% | 19 | 18% | 101 | 15% | 8 | 29% |
| 20 Million Trees | 91 | 57% | 76 | 35% | 45 | 47% | 12 | 13% | 23 | 28% | 31 | 28% | 278 | 37% | 7 | 23% |
| 25th Anniversary Landcare Grants | 56 | 41% | 102 | 46% | 58 | 59% | 10 | 11% | 9 | 12% | 26 | 25% | 261 | 36% | 6 | 20% |
| Sustainable Agriculture | 66 | 46% | 80 | 37% | 40 | 44% | 44 | 44% | 16 | 22% | 24 | 22% | 270 | 37% | 3 | 11% |
| **Small Grants** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous Protected Area | 25 | 19% | 2 | 1% | 5 | 6% | 1 | 1% | 6 | 9% | 14 | 13% | 53 | 8% | 16 | 48% |
| World Heritage Grants | 9 | 7% | 3 | 2% | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 7 | 9% | 2 | 2% | 23 | 3% | 1 | 4% |
| Reef Programme | 24 | 9% | 17 | 4% | 7 | 4% | 12 | 7% | 3 | 2% | 5 | 2% | 68 | 5% | 1 | 2% |
| Working on Country Rangers supplementation | 16 | 12% | 1 | 1% | 2 | 2% | 1 | 1% | 3 | 4% | 12 | 11% | 35 | 5% | 9 | 29% |
| Target Area Grants | 40 | 29% | 10 | 5% | 2 | 2% | 3 | 3% | 11 | 15% | 10 | 10% | 76 | 11% | 3 | 11% |
| Environmental Stewardship Programme | 23 | 17% | 12 | 6% | 2 | 2% | 6 | 7% | 3 | 4% | 10 | 9% | 56 | 8% | 2 | 7% |
| Innovation Grants | 29 | 21% | 12 | 6% | 11 | 13% | 22 | 25% | 5 | 7% | 12 | 11% | 91 | 13% | 0 | 0% |
| Landcare Networks | 63 | 45% | 102 | 45% | 38 | 41% | 24 | 26% | 23 | 30% | 29 | 27% | 279 | 38% | 5 | 17% |
| Wildlife Health Australia | 2 | 1% | 4 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 5 | 3% | 16 | 8% | 29 | 2% | 0 | 0% |
| Biosecurity Incursion Management | 6 | 5% | 13 | 7% | 5 | 6% | 5 | 6% | 10 | 14% | 12 | 11% | 51 | 8% | 1 | 3% |
| Total | 195 |  | 278 |  | 109 |  | 111 |  | 94 |  | 129 |  | 916 |  | 39 |  |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 10 ‘What is your level of awareness of/ involvement in National Landcare Programme sub-programmes?’, n=916

Note: Total by stakeholder group doesn’t add up to 100% as multiple responses were permitted for this question

### A high proportion of applicants received NLP funding and it mostly met the needs and priorities of their group

Most (58%) NRM local group respondents applied for NLP funding through a NRM regional organisation, and 84 per cent of those who applied received funding. For those who didn’t receive funding, the main reason was because their application was not successful (68%), due to not enough funding available or that the project was not in line with regional priorities as specified in open comments. Of those NRM local groups who did receive funding, the vast majority (82%) felt that the funding received met their groups’ needs and priorities.

### Most NLP funded projects benefitted from other income streams and involved partnering with other stakeholders

Overall, 72 per cent of the respondents reported that their NLP funded projects benefited from income streams other than the NLP. This proportion was much higher among NRM regional organisations stakeholders (83% for all or some funded projects) compared to NRM local groups (69%) and direct NLP grant recipients (59%).

Table 5. Income streams other than the NLP (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes, all of our NLP funded projects | Yes, some of our funded projects | No | Total | | Missing |
| % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM regional organisations | 23% | 60% | 18% | 194 | 100% | 1 |
| NRM local groups (received funding) | 16% | 53% | 31% | 131 | 100% | 1 |
| Direct NLP recipients | 17% | 42% | 41% | 109 | 100% | 0 |
| Total | 19% | 53% | 27% | 434 | 100% | 2 |
| Indigenous organisations | 27% | 33% | 40% | 15 | 100% | 2 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 11 ‘Did your National Landcare Programme funded projects benefit from income streams other than the National Landcare Programme?’, n=434

Other income streams were mostly from state government and land managers/ owners.

Table 6. Other income streams NLP funded projects benefit from (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding and direct NLP grantees)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NRM regional organisations | | NRM local groups (received funding) | | Direct NLP grant recipients | | Total | |
|  | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Other Australian Government programmes or agencies | 82 | 51% | 32 | 35% | 20 | 31% | 134 | 43% |
| State government | 142 | 89% | 52 | 57% | 30 | 47% | 224 | 71% |
| Local government | 82 | 51% | 42 | 46% | 16 | 25% | 140 | 44% |
| Land managers/ owners | 127 | 79% | 57 | 63% | 35 | 55% | 219 | 70% |
| Philanthropic/ community | 61 | 38% | 39 | 43% | 19 | 30% | 119 | 38% |
| University or research organisation | 58 | 36% | 15 | 16% | 9 | 14% | 82 | 26% |
| Private/ own funding | 41 | 27% | 47 | 52% | 41 | 64% | 129 | 41% |
| Other | 18 | 11% | 14 | 15% | 5 | 8% | 37 | 12% |
| Total | 160 |  | 91 |  | 64 |  | 315 |  |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 12 ‘Which of the following income streams did your National Landcare Programme funded projects benefit from?’, n=315.

Notes: Total by stakeholder group doesn’t add up to 100% as multiple responses were permitted for this question. Other income streams include corporate funding (n=10), industry groups (n=7), levies (=5), Landcare groups (=5), small businesses (=3) and private funding (=2).

Stakeholders who received funding from the NLP (NRM regional organisations, direct NLP grant recipients and NRM local groups receiving funding) indicated that they partnered with other stakeholders to deliver their NLP funded projects. Most respondents partnered with land managers/ owners (83%), Landcare groups (72%), local community members (71%) and state or local government (71%).

Table 7. Partnering (co-investing) with other stakeholders in delivery of NLP funded projects (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding and direct NLP grantees)

| Partners | NRM regional organisations | | NRM local groups  (Received funding) | | Direct NLP recipients | | Total | | Indigenous organisations | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| State or local government | 168 | 90% | 72 | 59% | 48 | 48% | 288 | 71% | 8 | 57% |
| Landcare groups | 164 | 88% | 85 | 70% | 46 | 46% | 295 | 72% | 5 | 36% |
| Bushcare groups | 71 | 38% | 21 | 17% | 17 | 17% | 109 | 27% | 2 | 14% |
| Coastcare, Rivercare groups | 78 | 42% | 15 | 12% | 10 | 10% | 103 | 25% | 1 | 7% |
| Land managers/ owners | 177 | 95% | 97 | 80% | 62 | 63% | 336 | 83% | 8 | 57% |
| Local community members | 146 | 78% | 89 | 73% | 54 | 55% | 289 | 71% | 7 | 50% |
| Regional populations | 89 | 48% | 25 | 20% | 25 | 25% | 139 | 34% | 3 | 21% |
| Businesses | 89 | 48% | 25 | 20% | 30 | 30% | 144 | 35% | 3 | 21% |
| Indigenous groups | 143 | 77% | 33 | 27% | 23 | 23% | 199 | 49% | 9 | 64% |
| Non-governmental organisations | 141 | 76% | 37 | 30% | 38 | 38% | 216 | 53% | 6 | 43% |
| Farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups | 140 | 75% | 32 | 26% | 27 | 27% | 199 | 49% | 6 | 43% |
| Research organisation/ university | 135 | 73% | 37 | 30% | 26 | 26% | 198 | 49% | 3 | 21% |
| Other | 9 | 5% | 10 | 8% | 10 | 10% | 29 | 7% | 2 | 14% |
| Total | 186 | 100% | 122 | 100% | 99 | 100% | 407 | 100% | 15 | 100% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 13 ‘Did you partner (i.e. co-invest) with any of the following stakeholders to deliver your National Landcare Programme funded projects?’, n=336

Notes: Total by stakeholder group doesn’t add up to 100% as multiple responses were permitted for this question. Other partner stakeholders include: Landcare groups (n=5), NRM regional organisations (n=3), education institutions (n=3), private companies (n=3), animal care (n=3) and tourism organisations (n=3).

# NLP objectives and priorities

## NLP objectives

#### Stakeholders are aware of the NLP objectives and feel that they are aligned with the Australian Government priorities as well as their own

The vast majority of all stakeholders are aware of the NLP objectives (91% agree or tend to agree across all stakeholder groups) (Table 8).

Almost all stakeholders from NRM regional organisations confirmed that their NLP funded projects aligned with their Regional NRM Plan (95% agree or tend to agree); and close to three quarters of them felt that it allowed enough autonomy in setting regional and local priorities (72% agree or tend to agree).

Most NRM regional organisations stakeholders and direct grantees also felt that NLP funding meets the environmental (92% agree or tend to agree) and agricultural priorities (92%) of the Australian Government.

Industry stakeholders felt that NLP funding helps the industry improve sustainability (84% agree or tend to agree); and that improving sustainability helps the industry improve profitability (94%) and access to markets (91%).

Most stakeholders from NRM local groups, direct NLP grant recipients and other stakeholders also felt that NLP objectives align with their own NRM priorities (respectively 87%, 90% and 86% agree or tend to agree).

Indigenous organisations were less likely than all groups to be aware of the of the NLP objectives (81%).

Table 8. NLP objectives and priorities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objectives and priorities  (agree and tend to agree) | NRM regional organisations | | NRM local groups | | Direct NLP recipients | | Industry groups | | State or local government | | Other | | Total | | Indigenous organisations | |
|  | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| I am aware of NLP objectives | 189 | 99% | 219 | 87% | 104 | 98% | 90 | 88% | 76 | 84% | 103 | 86% | 781 | 91% | 30 | 81% |
| Our NLP funded projects align with our Regional NRM plan | 183 | 95% | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | 183 | 95% | 3 | 75% |
| NLP funding meets the environmental priorities of the Australian Government | 179 | 93% | NA | | 85 | 90% | NA | | NA | | NA | | 264 | 92% | 12 | 92% |
| NLP funding meets the agricultural priorities of the Australian Government | 173 | 94% | NA | | 65 | 84% | NA | | NA | | NA | | 238 | 92% | 12 | 100% |
| NLP allowed for enough autonomy in setting regional and local priorities | 135 | 72% | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | | 135 | 72% | 3 | 75% |
| NLP funding helps our industry improve sustainability | NA | | NA | | NA | | 88 | 84% | 80 | 93% | NA | | 168 | 82% | 5 | 100% |
| Improving sustainability helps our industry improve profitability | NA | | NA | | NA | | 100 | 94% | 73 | 87% | NA | | 173 | 85% | 5 | 100% |
| Improving sustainability helps our industry improve access to markets | NA | | NA | | NA | | 97 | 91% | 67 | 84% | NA | | 164 | 80% | 5 | 100% |
| NLP objectives aligns with my group’s NRM priorities | NA | | 204 | 87% | 88 | 90% | NA | | NA |  | 85 | 86% | 377 | 88% | 21 | 84% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 15 ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the National Landcare Programme (NLP) objectives and priorities?’.

## Stakeholder priorities

#### Most respondents’ NRM priorities are related to NLP priorities and have not changed in the last two years

Stakeholders NRM priorities are very or somewhat related to most NLP priorities (over two thirds for each NLP priority). However, there were two priorities with which respondents NRM priorities related to a lesser extent (Table 9):

* Build Indigenous knowledge and participation, to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity: 69 per cent of all respondents felt that their NRM priorities related to this NLP priority, with the lowest proportion among industry groups (53%). However, all Indigenous organisations reported their NRM priorities related to this NLP priority.
* Protecting or conserving Matters of National Environmental Significance including management of World Heritage Areas, Ramsar wetlands, national heritage etc.: 79 per cent of all respondents identified that their NRM priorities related to this NLP priority, with the lowest proportion among industry groups (68%).

NRM local groups, direct NLP grant recipients and other stakeholders identified their top 3 priorities. The main priorities identified were, by order of frequency across all respondents:

* Landscape restoration and conservation
* Water management and maintenance, waterways management
* Education and capacity building
* Weed and/or pest control – this was more frequently mentioned among direct NLP grant recipients
* Biodiversity – this was the most frequently mentioned priority among NRM local groups
* Sustainable agriculture.

Direct NLP grant recipients also mentioned community engagement and facilitating cooperation as key priorities.

Overall, 86% of all respondents felt that their priorities had not changed over the past 2 years (Figure 3). When respondents identified some changes, those were due to changes in focus (in particular more focus on weed or pest control, on climate change, on sustainable agriculture or on increasing community awareness) or due to reduced funding.

Figure 3. Change in NRM priorities over the past 2 years (all respondents)



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 18 ‘To what extent have your own NRM priorities changed over the past 2 years?’, n=912

Table 9. NLP priorities relating to respondents’ NRM priorities (all respondents)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NLP priorities relating to respondents’ NRM priorities  (Very related and Somewhat related) | NRM regional organisations | | NRM local groups | | Direct NLP recipients | | Industry groups | | State or local government | | Other | | Total | | Indigenous organisations | |
| n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Protection and restoration of ecosystem function, resilience and biodiversity | 193 | 100% | 270 | 99% | 106 | 98% | 101 | 94% | 84 | 96% | 117 | 96% | 871 | 98% | 35 | 97% |
| Appropriate management of invasive species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or native species | 191 | 99% | 263 | 98% | 98 | 93% | 98 | 90% | 83 | 91% | 116 | 93% | 849 | 95% | 33 | 94% |
| Sustainable management of agriculture and aquaculture to conserve and protect biological diversity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase carbon stored in soil | 182 | 94% | 213 | 81% | 87 | 81% | 103 | 95% | 70 | 78% | 104 | 85% | 759 | 86% | 28 | 76% |
| Build community awareness of biodiversity values, skills, participation and knowledge | 191 | 99% | 259 | 97% | 95 | 89% | 98 | 90% | 84 | 94% | 106 | 85% | 833 | 93% | 33 | 94% |
| Build Indigenous knowledge and participation, to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity | 187 | 97% | 147 | 60% | 63 | 61% | 53 | 53% | 65 | 74% | 74 | 64% | 589 | 69% | 35 | 100% |
| Promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity | 187 | 98% | 245 | 92% | 98 | 94% | 91 | 85% | 82 | 89% | 110 | 90% | 813 | 92% | 34 | 97% |
| Reduce the loss of natural habitats, degradation and fragmentation | 183 | 95% | 256 | 96% | 103 | 94% | 95 | 89% | 83 | 93% | 115 | 93% | 835 | 94% | 33 | 94% |
| Protecting or conserving Matters of National Environmental Significance including management of World Heritage Areas, Ramsar wetlands, national heritage etc. | 171 | 90% | 188 | 72% | 73 | 71% | 70 | 68% | 77 | 87% | 95 | 79% | 674 | 79% | 31 | 88% |
| Reduce the number of nationally threatened species and improve their conservation status | 180 | 93% | 228 | 86% | 88 | 83% | 74 | 69% | 77 | 85% | 111 | 89% | 758 | 86% | 32 | 92% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 17 ‘Below are listed the national and international priorities that the National Landcare Programme supports. How strongly do your own NRM priorities relate to these National Landcare Programme priorities?’.

## Suggested changes to NLP objectives and priorities

All stakeholder groups were asked about what to change in relation to NLP objectives and priorities. Out of the 916 survey respondents, 486 provided comments to this question (53% overall response rate), with slight differences between stakeholder groups (Table 10).

Table 10. Response rate to the question about what to change – NLP objectives and priorities (all stakeholder groups)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eligible respondents | Respondents | Response rate |
| NRM regional organisations | 195 | 102 | 52% |
| NRM local groups | 278 | 157 | 56% |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 109 | 51 | 47% |
| Industry groups | 111 | 58 | 52% |
| State or local government | 94 | 44 | 47% |
| Other | 129 | 74 | 57% |
| Total | 916 | 486 | 53% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 47d ‘If there is one thing to change in each of the following areas of the National Landcare Programme, what would it be? – National Landcare Programme objectives and priorities’, n=486

The most prominent theme overall, and from every group apart from industry groups, was that the existing priorities worked well and did not need change. From participants who suggested improvements, the key themes by order of frequency across all respondents were:

* More focus on regional/ sub-regional/ local priorities or needs
* Increase community consultation and participation
* Remove certain programs, in particular the Green Army and 20 Million Trees programs
* More focus on sustainable agriculture.

Every stakeholder group prioritised focusing on local and regional needs. Many respondents expressed their belief that community focus had been lost by the NRM model, and was needed in order to engage community members to protect the environment, effectively deal with environmental issues, and give precedence to relevant regional issues.

The focus on community and local planning appears to have been lost by using the NRM model. Whilst regional planning is important it shouldn't come at the expense of community led initiatives. [Industry group stakeholder]

These are not relevant to local communities [NRM local group stakeholder]

Another frequent theme related to the previous one was to increase community participation. This was mentioned in particular by NRM local groups and industry groups’ respondents.

Increased involvement by the community and industry groups in priority and goal setting [Industry group stakeholder]

Other areas for improvements mentioned included making NLP objectives more flexible (NRM regional organisations), changing the wording of some specific current Strategic objectives (NRM regional organisations), more focus on biodiversity (NRM local groups), more focus on raising awareness and climate change (state or local government) and more focus on Indigenous communities or programs (other).

# Community engagement

## Community participation

All questions in this section were asked to NRM regional organisations stakeholders only.

#### NRM regional organisations provided opportunities for community stakeholders to participate and incorporated community priorities in regional NRM planning

Over two thirds of the NRM regional organisation stakeholders indicated that they provided a lot or a moderate number of opportunities for community participation, with more opportunities for delivering of NLP funded projects (69% provided a lot of opportunities) compared to planning (39%) and priority setting (33%) (Table 11).

Table 11. Opportunities for community participation (NRM regional organisations)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A lot | Moderate number | Only a few | None | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| Priority setting of NLP funded projects in your area | 33% | 43% | 17% | 6% | 192 | 100% | 3 |
| Planning of NLP funded projects delivered by your NRM regional organisation | 39% | 40% | 17% | 4% | 191 | 100% | 4 |
| Delivering of NLP funded projects by your NRM regional organisation | 69% | 23% | 7% | 1% | 192 | 100% | 3 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 20 ‘To what extent did you provide opportunities for your community to participate in the following?’.

The vast majority of NRM regional organisation respondents reported that they were able to incorporate community priorities in regional planning (97%). This was done mainly through community consultations that involved focus groups, forums, surveys, or through existing committees.

Stakeholder groups most likely to be involved in planning were: state or local government (81%), Indigenous groups (72%), Landcare groups (71%); and those most likely to be involved in delivery were land managers/ owners (89%), Landcare groups (89%), Indigenous groups (83%), state or local government (77%), local community members (76%), non-governmental organisations (74%), and farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups (74%) (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Community participation (NRM regional organisations only)



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 21 ‘To what extent did the following community members/ groups participate in the planning and/or delivery of regional NRM projects funded by the National Landcare Programme?’, n=195 (multiple responses were permitted for this questions)

Notes: Other groups included: conservation bodies (n=4), industry groups (n=3), NRM related groups (n=2) and community groups (n=2).

## Stakeholder participation

All questions in this section were asked of NRM local groups, industry, and state or local government.

#### Stakeholders were satisfied with the level of community engagement

Stakeholders were asked about their level of engagement in several NLP processes, and then about their level of satisfaction with regard to this level of engagement (Figure 5). A majority of stakeholders across all groups reported being very or somewhat engaged in priority setting (61% of NRM local groups, 52% of industry groups and 65% of state or local government). The majority of state or local government stakeholders were also engaged in the planning (60% very or somewhat engaged) and developing the regional NRM plan (58%). Conversely, a minority of stakeholders reported being engaged in priority setting of NLP funds delivered by regions (39% for NRM local groups, 27% for industry groups and 43% for state or local government).

Despite some differences in the level of engagement across the different NLP processes and between stakeholder groups, a majority of respondents from each of the groups felt satisfied with this level of engagement. This means that stakeholders are satisfied with a lower level of engagement with regard to priority setting.

The majority of stakeholders from each of these groups felt that their suggestions were considered and potentially taken on board. The proportion was higher among state or local governments (73%) compared to NRM local groups (65%) and industry groups (57%).

Table 12. Suggestions considered/ taken on board (NRM local groups, industry, state or local government)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very much | Somewhat | Not very | Not at all | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM local groups | 17% | 48% | 23% | 12% | 265 | 100% | 13 |
| Industry groups | 14% | 43% | 29% | 13% | 104 | 100% | 7 |
| State or local government | 20% | 53% | 13% | 15% | 87 | 100% | 7 |
| Total | 17% | 48% | 22% | 13% | 456 | 100% | 27 |
| Indigenous organisation | 20% | 60% | - | 20% | 10 | 100% | 1 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 26 ‘Do you feel your suggestions were considered/ taken on board?’, n=456

Figure 5. Community engagement: level of engagement and of satisfaction (NRM local groups, industry, state or local government)



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 25 ‘For each of the following aspects, please indicate your level of engagement and your satisfaction with this level of engagement.’

Of those stakeholders from NRM local groups, industry, and state or local government who were engaged in projects with NRM regional organisations through NLP funding, most (over 80%) identified that the projects focused on

* building community awareness of biodiversity values, skills, participation and knowledge (85% across all three stakeholder groups)
* protection and restoration of ecosystem function, resilience and biodiversity (83%)

Less than half reported that the projects undertaken related to:

* building Indigenous knowledge and participation, to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (42%)
* reducing the loss of natural habitats, degradation and fragmentation (48%) (Table 13).

Results for Indigenous organisations are shown in Table 12, and vary somewhat from those of all respondents. However, the number of respondents is small, so care should be taken in using these results.

Table 13. Priorities and threats addressed by projects undertaken by local regional bodies (NRM local groups, industry, state or local government)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Priorities and threats | NRM local groups | | Industry groups | | State or local government | | Total | | Indigenous organisations | |
| n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Protection and restoration of ecosystem function, resilience and biodiversity | 127 | 46% | 29 | 66% | 38 | 83% | 194 | 53% | 4 | 67% |
| Appropriate management of invasive species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or native species | 113 | 41% | 25 | 57% | 37 | 80% | 175 | 48% | 3 | 50% |
| Sustainable management of agriculture and aquaculture to conserve and protect biological diversity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase carbon stored in soil | 93 | 34% | 34 | 77% | 32 | 70% | 159 | 44% | 4 | 67% |
| Build community awareness of biodiversity values, skills, participation and knowledge | 123 | 45% | 35 | 80% | 41 | 89% | 199 | 55% | 3 | 50% |
| Build Indigenous knowledge and participation, to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity | 61 | 22% | 13 | 30% | 24 | 52% | 98 | 27% | 3 | 50% |
| Reduce the loss of natural habitats, degradation and fragmentation | 73 | 27% | 15 | 34% | 24 | 52% | 112 | 31% | 1 | 17% |
| Protecting or conserving Matters of National Environmental Significance including management of World Heritage Areas, Ramsar wetlands, national heritage | 87 | 32% | 14 | 32% | 30 | 65% | 131 | 36% | 2 | 33% |
| Reduce the number of nationally threatened species and improve their conservation status | 107 | 39% | 26 | 59% | 35 | 76% | 168 | 46% | 4 | 67% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 28 ‘What priorities and threats did the projects undertaken by your local regional bodies address?’

# NLP processes

All questions in this chapter were asked to two stakeholder groups: NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients.

## Appropriateness of NLP funding mechanism

Most respondents of both groups felt that the current NLP funding mechanisms (e.g. small grants, regional delivery etc.) are the best way (efficient and effective) to deliver NLP objectives (83% of respondents from NRM regional organisations agree or tend to agree, and 73% of direct NLP grant recipient respondents). Both groups were also positive about the NLP encouraging cooperation between government and stakeholders (90% and 88% respectively) (Table 14).

Table 14. NLP implementation (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NLP implementation  (agree and tend to agree) | NRM regional organisations | | Direct NLP grant recipients | | Total | |
|  | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| The current funding mechanisms are the best way to deliver NLP objectives | 163 | 90% | 86 | 88% | 249 | 89% |
| NLP encourages cooperation between government and stakeholders | 149 | 83% | 77 | 73% | 226 | 79% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 31 ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about National Landcare Programme implementation?’.

## Communication and advice provided

Most stakeholders (over 80%) from NRM regional organisations and direct grantees found that both the NLP application and funding requirements were well communicated. The proportion is slightly higher among NRM regional organisations stakeholders compared to direct NLP grant recipients. Most of them also indicated that information on key NLP implementation decisions is publicly available (Table 15).

Table 15. Communication about NLP processes (NRM regional organisations and direct grantees)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication about NLP requirements  (agree and tend to agree) | NRM regional organisations | | Direct NLP grant recipients | | Total | |
|  | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| NLP **application** requirements have been well communicated to our organisation | 154 | 89% | 91 | 84% | 245 | 87% |
| NLP **funding** requirements have been well communicated to our organisation | 150 | 88% | 94 | 87% | 244 | 87% |
| Information on key NLP implementation decisions is publicly available | 127 | 76% | 75 | 82% | 202 | 78% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 29 ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about how well communicated and designed the following National Landcare Programme aspects are?’ and Question 31 ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about National Landcare Programme implementation?’.

A number of stakeholders from NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients reported seeking advice from the Department of the Environment and Energy, or the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources. The highest proportion was in relation to developing the MERI plan, with a much higher proportion for NRM regional organisation respondents (88%) compared to direct NLP grant recipients (46%). When they sought advice from any of the Departments, the vast majority of respondents from both groups found the advice provided helpful (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Stakeholders seeking advice and helpfulness of information provided (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 42 ‘Did you seek advice or feedback from the Australian Department of the Environment and Energy, or the Australian Department of Agriculture and Water Resources on the following?’ and Question 43 ‘How helpful was the information you received?’

## Simplicity of processes

The majority of respondents from NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients found completing the funding application and finalising the contract simple or somewhat simple. However, while 64 per cent of direct NLP grant recipients also found the monitoring and reporting requirements simple, this was the case for only 36 per cent of NRM regional organisation respondents (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Simplicity of NLP processes (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 30 ‘Please indicate how simple you have found the following National Landcare Programme processes.’

## Application and MERI processes

Across both groups, 70 per cent of the respondents submitted an application form and MERI plan as their funding application, with some substantial differences between the groups. While respondents from NRM regional organisations mostly reported submitting both documents (82%), direct NLP grant recipients were almost evenly split between submitting an application form only (47%) and both an application and a MERI plan (51%).

Table 16. Documents submitted as part of NLP funding application (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Document submitted | Application form only | MERI plan only | Application form and MERI plan | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM regional organisations | 7% | 12% | 82% | 163 | 100% | 32 |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 47% | 2% | 51% | 102 | 100% | 7 |
| Total | 22% | 8% | 70% | 265 | 100% | 39 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 32 ‘Which of the following documents did you submit as part of your National Landcare Programme funding application?’, n=265

When asked about their preference for funding application requirements, 65 per cent of the respondents across both groups would prefer to submit an application form followed by the development of a MERI plan once the funding is approved (Figure 8). This proportion is much higher among direct NLP grant recipients (75%) compared to NRM regional organisations (58%).

Figure 8. Preferred NLP funding application requirement (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 41 ‘Which of the following would you prefer as a National Landcare Programme funding application requirement?’, n=266

Stakeholders from NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients who submitted a MERI plan were also asked to comment on traditional application forms compared to MERI plans as an application (the previous closed question was asked to all direct grantees and NRM regional organisations stakeholders whether they had submitted a MERI plan or not). A total of 158 stakeholders commented on that aspect, 112 from NRM regional organisations and 46 direct NLP grant recipients.

When comparing the strengths and weaknesses of the MERI plan and traditional application forms, participants valued how MERI ensured project delivery aligned with project objectives, gave stronger evidence for achieving targets than traditional forms, and helped staff to think through critical areas such as outcomes and partners ahead of time. Many found the MERI plan to be time consuming and complex, although participants had mixed views on whether or not this was appropriate for the first time using a new format.

Some respondents mentioned that the length of the MERI plan meant that it would be most effective after traditional applications had been accepted, so as to not waste the time and resources necessary to prepare the plan.

I think they are both necessary for competitive projects because of the time/ resources involved in developing a MERI Plan which is very detailed and complex - this is a lot of work to do for a competitive application which may not succeed. However, for regional delivery 'base' funding, it makes sense to just go straight to the MERI Plan and avoid duplication involved with the application form. As the MERI Plan is a living document this (presumably) would also enable greater flexibility to adapt project delivery without the need for a formal variation from specifics contained in the funding deed which reflects very early thinking in a projects lifecycle - this is an important advantage. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

A number of respondents were critical towards MERI (too complex, onerous, time consuming). This is further discussed in section 5.4.2 based on comments about what stakeholders identified to change in relation to the MERI requirements.

### Application form

#### Resources spent

The majority of the respondents who submitted an application form indicated that less than 5 people were involved in filling in the application form (67%) and spent greater than 20 hours (57%). This proportion, however, is substantially different in the two groups, which is probably due to differences in the requirements: 79 per cent of NRM regional organisations stakeholders spent greater than 20 hours filling in the application form compared to just 27 per cent of the direct NLP grant recipients (Table 17 and Table 18).

Table 17. Number of people involved in filling in the application form (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Less than 5 | 5-10 | 10-15 | 15-20 | Greater than 20 | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM regional organisations | 45% | 42% | 6% | 7% | 1% | 121 | 100% | 23 |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 94% | 6% |  |  |  | 97 | 100% | 3 |
| Total | 67% | 26% | 3% | 4% | 0% | 218 | 100% | 26 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 33 ‘Approximately how many people were involved in filling in the application form?’, n=218

Table 18. Total time all people spent filling in the application form (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Less than 5 hours | 5-10 hours | 10-20 hours | 20-40 hours | Greater than 40 hours | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM regional organisations | 5% | 5% | 11% | 16% | 63% | 131 | 100% | 13 |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 15% | 29% | 29% | 14% | 13% | 100 | 100% | 0 |
| Total | 9% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 42% | 231 | 100% | 13 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 34 ‘What is your estimate of the total time all people spent filling in the application form?’, n=231

#### Suggested changes to the application process

Respondents from NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients were asked about the one thing they would change in the NLP application process. Out of the 304 eligible respondents to this question, 184 commented (61% overall response rate), with direct NLP grant recipients being more likely to comment (Table 19).

Table 19. Response rate to the question about what to change – Application process (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eligible respondents | Respondents | Response rate |
| NRM regional organisations | 195 | 114 | 58% |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 109 | 70 | 64% |
| Total | 304 | 184 | 61% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 47a’If there is one thing to change in each of the following areas of the National Landcare Programme, what would it be? – Application process’, n=184

A number of respondents to this question identified that no change was required to the application process; this was particularly the case among direct NLP grant recipients.

For those who suggested improvements, the key themes were, by order of frequency across both stakeholder groups:

* A simpler, more streamlined process
* More time to complete applications – this was more frequently mentioned by NRM regional organisations stakeholders
* Improve application forms – this was more frequently mentioned by Direct NLP grant recipients
* More opportunities to invest in regional priorities – this was only suggested by NRM regional organisations stakeholders.

Both groups mentioned streamlining the application process as the main area for improvement. Participants suggested removing duplications, reducing the number of questions, improving the user-friendliness of the form, and using less jargon and formal language. Direct NLP grant recipients highlighted this in particular, and recommended improving the mapping tool, and using smart forms and standard templates to simplify the process.

The Application process should be much simpler. The personal responsibility is enormous and the technical and financial responsibilities are huge and put great pressure on participants. The amount of work required to justify every step of the grant is simply not worth it, when all you are doing is giving freely of your time and energy to make the environment better. [Direct NLP grant recipient]

Some stakeholders, from NRM regional organisations in particular, identified the need for more time, both to prepare applications, and to allow for consultation with groups in the community. NRM regional organisation respondents also highlighted the ability for regional organisations to set priorities, and aligning applications with regional plans as important improvements. As one stakeholder summarised it, more time should be allowed for community consultation:

More time to consult with the community and all relevant stakeholders. I think it should be a requirement that the application include meaningful participation of stakeholders and sufficient time periods be given to allow for this. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

Participants who desired more time for applications also requested more guidance and information ahead of the application due date, to clarify the process and reduce time wasted trying to understand new tasks such as developing a program logic.

The application process was very stressful and draining on productivity. Guidance documents must be made available to applicants well in advance of the deadline for submission, and realistic time frames must be allowed (6 - 8 weeks) to complete the application process. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

The application process for our NRM body was more of a negotiation with regional investor representatives and there was a limited amount of control over the final program makeup. I would prefer to see clear guidelines issued on program objectives and expectations, and criteria for assessment, and then the NRM body designing a suite of projects to fit these. There was too much personal and subjective influence by investor reps. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

### MERI plan

#### Resources spent

The majority of the respondents who completed the MERI plan indicated that less than 5 people were involved in completing it. However, this proportion was much higher among direct NLP grant recipients compared to NRM regional organisations stakeholders who mostly had up to 10 people involved in completing the MERI plan (Table 20).

Three quarters of the respondents reported that it could take up to 4 weeks to develop the MERI plan (Table 21), and 54 per cent indicated that it required an additional 20 hours to finalise this plan (Table 22). Most NRM regional organisations stakeholders spent more time developing the MERI plan (68% spending more than 2 weeks) and finalising it (65% spending over 20 hours) compared to direct NLP grant recipients (81% spending up to 2 weeks developing it, and 55% spending up to 10 hours).

Table 20. Number of people involved in completing the MERI plan (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Less than 5 | 5-10 | 10-20 | Greater than 20 | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM regional organisations | 38% | 46% | 15% | 1% | 130 | 100% | 22 |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 90% | 8% | 2% |  | 52 | 100% | 2 |
| Total | 53% | 35% | 11% | 1% | 182 | 100% | 24 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 35 ‘Approximately how many people were involved in completing the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan?’, n=182

Table 21. Total time spent developing the MERI plan (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time spent developing MERI | Less than 1 week | 1-2 weeks | 2-4 weeks | More than 4 weeks | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM regional organisations | 3% | 19% | 47% | 31% | 138 | 100% | 14 |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 43% | 38% | 9% | 9% | 53 | 100% | 1 |
| Total | 14% | 24% | 37% | 25% | 191 | 100% | 15 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 36 ‘What is your estimate of the total time all people spent initially in developing the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan until the first submission to the Department?’, n=191

Table 22. Total time spent finalising the MERI plan (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Less than 5 hours | 5-10 hours | 10-20 hours | 20-40 hours | Greater than 40 hours | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | % | % | n | % | n |
| NRM regional organisations | 4% | 11% | 20% | 23% | 42% | 138 | 100% | 14 |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 30% | 25% | 23% | 11% | 11% | 53 | 100% | 1 |
| Total | 11% | 15% | 21% | 20% | 34% | 191 | 100% | 15 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 37 ‘What is your estimate of the total time all people spent finalising the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan (once submitted to the Department)?’, n=191

#### Feedback about the MERI plan

When asked to provide feedback about the MERI plan (Table 23), a majority of respondents

* Understood what they needed to include in the MERI plan (82% agree or tend to agree)
* Found MERI a useful planning tool and refer to their plans to ensure the project is on track (75%).

A lower proportion of respondents refer to their MERI plan to identify issues in the project and inform future design and delivery of their projects. This proportion is much higher among NRM regional organisations stakeholders (81%) compared to direct NLP grant recipients (58%).

Fewer stakeholders reported MERI being a useful communication tool (53% agree or tend to agree), capturing practice change well (53%) and capturing agricultural outcomes well (54%).

Table 23. MERI plan feedback (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MERI statement  (agree and tend to agree) | NRM regional organisations | | Direct NLP grant recipients | | Total | |
|  | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| I understood what I needed to include in the MERI plan | 107 | 82% | 40 | 80% | 147 | 82% |
| MERI is a useful planning tool | 114 | 81% | 36 | 75% | 150 | 79% |
| I refer to my MERI plan to ensure the project is on track | 109 | 81% | 29 | 58% | 138 | 75% |
| I refer to my MERI plan to identify issues in the project | 85 | 65% | 22 | 45% | 107 | 60% |
| I refer to my MERI plan to inform future design and delivery of my project | 103 | 77% | 22 | 45% | 125 | 68% |
| MERI is a useful communication tool for my organisation to share information on project delivery with the community | 72 | 52% | 26 | 55% | 98 | 53% |
| MERI captures practice change well | 69 | 53% | 25 | 53% | 94 | 53% |
| MERI captures environmental outcomes well | 80 | 59% | 31 | 62% | 111 | 60% |
| MERI captures agricultural outcomes well | 70 | 55% | 19 | 50% | 89 | 54% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 39 ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan?’

Stakeholders were also split in regards to the amount of time spent on the MERI plan compared to the benefits generated (Table 24). Overall, 47% of the respondents felt they spent the right amount of time and budget in developing and implementing MERI compared to benefits generated, while 49% felt they spent too much time. The proportion of respondents who felt they spent the right amount of time and budget was slightly higher among direct NLP grant recipients compared to NRM regional organisations stakeholders.

Table 24. Time and cost of developing and implementing the MERI plan compared to benefits generated (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Right amount of time and budget | Spent too much time and budget | Spent too little time and budget | Total | | Missing |
|  | % | % | % | n | % |  |
| NRM regional organisations | 46% | 49% | 6% | 138 | 100% | 14 |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 49% | 49% | 2% | 53 | 100% | 1 |
| Total | 47% | 49% | 5% | 191 | 100% | 15 |
| Indigenous organisations | 67% | 17% | 17% | 6 | 100% | 1 |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 40 ‘How do you feel about the time and cost of developing and implementing the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan compared to the benefits generated for the funded project and your organisation?’, n=191

#### Suggested changes to the MERI plan

Stakeholders from NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients also had the opportunity to identify one thing to change the MERI requirements. Out of the 304 respondents eligible to respond to this question, 201 commented (66% overall response rate), with little difference in the response rate between the two groups (Table 25).

Table 25. Response rate to the question about what to change – MERI requirements (NRM regional organisations and direct NLP grant recipients)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eligible respondents | Respondents | Response rate |
| NRM regional organisations | 195 | 130 | 67% |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 109 | 71 | 65% |
| Total | 304 | 201 | 66% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 47b ’If there is one thing to change in each of the following areas of the National Landcare Programme, what would it be? – MERI requirements’, n=201

The main comments provided, across both groups were, by order of frequency:

* MERI is too onerous, and resource intensive
* MERI should be simpler and streamlined – this was more frequently mentioned by direct NLP grant recipients
* More information and explanation around requirements is needed – this was more frequently mentioned by direct grant recipients
* MERI should collect only the information that is useful.

Participants identified MERI forms as burdensome, time consuming, complex, and repetitive, and recommended simplifying them, particularly for volunteers and lay people tasked with filling out the forms. Stakeholders were also critical about changes to the requirements along the way. The changes in forms and requirements were seen as disruptive and damaging to useful data collection.

Just make it simple. The benefits and outcomes are often cumulative and hard to judge from the one event. [Direct NLP grant recipient]

Stop changing the goalposts all the time. Develop a system, listen to feedback, improve it and then don't change it. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

Simpler MERI both in the planning and the filling out, some small groups have trouble with internet and this effects how they can upload to the MERI system. [Direct NLP grant recipient]

Direct grant recipients mentioned needing support and advice to complete the forms, particularly as expectations differed between people, and expectations seemed to change throughout the process.

NRM regional organisations stakeholders emphasised the difference between regions, which meant a standard MERI form asked for information that was not relevant or necessary, as it tried to fit a ‘one size fits all’ approach.

Recognition that systems vary across the nation. The model of trying to have one size fits all, while ideal for consolidating reporting, does not fit/ align with many project activities. Having more scope to build projects that fit into communities/ localities and develop relevant report & monitoring would give greater value to the project proponents. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

# Project outcomes and beneficiaries

## Outcomes

### The importance of NLP funding for funded projects

The majority of all stakeholders who received direct funding (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding or direct NLP grant recipients) indicated that none of the NLP funded projects would have gone ahead if they had not received NLP funding. The proportion was higher among direct NLP grant recipients (60%) compared to NRM regional organisations stakeholders (54%) and NRM local groups who received funding (50%) (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Number of projects that would have gone ahead without NLP funding (NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who received funding or direct NLP grant recipients)



Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 14 ‘How many of the National Landcare Programme funded projects would have gone ahead if they had not received National Landcare Programme funding?’, n=433

### Direct impacts

All NRM stakeholders were asked about the broad impacts of the NLP (Table 26). While the majority of stakeholders agreed with all types of potential impacts listed, the most frequently identified across all stakeholder groups were:

* Improved landscape management (86% agree or tend to agree)
* Increased adoption of sustainable management practices (86%)
* Enhanced social and institutional capacity for sustainable management practices (82%).

Table 26. Impact of NLP (all respondents)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Impact of NLP: As a result of NLP funded projects…  (agree and tend to agree) | NRM regional organisations | | NRM local groups | | Direct NLP grant recipients | | Industry groups | | State or local government | | Other | | Total | | Indigenous organisations | |
| n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| … landscape management has improved | 169 | 92% | 203 | 81% | 91 | 91% | 85 | 88% | 72 | 88% | 85 | 79% | 705 | 86% | 26 | 84% |
| … there is enhanced social and institutional capacity for sustainable management practices | 167 | 92% | 180 | 73% | 85 | 87% | 85 | 83% | 68 | 86% | 82 | 75% | 667 | 82% | 26 | 84% |
| … the adoption of sustainable farming and fishing management practices has increased | 166 | 95% | 187 | 82% | 70 | 90% | 92 | 88% | 57 | 85% | 79 | 74% | 651 | 86% | 21 | 78% |
| … community involvement in natural resource management has increased | 170 | 93% | 184 | 71% | 81 | 82% | 75 | 81% | 63 | 76% | 85 | 74% | 658 | 79% | 27 | 79% |
| … there are better partnerships between individuals/ communities and NRM regional organisations | 173 | 93% | 183 | 72% | 81 | 80% | 73 | 74% | 66 | 80% | 76 | 72% | 652 | 78% | 28 | 78% |
| … the level of protection, rehabilitation, restoration of prioritised environmental assets, threatened species, ecological communities and/or migratory species has increased | 165 | 92% | 166 | 67% | 86 | 87% | 73 | 78% | 58 | 73% | 80 | 71% | 628 | 77% | 24 | 75% |
| … Indigenous participation in natural resource management has increased | 166 | 92% | 129 | 74% | 47 | 66% | 52 | 76% | 49 | 71% | 62 | 75% | 505 | 78% | 27 | 79% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 44 ‘To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the impact of the National Landcare Programme? As a result of National Landcare Programme funded projects …’

### Indirect impacts

Stakeholders were then asked about indirect impacts of the NLP. A high proportion of respondents (over 90%) said that the NLP has had a large positive impact or small positive impact on developing skills and knowledge in NRM and environmental health. A slightly lower proportion of respondents (between 70% and 80%) said NLP has had a positive impact on the economy, community engagement and sustainable agriculture. A lower proportion (between 50% and 69%) said there was a positive impact on jobs or public health.

Table 27. Indirect impact of NLP (all respondents)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indirect impact of NLP  (large positive impact and small positive impact) | NRM regional organisations | | NRM local groups | | Direct NLP grant recipients | | Industry groups | | State or local government | | Other | | Total | | Indigenous organisations | |
|  | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Economy | 142 | 84% | 155 | 72% | 64 | 74% | 64 | 72% | 54 | 76% | 62 | 67% | 541 | 75% | 22 | 71% |
| Jobs | 136 | 82% | 142 | 64% | 60 | 71% | 45 | 55% | 50 | 66% | 61 | 68% | 494 | 69% | 20 | 65% |
| Developing skills and knowledge in managing natural resources (capacity building) | 183 | 97% | 227 | 89% | 97 | 95% | 89 | 93% | 73 | 90% | 87 | 83% | 756 | 92% | 33 | 89% |
| Community engagement | 183 | 97% | 219 | 86% | 95 | 92% | 80 | 86% | 76 | 90% | 84 | 78% | 737 | 89% | 31 | 86% |
| Social wellbeing | 133 | 83% | 167 | 72% | 71 | 79% | 56 | 64% | 56 | 73% | 66 | 70% | 549 | 74% | 25 | 81% |
| Environmental health | 172 | 98% | 224 | 89% | 96 | 94% | 78 | 87% | 77 | 91% | 87 | 80% | 734 | 90% | 27 | 82% |
| Sustainable agriculture | 175 | 96% | 194 | 84% | 76 | 88% | 80 | 85% | 62 | 82% | 80 | 78% | 667 | 87% | 17 | 63% |
| Public health | 80 | 60% | 86 | 44% | 42 | 60% | 33 | 46% | 26 | 40% | 45 | 55% | 312 | 50% | 14 | 56% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 45 ‘On balance, what has been the impact of the National Landcare Programme in your region?’

## Beneficiaries

When asked about which groups benefitted from the outputs and outcomes of NLP funded projects, stakeholders most frequently identified land managers/ owners (73% moderate and significant benefits), farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups (61%) and local community members (60%). Stakeholder groups reported to benefit the least from the NLP were businesses (36%), regional populations (47%), and research organisations/ universities (47%) (Table 28).

Table 28. Benefits to stakeholder groups

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benefits to stakeholder groups  (significant benefits and moderate benefits) | NRM regional organisations | | NRM local groups | | Direct NLP grant recipients | | Industry groups | | State or local government | | Other | | Total | | Indigenous organisations | |
| n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Land managers/ owners | 160 | 86% | 158 | 65% | 85 | 83% | 67 | 66% | 62 | 70% | 68 | 64% | 600 | 73% | 28 | 76% |
| Local community members | 135 | 73% | 132 | 54% | 70 | 67% | 54 | 56% | 49 | 57% | 57 | 54% | 497 | 60% | 20 | 56% |
| Regional populations | 91 | 53% | 100 | 44% | 46 | 49% | 44 | 46% | 37 | 45% | 45 | 46% | 363 | 47% | 17 | 53% |
| Businesses | 65 | 39% | 58 | 28% | 41 | 45% | 32 | 34% | 30 | 38% | 37 | 39% | 263 | 36% | 16 | 52% |
| Indigenous community groups | 124 | 69% | 66 | 42% | 34 | 45% | 32 | 53% | 38 | 54% | 38 | 49% | 332 | 53% | 19 | 56% |
| Non-Indigenous community groups | 127 | 69% | 98 | 45% | 49 | 55% | 31 | 38% | 38 | 50% | 43 | 49% | 386 | 53% | 16 | 57% |
| Farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups | 119 | 71% | 104 | 51% | 53 | 65% | 60 | 59% | 46 | 67% | 56 | 61% | 438 | 61% | 18 | 69% |
| Research organisation/ university | 60 | 38% | 80 | 48% | 37 | 53% | 47 | 59% | 29 | 40% | 46 | 53% | 299 | 47% | 18 | 62% |
| Other | 6 | 75% | 5 | 38% | 4 | 44% | 5 | 71% | 2 | 33% | 12 | 63% | 34 | 55% | 2 | 29% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 46 ‘How much do you estimate each of the following groups have benefited from the outputs and outcomes of National Landcare Programme funded projects?

Notes: Other groups included community groups (n=9), NRM regional organisations (n=6), Landcare groups (n=6), schools (n=6), wildlife organisations (n=5) and environmental management groups (n=5).

# Future of the NLP

## What stakeholders want to retain

All respondents were asked to identify one thing they would not change in the NLP and why. Out of the 916 respondents to the survey, 535 provided a response to this question (58% overall response rate), with a substantially higher response rate among NRM regional organisation respondents compared to other groups (Table 29).

Table 29. Response rate to the question about what not to change (all respondents)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eligible respondents | Respondents | Response rate |
| NRM regional organisations | 195 | 131 | 67% |
| NRM local groups | 278 | 172 | 62% |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 109 | 69 | 63% |
| Industry groups | 111 | 50 | 45% |
| State or local government | 94 | 38 | 40% |
| Other | 129 | 75 | 58% |
| Total | 916 | 535 | 58% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 49 ‘What is the one thing you would not change in the programme and why?’, n=535

A number of respondents to this question identified things to change or areas for improvement, that were covered in other questions (see following section), thus those responses were excluded from this particular analysis.

The key themes identified around what not to change across all 535 respondents to this question, were, by order of frequency:

* The regional delivery model
* The length or timeframe of the program
* The community and local involvement aspect
* The funding
* The NLP brand (name and logo).

However, the frequency of themes varied greatly between stakeholder groups.

For the most frequent theme, the regional delivery model, half the mentions were made by respondents from NRM regional organisations who were supportive of the way the model was structured, the effectiveness of the NRM regional organisations and the Regional plans. Some NRM local groups and ‘other’ respondents were also in favour of the regional model, with particular emphasis on Regional Landcare Facilitators as beneficial. Very few industry groups mentioned the model as the thing they would not change. According to one stakeholder from an NRM regional organisation

Regional delivery structure. This structure allows strategic and targeted on ground delivery across areas despite other organisations capacity, politics in the area, population size or focus of other business and groups. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

A lot of stakeholders welcomed the multiyear timeframe of the NLP; this was equally frequently mentioned by the two main stakeholder groups, NRM regional organisations and NRM local groups, less frequently by other groups.

Multi-year funding is fantastic. The introduction of a 5-year NLP has been wonderful for the stability of staffing, long-term planning and delivery of well-planned outputs and outcomes. It also reduced the overhead burden by not requiring annual application-assessment processes. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

The community and local involvement aspects were mostly popular among state and local government, NRM local groups, Industry and Other groups.

Local engagement is vital - never centralise control when so many different areas of this country require different solutions to their local environment parameters. [Industry group stakeholder]

Retaining the funding of the NLP, in particular small grants, was a key theme among direct NLP grant recipients and NRM local groups.

Other key themes from individual stakeholder groups included MERI plans (NRM regional organisations), and the focus on sustainable agriculture (industry groups).

## Areas for improvement identified by stakeholders

Stakeholders also had the opportunity to identify areas for improvement for specific aspects of the NLP. As in the previous analysis, any mention of positive aspects of the NLP were excluded from this particular analysis as this was covered in another question.

### Program delivery approach

All stakeholder groups had also the opportunity to comment on the NLP program delivery approach (through small grants and regional delivery) and identify areas for improvement. This open-ended question is the one that received the most comments. Out of 916 survey respondents, 651 commented on what to change (71% overall response rate), with a substantially higher response rate among NRM local groups (Table 30)

Table 30. Response rate to the question about what to change – Program delivery approach (all respondents)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eligible respondents | Respondents | Response rate |
| NRM regional organisations | 195 | 123 | 63% |
| NRM local groups | 278 | 234 | 84% |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 109 | 75 | 69% |
| Industry groups | 111 | 73 | 66% |
| State or local government | 94 | 53 | 56% |
| Other | 129 | 93 | 72% |
| Total | 916 | 651 | 71% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 47c ‘If there is one thing to change in each of the following areas of the National Landcare Programme, what would it be? – Program delivery approach (e.g. delivery through small grants, regional delivery)’, n=651

A number of respondents identified no change or that the current program delivery approach was working fine; those responses were considered separately as aspects that were working well and were covered through another question. Stakeholders identifying no change or being positive about the current delivery approach were mostly from NRM regional organisations stakeholders and direct NLP grant recipients.

The key areas for improvement around the NLP delivery approach identified across all stakeholder groups were, by order of frequency:

* More funding
* Change the regional delivery model
* Change small grants delivery
* Expand the funding and program period
* Enhance and strengthen the regional delivery model.

More funding was a key priority for every stakeholder group except for NRM regional organisations. In particular, almost half of NRM local groups and direct NLP grant recipients mentioned increased funding as a priority. This included funding for small grants, for medium and large projects, for specific groups including on-ground groups, landholders, Landcare and local community, and funding for program management and administration. Examples of comments related to requests for more funding include:

NLP is very underfunded - there is much more demonstrated demand for funding for high quality projects that is unfunded and unsupported by existing institutions and organisations. [State or local government stakeholder]

I am aware of many high quality project proposals submitted by a range of NRM community groups and regional organisations which have been unsuccessful - reason given is always - "large demand not enough money"[State or local government]

Participants had varying and sometimes diverging views about the regional delivery model and small grants. While NRM local groups, state or local government and direct NLP recipient respondents were more likely to be critical of the regional delivery model, some stakeholders in particular from state or local government, direct NLP recipient and the other stakeholder groups identified issues with regard to the small grants. A number of stakeholders advocated for strengthening the regional delivery model, in particular respondents from NRM regional organisations.

The biggest issue respondents had with the Regional NRM model was funding being held or diverted through regional NRM groups, and used for administration as it travelled through multiple levels before reaching the community, significantly depleting local resources and outcomes, or not devolving enough to the community. These respondents, mostly from NRM local groups and direct NLP grant recipients, advocated for a separate funding stream for individuals and communities, in order that they could directly receive the necessary money. Other issues with the regional delivery model included the lack of clear NRM strategy, distance between regional organisations and local members, regional rigidity and a broad-brush approach, which did not take into account sub-regions and communities, and the competition between regional NRM and local groups for delivery.

The biggest issues respondents highlighted with small grants were their inefficiency in achieving long-term, large scale environmental outcomes – mostly mentioned by direct grant recipients and state or local government respondents – and the poor cohesion and oversight that small grant recipients had in comparison to regional NRM bodies – mostly mentioned by ‘Other’ respondents.

Regional delivery should be enhanced, with greater ability of regions to determine the best investment package for their region within broad themes. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

Regional delivery should be preferred delivery mechanism as it delivers larger, more effective and efficient landscape scale change. [NRM regional organisation stakeholder]

Current regional model is inefficient, expensive and has lost its way; it no longer functions to do the job it was set up to do. [State or local government stakeholder]

Reconsider limited benefits provided through small grants, given the need for landscape scale responses that require triennial (or longer) funding of organisations with capability to deliver on-ground strategic solutions and demonstrated ability to work in partnership with stakeholders (land owners, local government, Aboriginal rangers etc.). [Other stakeholder]

Previous funding programs which had opportunity to apply for larger grants directly delivered more coordinated cooperative projects than the individual landholder engagement we have seen through regional NRM organisation. [Direct NLP grant recipient]

### Other aspects

Finally, all stakeholder groups had the opportunity to comment on any other aspect of the NLP that they would like to change – beyond NLP objectives and priorities, application and MERI processes, and program delivery. A total of 206 respondents responded, mostly from NRM local groups (Table 31).

Table 31. Response rate to the question about what to change – Other aspects (all respondents)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eligible respondents | Respondents | Response rate |
| NRM regional organisations | 195 | 48 | 25% |
| NRM local groups | 278 | 78 | 28% |
| Direct NLP grant recipients | 109 | 22 | 20% |
| Industry groups | 111 | 17 | 15% |
| State or local government | 94 | 9 | 10% |
| Other | 129 | 32 | 25% |
| Total | 916 | 206 | 22% |

Source: NLP stakeholder survey. Question 47e ‘If there is one thing to change in each of the following areas of the National Landcare Programme, what would it be? – Other’, n=206

The main suggestions were, by order of frequency across all respondents:

* More funding – prioritised by every group but state or local government
* Improve reporting issues – this was more frequently mentioned among NRM regional organisations
* More regional or local influence – this was more frequently mentioned among NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups, and Other
* Expand program timeframe – this was more frequently mentioned among ‘Other’ groups
* More certainty and predictability with funding.

Responses to this question varied widely, with stakeholders also highlighting changes to MERI and more flexibility in use of grant money (NRM regional organisations), Indigenous or IPA programs (state or local government), and support and education (Industry groups).

Regional body needs to be less insular. [NRM local group stakeholder]

Reduce the large work load on individuals and groups to obtain and maintain funding by increasing certainty of funds and providing long-term support. Longer-term support does not imply a free ride, as organisations and individuals must still be fully accountable, but there is a lot of time spent 'feeding the beast' of processes, which could be redirected to on-ground support and creative thinking. [Direct NLP grant recipient]

Young farmers are interested in productivity and they should be encouraged as I find most young land managers are interested in the environment. [NRM local group stakeholder]

1. NLP stakeholder survey questionnaire

#### Overview

The Australian Government Department of the Environment and Energy and the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources invite you to provide feedback on the National Landcare Programme to help inform future program design. As you know, the Australian Government is investing $1 billion from its 2014 - 2018 budgets in the National Landcare Programme to drive sustainable agriculture and support the protection, conservation and rehabilitation of Australia’s natural environment. Our investment in the National Landcare Programme also contributes to a range of Australian Government priorities, including community engagement.

The survey is being conducted to gather your views on the National Landcare Programme – including National Landcare Programme priorities and the flow on benefits to your community. Further information regarding the ongoing review that the survey will inform can be found at nrm.gov.au.

The survey should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete and your response will be confidential. The government has engaged an independent consultancy firm, ARTD Consultants, to undertake this survey.

The present document is the paper/ electronic version of the survey available online at: <https://environment.au.citizenspace.com/biodiversity-conservation/nlp-stakeholder-survey>

Please provide your response by **14 October 2016**.

For more information on the National Landcare Programme see <http://www.nrm.gov.au/national-landcare-programme>.

#### Survey introduction

**Welcome to the National Landcare Programme NRM Stakeholder online survey**

This survey is your opportunity to contribute to the review of the National Landcare Programme.

Your responses are greatly appreciated and will be used in conjunction with other data to inform the National Landcare Programme review.

You will have the opportunity to register to receive results from the survey and/or outcomes of the National Landcare Programme review at the end of the survey. The overall review of the program will be completed by early 2017.

The very first question of the survey asks you which stakeholder group you belong to or mostly associate with. Depending on your response, you will have to answer a different set of questions as specified in the square brackets [ ] before each question.

If you have any questions about the form you can contact Erum Rasheed, ph 02 9373 9918, [NLP@artd.com.au](mailto:NLP@artd.com.au).

Thank you for your contribution.

* 1. Your details

1. [All respondents] Which of the following stakeholder groups do you belong to?

*Tick one option only. If you associate with more than one of the groups listed, select the one that is most strongly associated with (and most strongly influences your views on) the National Landcare Programme.*

**Your response to this question will determine which questions you will have to answer in the rest of the survey. Please refer to the square brackets [ ] before each question to determine if you are eligible to answer this question, and only answer questions for your stakeholder group.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Stakeholder group** | **Description** |
|  | Natural Resource Management (NRM) regional organisations | You are employed by one of the 56 NRM regional organisations funded through the National Landcare Programme. |
|  | NRM local groups­ | You are a member of a local NRM group or organisation. These groups or organisations include:   * Landcare groups and other ‘care’ groups such as bushcare, coastcare, rivercare etc. * ‘friends of’ groups and other community environment groups * Individual land managers working in the landcare/ NRM sector |
|  | Direct National Landcare Programme grant recipients | You are an individual or a member of a group or organisation—other than NRM regional organisations—directly funded through National Landcare Programme grants, including 25th Anniversary Landcare Grants, Innovation Grants and Sustainable Agriculture Small Grants 2015-16. |
|  | Industry groups | You represent or are a member of a farming, forestry, fishing or aquaculture industry group with an interest in natural resource management or sustainable agriculture issues. |
|  | State or local government | You are employed by state government environment and agriculture departments. |
|  | Other, please specify:  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | You do not fit the description of any of the groups above |

1. [Direct grantees only] Which other stakeholder group do you belong to?

*Tick one option only.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Stakeholder group** | **Description** |
|  | Natural Resource Management (NRM) regional organisations | You are employed by one of the 56 NRM regional organisations funded through the National Landcare Programme. |
|  | NRM local groups­ | You are a member of a local NRM group or organisation. These groups or organisations include:   * Landcare groups and other ‘care’ groups such as bushcare, coastcare, rivercare etc * ‘friends of’ groups and other community environment groups * Individual land managers working in the landcare/ NRM sector |
|  | Industry groups | You represent or are a member of a farming, forestry, fishing or aquaculture industry group with an interest in natural resource management or sustainable agriculture issues. |

1. [NRM local groups only] Did you apply **for** National Landcare Programme funding through a NRM regional organisation?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No (Go to Q7) |

1. [NRM local groups only; if Q3=Yes] Did you **receive** National Landcare Programme funding through a NRM regional organisation?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes (Go to Q6) |
|  | No (Go to Q5) |

1. [NRM local groups only; if Q4=No] What was the main reason for not receiving the funding?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not successful | Please specify the main reason for not being successful  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  | Other reason | Please specify  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

1. [NRM local groups only; if Q4=Yes] Did the funding received meet the needs and priorities of your group?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No, please specify the main reason why not  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

1. [NRM local groups] Which of the following NRM groups are you associated with?

If you associate with more than one of the groups listed, select the one that ismost strongly associated with (and most strongly influences your views on) the National Landcare Programme.

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Landcare groups and other ‘care’ groups such as bushcare, rivercare, coastcare |
|  | ‘Friends of’ groups and other community environment groups |
|  | Individual land managers working in the landcare/ NRM sector |
|  | Research entity (includes schools/ university) |
|  | Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

1. [All respondents] Does your organisation identify as an Indigenous organisation?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

1. [All respondents] What is/are the main NRM region/regions you operate within?

*Tick all that apply*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | New South Wales | Central Tablelands  Central West  Greater Sydney  Hunter  Murray  Northern Tablelands  North West NSW  North Coast  Riverina  South East  Western |
|  | South Australia | Alinytjara Wilurara  Eyre Peninsula  Kangaroo Island  Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges  South Australian Murray Darling Basin  Northern and Yorke  South Australian Arid Lands  South East |
|  | Victoria | Corangamite  East Gippsland  Glenelg Hopkins  Goulburn Broken  Mallee  North Central  North East  Port Phillip and Westernport  West Gippsland  Wimmera |
|  | Western Australia | Northern Agricultural  Perth  Peel Harvey  Rangelands  South Coast  South West  Wheatbelt |
|  | Tasmania | Cradle Coast  North  South |
|  | Northern territory |  |
|  | Queensland | Border Rivers Maranoa-Balonne  Burdekin  Burnett Mary  Cape York  Condamine  Cooperative Management Area (Cape York and Northern Gulf)  Desert Channels  Fitzroy  Mackay Whitsunday  Northern Gulf  South East Queensland  Southern Gulf  South West Queensland  Torres Strait  Wet Tropics |
|  | Australian Capital Territory |  |
|  | Ocean Watch |  |
|  | Unknown |  |

1. [All respondents] What is your level of awareness of/ involvement in National Landcare Programme sub-programs?

| *Tick one option only for each of the following programmes.* | Not aware of | Aware of, but no direct involvement | Participated in, but didn’t apply for funding | Applied for funding, but didn’t receive it | Received funding |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Regional stream** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Local programs** | | | | | |
| Cumberland Conservation Corridor |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kimberly Cane Toad Clean Up |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coastal River Recovery Initiatives |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dandenong Ranges Programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whales and Dolphin protection |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clean up and Keep Australia Beautiful grants |  |  |  |  |  |
| **National Stream** | | | | | |
| 20 Million Trees |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25th Anniversary Landcare Grants |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable Agriculture Small Grants |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous Protected Areas |  |  |  |  |  |
| World Heritage Grants |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reef Programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working on Country Rangers supplementation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target Area Grants |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Stewardship Programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| Innovation Grants |  |  |  |  |  |
| Landcare networks |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wildlife Health Australia |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biosecurity Incursion Management |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who answered Yes to Q4 i.e. received funding, and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees] Did your National Landcare Programme funded projects benefit from income streams other than the National Landcare Programme?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes, all of our National Landcare Programme funded projects (Go to Q12) |
|  | Yes, some of our funded projects (Go to Q12) |
|  | No (Go to Q13) |

1. [NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who answered Yes to Q4 i.e. received funding, and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees] Which of the following income streams did your National Landcare Programme funded projects benefit from?

*Tick all that apply*

|  | Yes | No |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Other Australian Government programs or agencies |  |  |
| State government |  |  |
| Local government |  |  |
| Land managers/ owners |  |  |
| Philanthropic/ community |  |  |
| University or research organisation |  |  |
| Private/ own funding |  |  |
| Other (please specify):  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who answered Yes to Q4 i.e. received funding, and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees] Did you partner (i.e. co-invest) with any of the following stakeholders to deliver your National Landcare Programme funded projects?

*Tick all that apply*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No |
| State or local government |  |  |
| Landcare groups |  |  |
| Bushcare groups |  |  |
| Coastcare, rivercare groups |  |  |
| Land managers/ owners |  |  |
| Local community members |  |  |
| Regional populations |  |  |
| Businesses |  |  |
| Indigenous groups |  |  |
| Non-governmental organisations |  |  |
| Farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups |  |  |
| Research organisation/ university |  |  |
| Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations, NRM local groups who answered Yes to Q4 i.e. received funding, and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees] How many of the National Landcare Programme funded projects would have gone ahead if they had not received National Landcare Programme funding?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | All of them |
|  | Most of them |
|  | A few of them |
|  | None of them |

* 1. National Landcare Programme objectives and priorities

1. [All respondents] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the National Landcare Programme (NLP) objectives and priorities?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each statement* | Agree | Tend to agree | Tend to disagree | Disagree | Don’t know/NA |
| I am aware of National Landcare Programme objectives |  |  |  |  |  |

[NRM regional organisations only]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Our National Landcare Programme funded projects align with our Regional NRM plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Landcare Programme funding meets the environmental priorities of the Australian Government |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Landcare Programme funding meets the agricultural priorities of the Australian Government |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Landcare Programme allowed for enough autonomy in setting regional and local priorities |  |  |  |  |  |

[Industry groups and state or local government]

| *Tick one option only for each statement* | Agree | Tend to agree | Tend to disagree | Disagree | Don’t know/NA |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Landcare Programme funding helps our industry improve sustainability |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improving sustainability helps our industry improve profitability |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improving sustainability helps our industry improve access to markets |  |  |  |  |  |

[Direct grantees only]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Landcare Programme funding meets the environmental priorities of the Australian Government |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Landcare Programme funding meets the agricultural priorities of the Australian Government |  |  |  |  |  |

[Direct grantees, NRM local groups, Other]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each statement* | Agree | Tend to agree | Tend to disagree | Disagree | Don’t know/NA |
| National Landcare Programme objectives aligns with my group’s NRM priorities |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [Direct grantees, NRM local groups, Other] Please list your group’s top 3 priorities:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. [All respondents] Below are listed the national and international priorities that the National Landcare Programme supports. How strongly do your own NRM priorities relate to these National Landcare Programme priorities?

| *Tick one option only for each priority* | Very related | Somewhat related | Not very related | Not related at all | Don’t know/NA |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Protection and restoration of ecosystem function, resilience and biodiversity |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriate management of invasive species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or native species |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable management of agriculture and aquaculture to conserve and protect biological diversity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase carbon stored in soil |  |  |  |  |  |
| Build community awareness of biodiversity values, skills, participation and knowledge |  |  |  |  |  |
| Build Indigenous knowledge and participation, to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity |  |  |  |  |  |
| Promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reduce the loss of natural habitats, degradation and fragmentation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protecting or conserving Matters of National Environmental Significance including management of World Heritage Areas, Ramsar wetlands, national heritage etc |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reduce the number of nationally threatened species and improve their conservation status |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [All respondents] To what extent have your own NRM priorities changed over the past 2 years?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Not at all (Go to next section) |
|  | Not very much |
|  | Quite a lot |
|  | Very much |

1. [All respondents] How have your priorities changed?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* 1. Community engagement

1. [NRM regional organisations only] To what extent did you provide opportunities for your community to participate in the following?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each question* | A lot of opportunities | Moderate number of opportunities | Only a few opportunities | No opportunities |
| Priority setting of National Landcare Programme funded projects in your area |  |  |  |  |
| **Planning** of National Landcare Programme funded projects delivered by your NRM regional organisation |  |  |  |  |
| **Delivering** of National Landcare Programme funded projects by your NRM regional organisation |  |  |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations]To what extent did the following community members/ groups participate in the planning and/ or delivery of regional NRM projects funded by the National Landcare Programme?

| *Tick all that apply for each group.*  *Please tick no involvement if the group had no involvement in these processes.* | Planning | Delivery | No involvement |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State or local government |  |  |  |
| Landcare groups |  |  |  |
| Bushcare groups |  |  |  |
| Coastcare, rivercare groups |  |  |  |
| Land managers/ owners |  |  |  |
| Local community members |  |  |  |
| Regional populations |  |  |  |
| Farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups |  |  |  |
| Businesses |  |  |  |
| Indigenous groups |  |  |  |
| Non-governmental organisations |  |  |  |
| Research organisation/ university |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations only] Were you able to incorporate community priorities into your regional NRM planning?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes (Go to Q23) |
|  | No (Go to Q24) |

1. [NRM regional organisations only; Yes to Q22]How?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. [NRM regional organisations only; No to Q22] Why not?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. [NRM local groups, industry and state or local government] For each of the following aspects, please indicate your level of engagement and your satisfaction with this level of engagement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only* | **How engaged** were you with this process? | **How satisfied** are you with this level of engagement? |
| Priority setting of National Landcare Programme funds delivered by regions | Very engaged  Somewhat engaged  Not very engaged  Not engaged at all | Very satisfied  Somewhat satisfied  Not very satisfied  Not satisfied at all |
| Developing the regional NRM plan delivered by your NRM regional organisation | Very engaged  Somewhat engaged  Not very engaged  Not engaged at all | Very satisfied  Somewhat satisfied  Not very satisfied  Not satisfied at all |
| The planning of projects delivered by your NRM regional organisation under the National Landcare Programme | Very engaged  Somewhat engaged  Not very engaged  Not engaged at all | Very satisfied  Somewhat satisfied  Not very satisfied  Not satisfied at all |
| The delivery of projects by your NRM regional organisation under the National Landcare Programme | Very engaged  Somewhat engaged  Not very engaged  Not engaged at all | Very satisfied  Somewhat satisfied  Not very satisfied  Not satisfied at all |

1. [NRM local groups, industry and state or local government] Do you feel your suggestions were considered/ taken on board?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Very much |
|  | Somewhat |
|  | Not very |
|  | Not at all |

1. [NRM local groups, industry and state or local government] Have you been engaged in other projects with NRM regional organisations through National Landcare Programme funding?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes (Go to Q28) |
|  | No (Go to next section) |

1. [NRM local groups, industry and state or local government] What priorities and threats did the projects undertaken by your local regional bodies address?

| *Tick one option only* | Yes | No | Don’t know/ NA |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Protection and restoration of ecosystem function, resilience and biodiversity |  |  |  |
| Appropriate management of invasive species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or native species |  |  |  |
| Sustainable management of agriculture and aquaculture to conserve and protect biological diversity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase carbon stored in soil |  |  |  |
| Build community awareness of biodiversity values, skills, participation and knowledge |  |  |  |
| Build indigenous knowledge and participation, to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity |  |  |  |
| Reduce the loss of natural habitats, degradation and fragmentation |  |  |  |
| Protecting or conserving Matters of National Environmental Significance including management of World Heritage Areas, Ramsar wetlands, national heritage |  |  |  |
| Reduce the number of nationally threatened species and improve their conservation status |  |  |  |

* 1. National Landcare Programme processes

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about how well communicated and designed the following National Landcare Programme aspects are?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each statement* | Agree | Tend to agree | Tend to disagree | Disagree | Don’t know/NA |
| National Landcare Programme **application** requirements have been well communicated to our organisation |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Landcare Programme **funding** requirements have been well communicated to our organisation |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only] Please indicate how simple you have found the following National Landcare Programme processes.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each process* | Very simple | Somewhat simple | Not very simple | Not simple at all | Don’t know/NA |
| Completing the funding application |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finalising the contract |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monitoring and reporting requirements |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about National Landcare Programme implementation?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each statement* | Agree | Tend to agree | Tend to disagree | Disagree | Don’t know/NA |
| Information on key National Landcare Programme implementation decisions is publicly available |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Landcare Programme encourages cooperation between government and stakeholders |  |  |  |  |  |
| The current **funding mechanisms** (e.g.: small grants, regional delivery, etc.) of the National Landcare Programme are the best way (efficient and effective) to deliver National Landcare Programme objectives |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only] Which of the following documents did you submit as part of your National Landcare Programme funding application?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Application form ONLY (as separate to the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement plan) (Go to Q33) |
|  | Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan ONLY (If Yes Go to Q35) |
|  | Application form AND Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan (Go to Q33) |

#### The application form

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; and answer to Q32 - ‘Application form’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] Approximately how many people were involved in filling in the application form?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; and answer to Q32 - ‘Application form’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] What is your estimate of the total time all people spent filling in the **application form?**

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Less than 5 hours |
|  | 5 – 10 hours |
|  | 10 – 20 hours |
|  | 20 – 40 hours |
|  | Greater than 40 hours |

#### The Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan

*The majority of successful applicants for National Landcare Programme funding were required to develop monitoring, evaluation, reporting and improvement (MERI) plans to help specify the project activities and track progress. Please note that for all following questions MERI refers to this monitoring, evaluation, reporting and improvement plan and not the online reporting tool MERIT*

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; and answer to Q32 - ‘MERI plan’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] Approximately how many people were involved in completing the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; and answer to Q32 - ‘MERI plan’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] What is your estimate of the total time all people spent initially in **developing** the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan until the first submission to the Department?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Less than 1 week |
|  | 1-2 weeks |
|  | 2-4 weeks |
|  | More than 4 weeks |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; and answer to Q32 - ‘MERI plan’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] What is your estimate of the total time all people spent **finalising** the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan(once submitted to the Department)?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Less than 5 hours |
|  | 5 – 10 hours |
|  | 10 – 20 hours |
|  | 20 – 40 hours |
|  | Greater than 40 hours |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; answer to Q32 - ‘MERI plan’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] What are your views on traditional application forms compared to the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan as an application?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­­­­­­­­­­­­\_

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; and answer to Q32 - ‘MERI plan’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan?

| *Tick one option only for each statement* | Agree | Tend to agree | Tend to disagree | Disagree | Don’t know/NA |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I understood what I needed to include in the MERI plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| MERI is a useful planning tool |  |  |  |  |  |
| I refer to my MERI plan to ensure the project is on track |  |  |  |  |  |
| I refer to my MERI plan to identify issues in the project |  |  |  |  |  |
| I refer to my MERI plan to inform future design and delivery of my project |  |  |  |  |  |
| MERI is a useful communication tool for my organisation to share information on project delivery with the community |  |  |  |  |  |
| MERI captures practice change well |  |  |  |  |  |
| MERI captures environmental outcomes well |  |  |  |  |  |
| MERI captures agricultural outcomes well |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; and answer to Q32 - ‘MERI plan’ or ‘Application form and MERI plan’] How do you feel about the time and cost of developing and implementing the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan compared to the benefits generated for the funded project and your organisation?

*Tick one option only*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | We spent the right amount of time and budget compared to the benefits generated |
|  | We spent too much time and budget compared to the benefits generated |
|  | We spent too little time and budget compared to the benefits generated |

*End of the MERI plan section*

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only] Which of the following would you prefer as a National Landcare Programme funding application requirement:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Application form followed by development of Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan after funding is approved |
|  | Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan only (no application form) |
|  | Application form and Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan both submitted as funding application |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only] Did you seek advice or feedback from the Australian Department of the Environment and Energy, or the Australian Department of Agriculture and Water Resources on the following?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each aspect* | Yes | No |
| Funding application/ Developing project idea prior to application |  |  |
| Developing Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan |  |  |
| Implementing Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan |  |  |
| Implementing the project |  |  |
| Reporting on the project (if no MERI plan) |  |  |

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct National Landcare Programme grantees only; if Yes to any of Q42] How helpful was the information you received?

| *Tick one option only for each process* | Very helpful | Somewhat helpful | Not very helpful | Not helpful at all | Don’t know/Not applicable |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Funding application/ Developing project idea prior to application |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developing Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementing Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementing the project |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reporting on the project (if no MERI plan) |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. Project outcomes and beneficiaries

1. [All respondents] To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the impact of the National Landcare Programme? As a result of National Landcare Programme funded projects …

| *Tick one option only for each statement.* | Agree | Tend to agree | Tend to disagree | Disagree | Don’t know/NA |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| … landscape management has improved |  |  |  |  |  |
| … there is enhanced social and institutional capacity for sustainable management practices |  |  |  |  |  |
| … the adoption of sustainable farming and fishing management practices has increased |  |  |  |  |  |
| … community involvement in natural resource management has increased |  |  |  |  |  |
| … there are better partnerships between individuals/ communities and NRM regional organisations |  |  |  |  |  |
| … the level of protection, rehabilitation, restoration of prioritised environmental assets, threatened species, ecological communities and/or migratory species has increased |  |  |  |  |  |
| … Indigenous participation in natural resource management has increased |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [All respondents] On balance, what has been the impact of the National Landcare Programme in your region?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each statement.* | Large positive impact | Small positive impact | No impact | Small negative impact | Large negative impact | Don’t know/NA |
| Economy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jobs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developing skills and knowledge in managing natural resources (capacity building) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community engagement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social wellbeing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental health |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public health |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. [All respondents] How much do you estimate each of the following groups have benefited from the outputs and outcomes of National Landcare Programme funded projects?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Tick one option only for each stakeholder group* | Significant benefits | Moderate benefits | Small benefits | No benefits | Don’t know/ Not applicable |
| Land managers/ owners |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local community members |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regional populations |  |  |  |  |  |
| Businesses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indigenous community groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Indigenous community groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farming, forestry, fishing, aquaculture industry groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research organisation/ university |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (please specify):  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. Future of National Landcare Programme

1. [NRM regional organisations and Direct grantees only] If there is one thing to change in each of the following areas of the National Landcare Programme, what would it be?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Application process |  |
| Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) requirements |  |
| Program delivery approach (e.g. delivery through small grants, regional delivery) |  |
| National Landcare Programme objectives and priorities |  |
| Other |  |

1. [NRM local groups, industry, state or local government and Other] If there is one thing to change in each of the following areas of the National Landcare Programme, what would it be?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program delivery approach (e.g. delivery through small grants, regional delivery) |  |
| National Landcare Programme objectives and priorities |  |
| Other |  |

1. [All respondents] What is the one thing you would not change in the programme and why?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* 1. Thank you!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.

Please indicate if you would like to be informed about:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The results of the survey |  |
| The outcome of the National Landcare Programme review |  |

Please enter your email address if you would like to receive the results of the survey or outcome of the NLP review:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_