

Caring for our Country

Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) Plan

Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin

Base-level allocation (Four of four)



wheatbelt
natural resource
management

Version:	1.1
Date:	16 September 2009

Document review details

Data Established/Reviewed	Key Lessons Learned
Date Established: 7 September 2009	
Date Reviewed:	
Date Reviewed:	
Date Reviewed:	

Document History

Revision	Prepared By	Date	Comments
V1.0	Elizabeth Kington Michelle Kidman	7 September 2009	Final draft version for submission to Ann Connelly, Australian Government
V1.1	Michelle Kidman	16 September 2009	Incorporate changes advised by Ann Connelly, Australian Government. Add Document History section

Contents

Document review details	2
Document History	2
Contents.....	3
1: Introduction	4
1.1 Purpose of the <i>Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin</i> Program MERI Plan	4
1.2 Broader MERI Context	4
2: Scope.....	5
2.1 Program description	5
2.2 Program methodology	6
2.3 Caring for our Country targets and outcomes	8
2.4 Users of the Plan	10
2.5 Key evaluation questions	11
2.6 Workplan and budget	13
2.7 Reports	23
3. Program Logic	25
3.1 Assumptions within the logic and managing risk	26
4. Evaluation questions	27
5. Improvement	33
5.1 Reviewing the MERI plan	33
5.3 Communicating results	36
Attachment 1	37

1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the *Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin Program MERI Plan*

The continuous and integrated cycle of **monitoring, evaluation, reporting and improvement** is referred to as **MERI** in the Australian NRM context.

A program MERI plan articulates all the different aspects of MERI that will be needed and how they will be implemented over the life of the program.

This program MERI plan:

- Guides MERI for the *Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin* program of Caring for our Country in accord with the stated Caring for our Country outcomes and targets (<http://www.nrm.gov.au/me/index.html>) and consistent with the Caring for our Country MERI Strategy (<http://www.nrm.gov.au/me/index.html>)
- Provides a base from which to review the progress the program is making towards the agreed Caring for our Country targets and outcomes and from which to learn about successful implementation strategies and to adapt in response to lessons learnt.

1.2 Broader MERI Context

This plan is nested within:

- The NRM MERI framework (<http://www.nrm.gov.au/me/index.html>);
- The Caring for our Country Outcomes 2008-2013 (<http://www.nrm.gov.au/index.html>);
- The Caring for our Country Business Plan 2009-10 (<http://www.nrm.gov.au/index.html>);
- The MERI Strategy for Caring for our Country Strategy 2009-13 (<http://www.nrm.gov.au/me/index.html>), and
- The Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management (WNRM) *Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin* Program Management Plan.

2: Scope

2.1 Program description

Building on the Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Inc. (WNRM) investment (from 2006) the Aboriginal NRM program incorporates Aboriginal traditional cultural knowledge into natural resource management through recording traditional ecological knowledge, a network of Indigenous Advisory Groups and specific site management activities over the next two years.

This will be achieved through:

1. A continuation of the recording traditional knowledge, building on the capacity WNRM has developed to date. This includes maintaining and building the capacity of Avon Aboriginal Advisory Groups.
2. Developing partnerships with Aboriginal and NRM organisations, identifying a further three sites per year of cultural and environmental significance where the Aboriginal community is willing to play an active management role, and to develop processes allowing ACC to continue integrating cultural ecological knowledge into site management plans.
3. Continued employment of the Nyungar Budjar Carers through partnerships with National Reserve System managers in the region to integrate traditional knowledge.

Assistance will also be provided to Aboriginal landowners in the region to become more sustainable, both in their farming practices and through caring for the environment.

2.2 Program methodology

The program will develop, establish and manage activities using the following principle mechanisms.

WNRM employment of two Indigenous NRM facilitators trained in project management, engagement protocols, cultural awareness and on-ground management will coordinate the delivery of activities in consultation with stakeholders, advisory groups and community. The Avon Aboriginal Advisory Group made up of Elders from the region will oversee and provide advice on protocols and utilisation of traditional ecological knowledge through project activities. In addition, an Avon Institutional Aboriginal Steering Committee will be made up of government and community stakeholders that will guide the project on engagement protocols, legislation as it relates to NRM, and to facilitate the development of partnerships.

Culturally significant site management committees will be established in relation to identified sites of cultural significance to oversee site management plans and possible site management teams, where appropriate.

A regularly updated and maintained database of Indigenous community and regional stakeholders will be used to engage Indigenous communities. Recording equipment, appropriate knowledge storage mechanisms and professional publications will record and manage Traditional Knowledge information.

Specific activities required to deliver targets

Community engagement activities are important to relationship building with the Avon Indigenous community. These will include one-on-one and group consultation, for example through cultural NRM events and workshops. Consultation protocols and engagement processes, management plans, on-ground works programs/teams and interpretive signage will be used for managing culturally significant sites.

Training workshops specifically designed for Nyungar Budjar Carers, Indigenous land managers, NRM managers and community on cultural awareness and traditional knowledge will be used to improve community knowledge and skills. A works program for the inclusion of the Nyungar Budjar Carers within the National Reserve System management program is planned.

Memoranda of Understanding agreements with Indigenous government organisations will be negotiated with WNRM to develop structural support and appropriate cultural engagement processes for site management work.

Why these activities are the most appropriate and technically feasible

The development of skilled facilitators who can build trust and respect with the Avon Indigenous community and government organisations is vital to build internal capacity to deliver these activities. Elder and government Advisory groups are essential to engage the Indigenous community in a culturally appropriate manner.

Site management committees establish firm engagement with the local community, transparency in management and ensure consultation and ownership. Site management plans allow for contracts, progress tracking and the establishment of firm boundaries for implementation works.

Partnerships and employment opportunities through NRM organisations ensure the professional development of individuals and open up career opportunities for the Indigenous community.

A well maintained stakeholder database ensures efficient engagement processes and develops networking opportunities.

Recording equipment will produce professionally recorded material on traditional ecological knowledge, which can be marketed to other NRM professionals, stakeholders and community.

How these activities deliver a strategic and integrated proposal

The capacity of the Avon Indigenous community in NRM is small and the development of trust through experienced facilitators is essential to develop Indigenous engagement. Much of the regional traditional knowledge is not recorded and the number of Elders with a connection to country is low, many of whom want to pass on their knowledge. Developing respect for Elders and individuals with a connection for country is an important initial protocol for engaging the Indigenous community in NRM.

Identifying specific areas where there is cultural significance, where partnerships and management activities can be developed will help build the capacity of the regional Indigenous community in NRM.

The development of opportunities for employment in NRM is important, particularly for Indigenous youth. Working with Indigenous land managers and assisting them through training opportunities will develop business opportunities, employment and improve their confidence in caring for country.

Recording, storing and appropriate marketing (through DVDs etc) traditional Indigenous knowledge will build knowledge, skills and engagement of Aboriginal youth, by providing a means of sharing Elder knowledge and the wider Avon community (as appropriate), and to also provide a legacy for the Indigenous community to maintain knowledge over the longer term and to safeguard traditional knowledge for future generations. It will also allow other NRM managers to utilise this knowledge. Recording knowledge and building capacity will encourage integration with the other NRM programs, principally sustainable farm practices and the National Reserve System programs.

Measure, monitor and evaluate, review and improve

This Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) Plan guides the adaptive management cycle of this program. As part of the program management methodology the MERI Plan and all aspects of program delivery will be reviewed to improve program activities over time, increase impact, appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of program outcomes and to demonstrate the contribution of the program towards Caring for Our Country outcomes.

2.3 Caring for our Country targets and outcomes

Table 1 illustrates the specific Caring for our Country outcomes and targets the *Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin* program contributes to.

Table 1: Caring for our Country targets to which the *Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin* program will contribute

Caring for our Country Target/s	Funded Activity to be undertaken	Expected contribution of program
<p>Utilising traditional ecological knowledge: To involve at least 15 projects in the use or recording of Indigenous traditional knowledge from Indigenous communities over two years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three sites prioritised per annum • Management action plans incorporating Indigenous traditional knowledge operational within each site. • Management plans for integration of Indigenous community traditional knowledge into the NRS/Biodiversity Conservation program 	6 projects use or record Indigenous traditional knowledge (6 ARB cultural sites)
<p>Engaging Indigenous communities: To develop at least 20 Indigenous partnerships over two years that engage Indigenous communities in delivering Caring for Our Country.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference agreed for the Avon Indigenous Advisory Group • A partnership agreement developed with Avon Youth organisation for youth and Elder knowledge sharing. • Four Memorandum's of Understanding signed with organisations wishing to work in NRM and Indigenous ecological knowledge, cultural site identification and site mapping services for the Avon region (e.g. SWALSC, DIA, TAFE and CANWA) • Four partnerships facilitated between Indigenous community and Government Authorities (e.g. Badjaling group partnership with the Quairading Shire over reserve management) 	9 partnerships with Indigenous communities
<p>Increasing Community Knowledge and Skills: To ensure all regional NRM organisations assist local communities,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One information workshop completed on the traditional ecological knowledge developed through the Recording of 	Increasing participation in natural resource management 2 Nyungar Budjar Carer rangers employed in partnership

Caring for our Country Target/s	Funded Activity to be undertaken	Expected contribution of program
<p>including Indigenous, landcare and coastcare groups over the next two years to access knowledge and skills in managing natural resources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing easily accessible, free information to groups and individuals • providing training opportunities to local groups. 	<p>Traditional knowledge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two information sessions held with regional community to develop an understanding of Indigenous Protected Area requirements and Recording of Traditional Ecological Knowledge status within the region over the next year. • Five partnerships contracted to deliver Indigenous knowledge and skills • Two cultural heritage workshops completed for Elders and Indigenous Youth. • Five partnerships developed with regional schools. • Two DVDs produced from the Recording of Traditional Ecological Knowledge activities. • Two year contract with Department of Environment and Conservation signed to continue employment for Nyungar Budjar carers. • Annual training program developed and implemented for the Nyungar Budjar Carers 	<p>with DEC, integrated into the NRS project</p>
<p>Improving knowledge and skills of land managers: To increase by 42 000 land managers and farmers over four years who have demonstrated an improvement in knowledge and skills in natural resource management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ten Indigenous land managers NRM needs scoped. • Indigenous Land managers NRM training programs developed and implemented • Indigenous Land managers NRM training programs evaluated and adapted. 	<p>10 Aboriginal Land Managers engage in training programs to improve knowledge and skills in NRM, particularly wind erosion</p>

2.4 Users of the Plan

Table 2 shows the primary users or the key people who will use this MERI plan to organise data collection, analysis and reporting. The Secondary users are people who may benefit from understanding and being aware of this MERI plan.

Table 2: Key users for this MERI plan

<p>Primary users: who will reflect and adapt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Inc. including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The 8 to 10 Directors on the Board of Management ○ Key staff positions including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Peter Sullivan, Chief Executive Officer ▪ Natarsha Woods, WNRM Operations Manager and Program Manager, Core Operating and Community Engagement and Participation ▪ Elizabeth Kington, Program Manager, Sustainable Communities ▪ Dan Ferguson, Program Manager, Sustainable Agriculture ▪ Rebecca Palumbo, Program Manager, Natural Diversity ▪ Michelle Kidman, Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator ▪ Cilla Wilson, Communications Officer ▪ Chris David, Communications Facilitator ▪ Dianne Lovell, Indigenous NRM Coordinator ▪ Nathan Heal, Aboriginal NRM Officer
<p>Secondary users: who need to be aware of this plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australian Government: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ann Connelly, Assistant Director, WA Team, Australian Government Land and Coasts • Drue Edwards, Director, Program Performance, Australian Government Land and Coasts Western Australian Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Holley, Acting Director State NRM Office, Government of Western Australia • Community including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Caring for our Country program participants ○ 3 Sub-catchment community reference groups for Avon, Yilgarn and Lockhart ○ Aboriginal community network including Recording Traditional Knowledge advisory group ○ WNRM Membership and Associates ○ General land manager and town community in the Avon River Basin • Other Natural Resource Management Stakeholders including regional groups and local governments • WNRM Nyungar Budjar Carers and Department of Environment and Conservation, WA

2.5 Key evaluation questions

The key evaluation questions (KEQs) to be answered for the purposes of reporting outcomes against the targets that the *Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin* program addresses and program improvement are illustrated in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Key Evaluation Questions

Evaluation purpose	KEQ	The question relates to Caring for our Country target
<u>Impact</u>	In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program used traditional Nyungar knowledge from local communities in projects?	<i>Utilising traditional ecological knowledge:</i> To involve at least 15 projects in the use or recording of Indigenous traditional knowledge from Indigenous communities over two years.
<u>Impact</u>	In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program engaged Nyungar communities in delivery Caring for Our Country?	<i>Engaging Indigenous communities:</i> To develop at least 20 Indigenous partnerships over two years that engage Indigenous communities in delivering Caring for Our Country.
<u>Impact</u>	In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program assisted local communities to access knowledge and skills in NRM?	<i>Increasing Community Knowledge and Skills:</i> To ensure all regional NRM organisations assist local communities, including Indigenous, landcare and coastcare groups over the next two years to access knowledge and skills in managing natural resources, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing easily accessible, free information to groups and individuals • providing training opportunities to local groups.

Evaluation purpose	KEQ	The question relates to Caring for our Country target
<u>Impact</u>	To what extent have Nyungar land managers and farmers demonstrated an improvement in knowledge and skills in natural resource management, as a result of being engaged in the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program?	<i>Improving knowledge and skills of land managers:</i> To increase by 42 000 land managers and farmers over four years who have demonstrated an improvement in knowledge and skills in natural resource management
<u>Impact</u>	What, if any, unanticipated positive or negative changes or other outcomes have resulted?	All targets
<u>Effectiveness</u>	To what extent have the planned activities and milestones been achieved? Why or why not? What other activities/strategies that might be more effective?	All targets
<u>Appropriateness</u>	To what extent are the investment strategies proving useful in engaging and influencing the targeted stakeholders?	All targets
<u>Efficiency</u>	To what extent has the program attained the highest value out of available resources? Why or why not?	All targets

2.6 Workplan and budget

MERI workplan and budget for *Aboriginal Natural Resource Management in the Avon River Basin* program.

Program timeline for activities			
Immediate program outcomes			
Activity	Achievement towards Caring for our Country Target	By when	Quantity of Target to be achieved
Develop projects (culturally significant sites) that utilise Traditional Ecological Knowledge	Six cultural sites prioritised	November 2009	6 projects (sites)
	Management plans incorporating Indigenous Traditional knowledge operational within three sites	June 2010	
	Management plans incorporating Indigenous Traditional knowledge operational within three sites	June 2011	
	Two year contract with Department of Environment and Conservation signed to continue employment for Nyungar Budjar carers	November 2009	
	Training program developed and implemented for the Nyungar Budjar Carers	June 2009	
	Training program developed and implemented for the Nyungar Budjar Carers	June 2010	
Developing partnerships that engage Indigenous community in caring for country	Terms of Reference agreed for the Avon Indigenous Advisory Group	November 2009	9 partnerships
	A partnership agreement developed with Avon Youth organisation for youth and Elder knowledge sharing	June 2010	
	Memorandum's of Understanding signed with organisations wishing to work in NRM and Indigenous ecological knowledge, cultural site identification and site mapping services for the Avon region (e.g. SWALSC, DIA, TAFE and CANWA)	November 2010	
	Four partnerships facilitated between Indigenous community and Government Authorities (e.g. Badjaling group partnership with the Quairading Shire over reserve management)	June 2011	

Program timeline for activities			
Immediate program outcomes			
Activity	Achievement towards Caring for our Country Target	By when	Quantity of Target to be achieved
WNRM assists local Indigenous communities to access knowledge and skills in managing natural resources	One information workshop completed on the traditional ecological knowledge developed through the Recording of Traditional knowledge project 07-09	November 2009	5 workshops
	Two information sessions held with regional community to develop an understanding of IPA requirements and Recording of Traditional Knowledge status within the region	June 2010	2 DVDs
	One information workshop completed on the traditional ecological knowledge developed through the Recording of Traditional knowledge project 07-09	November 2010	5 partnerships with regional schools
	Two cultural heritage workshops completed for Elders and Indigenous Youth.	November 2010	
	Five partnerships developed with regional schools.	June 2011	
	Two DVDs produced from the Recording of Traditional Ecological Knowledge activities.	June 2011	
10 Aboriginal Land Managers engage in training programs to improve knowledge and skills in NRM, particularly wind erosion	Ten Indigenous land managers NRM needs scoped.	November 2009	10 Aboriginal Land Managers engaged
	Indigenous Land managers NRM training programs developed and implemented	June 2010	
	Indigenous Land managers NRM training programs evaluated and adapted.	June 2011	
	Indigenous Land managers NRM training programs developed and implemented	June 2012	
	Indigenous Land managers NRM training programs evaluated and adapted.	June 2013	

Program MERI activities and budget				
Monitoring				
Measure	Method of collection	Frequency of collection	Responsibility	Cost \$
<p><i>Measure 1</i></p> <p>Monitoring Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of monitoring programs established 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of monitoring programs that have been established.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2000</p>
<p><i>Measure 2</i></p> <p>Management plans, strategies, arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of resource management plans or strategies completed or established, including project management plans, management plans for AG funded protected areas under the NRS, Indigenous Protected Areas in NRS. Area (ha) managed 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of resource management plans, project management plans or strategies that have been completed or established.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2011</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$1000</p>
<p><i>Measure 3</i></p> <p>Use of traditional ecological knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of projects (includes use and recording of traditional knowledge) 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of projects using and recording traditional knowledge.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2011</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$1000</p>

Program MERI activities and budget				
<p><i>Measure 4</i></p> <p>Sustainable Land Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of land managers using sustainable land mgt practices • Area (ha) managed (as % of total area for each land use type) 	<p>Quantification of change in number of land managers using sustainable land management practices, and area of land managed</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2000</p>
<p><i>Measure 5</i></p> <p>Events/Displays</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of awareness-raising events or displays such as demonstrations, field days or study tours conducted, community volunteer days. • Number of participants/groups involved or supported 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of awareness-raising events and/or displays, and the number of participants involved or supported.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2000</p>
<p><i>Measure 6</i></p> <p>Partnerships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of partnerships established, supported, contributed to • Organisation type 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of partnerships that have been established, supported or contributed to, and the type of organisation.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2011</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$1000</p>
<p><i>Measure 7</i></p> <p>Publications/Websites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of written products such as brochures, newsletters, posters or fact sheets developed and websites developed or significantly enhanced. • Number of people/groups targeted. 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of written products such as brochures, newsletters, posters, fact sheets and/or websites developed or significantly enhanced, together with the number of people and/or groups that have been targeted.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2000</p>

Program MERI activities and budget				
<p><i>Measure 8</i></p> <p>Training Sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of training sessions, workshops, seminars or other skills and training events conducted. Number of participants/ groups involved or supported. 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of training sessions, workshops, seminars and other skills and training events conducted, together with the number of participants and/or groups involved or supported.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2000</p>
<p><i>Measure 9</i></p> <p>Indigenous Rangers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of rangers 	<p>Quantification of change in the number of Indigenous rangers recruited through the project to help protect environmental values, maintain traditional ecological knowledge, and provide economic benefits.</p> <p>Data will be collected via interim progress (immediate outcomes) reporting.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009-2011</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$1,000</p>
<p><i>Measure 10*</i></p> <p>Knowledge, Skills and Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> qualitative evaluation of knowledge, skills, engagement and practice change <p><i>*WNRM Specific Measure</i></p>	<p>Evaluation using a set of five semi-structured questions implemented one-on-one through phone or personal interviewing and/or through a forum of selected stakeholders.</p> <p>Program participants will be interviewed with these simple questions at the time of engagement, which will be ongoing throughout the program.</p>	<p>Ongoing throughout the program 2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$40,000</p>

Evaluation				
Key evaluation question	Methodology for addressing this question	Timeframe	Responsibility	Cost \$
<p><i>KEQ 1</i></p> <p>In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program used traditional Nyungar knowledge from local communities in projects?</p>	<p>Analysis and review of change in Immediate Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management Plans, strategies, arrangements (Measure 2) 2. Use of traditional ecological knowledge (Measure 3) <p>Analysis of KEQs 2 and 3 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2011</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$1,000</p>
<p><i>KEQ 2</i></p> <p>In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program engaged Nyungar communities in delivery Caring for Our Country?</p>	<p>Analysis and review of change in Immediate Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships (Measure 6) • Knowledge, skills and engagement (Measure 10) <p>Analysis of KEQs 1 and 3 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2011</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$1,000</p>
<p><i>KEQ 3</i></p> <p>In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program assisted local communities to access knowledge and skills in NRM?</p>	<p>Analysis and review of change in Immediate Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events/Displays (Measure 5) • Publications/Websites (Measure 7) • Training Sessions (Measure 8) • Indigenous Rangers (Measure 9) • Knowledge, skills and engagement (Measure 10) <p>Analysis of KEQs 1 and 2 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2011</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$1,000</p>

<p><i>KEQ 4</i></p> <p>To what extent have Nyungar land managers and farmers demonstrated an improvement in knowledge and skills in natural resource management, as a result of being engaged in the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program?</p>	<p>Analysis and review of change in Immediate Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Land Management (Measure 4) • Knowledge, skills and engagement (Measure 10) <p>Analysis of KEQs 1 and 3 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2,000</p>
<p><i>KEQ 5</i></p> <p>What, if any, unanticipated positive or negative changes or other outcomes have resulted?</p>	<p>Analysis and review of all data, including anecdotal evidence collected throughout program.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2,000</p>
<p><i>KEQ 6</i></p> <p>To what extent have the planned activities and milestones been achieved? Why or why not?</p> <p>What other activities/strategies that might be more effective?</p>	<p>Analysis and review of all data, including achievement against activity and milestones.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2,000</p>
<p><i>KEQ 7</i></p> <p>To what extent are the investment strategies proving useful in engaging and influencing the targeted stakeholders?</p>	<p>Analysis and review of all data addressing KEQs 1 – 5.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2,000</p>
<p><i>KEQ 8</i></p> <p>To what extent has the program attained the highest value out of available resources? Why or why not?</p>	<p>Analysis of data sourced through all Key Evaluation Questions and associated measures and methodologies, program staff, program management records, Immediate Outcome Reporting and Project Status Reporting.</p> <p>Data will be reviewed annually by program staff to determine the</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>\$2,000</p>

	<p>efficiency of program activities against outcomes achieved. Strategies for increased efficiencies will be identified and implemented in the next phase of program delivery.</p> <p>All Key Evaluation Questions addressed in Final AG Program Report and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management Evaluation Report (with Results Chart).</p>		<p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Operations Manager, WNRM</p>	
Reporting				
Report	Information sources	Timeframe	Responsibility	Cost \$
Immediate Outcomes Report	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Nyungar Budjar Carer Rangers, DEC</p> <p>Aboriginal NRM Officer, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>Biannual:</p> <p>17 July and 15 December</p> <p>2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	\$4,000
Project Status Report	<p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Nyungar Budjar Carer Rangers, DEC</p> <p>Aboriginal NRM Officer, WNRM</p>	<p>Quarterly:</p> <p>March, June, September, December</p> <p>2009-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	\$4,000
Annual Results Chart	<p>Immediate Outcome Reports</p> <p>Project Status Reports</p> <p>Program Management Records</p> <p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p>	<p>Annual:</p> <p>November 2010-2013</p>	<p>Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM</p> <p>Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM</p>	\$4,000

	Nyungar Budjar Carer Rangers, DEC and Supervisors, DEC Aboriginal NRM Officer, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM Annual Knowledge, Skills and Engagement Evaluation			
Management Response Report	Results Chart (updated version, with outcome statements against targets and KEQs included, following review)	Annual: July 2010-2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM	\$2,000
WNRM Program Evaluation Report (with Results Chart)	Results Charts 2010-2012 Immediate Outcome Reports Management Response Reports 2010-2012 Program Management Records Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Aboriginal NRM Officer, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM Annual Knowledge, Skills and Engagement Evaluation	July, 2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM	\$4,000
Improvement				
Activity	Methodology	Timeframe	Responsibility	Cost \$
Activity 1 Annual Review	Review of all monitoring data, key evaluation questions, program management records and reports by program management staff. Outcomes and lessons learnt captured in Results Chart, with recommendations for improvement and associated actions for adaptive management documented in Management Response Report.	Annual: July 2010-2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation	\$8,000

			Coordinator, WNRM	
<i>Activity 2</i> Management Response	Recommendations for Improvement documented in Management Response Report which is reviewed and shared with Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management team to determine how recommendations will be implemented and findings used, for adaptive management and communication of findings.	Annual: July 2010-2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM	\$7,000
<i>Activity 3</i> Final Program Evaluation	Final analysis and review of overall program outcomes documented in WNRM Program Evaluation Report, which includes final results chart showing actual result versus expected result.	July, 2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM	\$14,000
Total MERI cost				\$114,000

2.7 Reports

The Australian Government (AG) reporting requirements and timeframes as specified in the funding agreement for this program.

Table 4 below sets out the Australian Government mandatory reporting requirements for the program together with program management reports required by the Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management.

Table 4: reporting requirements

Type of report	Requirements	Recipient	Timeframe
MANDATORY CARING FOR OUR COUNTRY REPORTS			
Interim progress report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Results to date against targets using Caring for our Country reporting template ▪ Summary of expenses ▪ For the period July to 30 November of each year that the program is funded 	AG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1 July – 30 November ▪ With in 60 days of the 30 November for each year of the program
Annual progress report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Results to date against targets using Caring for our Country reporting template ▪ For the period December to 30 June of each year that the program is funded ▪ Financial year funding acquittal for period July to June for each year that the program is funded 	AG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1 December – 30 June ▪ With in 60 days of the 30 June each year of the program
Final program performance report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final compilation and assessment of all the Program data/results (May include information from mid-year reports, annual reports, and other research reports) ▪ Summative conclusion on achievements biophysical and /or social, cultural economic or environmental change that has occurred. ▪ Final program financial acquittal for the whole of the programs life 	AG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30 June ▪ With in 60 days of the specified completion date for the program
Milestone report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mandatory report specified against a milestone 	AG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As specified in Deed of Agreement

Type of report	Requirements	Recipient	Timeframe
OTHER REPORTS			
Immediate Outcomes Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results to date of measures collected and reported by project delivery organisations and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management program staff 	WNRM	Biannual: June and November, 2009-2013
Project Status Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress towards achievement of deliverables and activities for each 6 month period from project delivery organisations and Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management program staff, including budget status, and tracking and management of project issues and risks 	WNRM	Quarterly: April, August, December 2009-2013
Annual Results Chart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on outcomes to date of program and its contribution towards Caring for Our Country targets and Key Evaluation Questions. Includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date. 	WNRM	Annual: November 2010-2013
Management Response Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on recommendations for improvement identified through annual review process, and having been documented in Annual Results Chart. Determines roles, responsibilities and processes for implementing findings or communicating results. 	WNRM	Annual: November 2010-2013
Annual KSE Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on the analysis of change in levels of knowledge, skills and engagement 	WNRM	October 2009-2011
WNRM Program Evaluation Report (with Results Chart) Audio-visual and written	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on overall outcome of program and contribution towards Caring for Our Country targets, and addresses key evaluation questions. Includes assessment of program management performance. Includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt. 	WNRM AG	End of Program: July 2013

3. Program Logic

Program Logic is a key element of an evaluation process as it shows a series of expected consequences, not just a series of events, at different outcomes levels within the logic. The program logic describes the relationships between activities and desired outcomes.

The overarching *Caring for our Country MERI Strategy* is underpinned by program logic, against which the key evaluation questions about the initiative can be clearly articulated. The outcomes range in type and timing from immediate through to longer-term outcomes, and build on foundations such as plans, frameworks, systems, and agreements for knowledge, communication and partnerships.

The Program logic for this MERI plan is included at Attachment 1.

3.1 Assumptions within the logic and managing risk

The hierarchy of the program logic (Attachment 1) and the rationale rest on some particular assumptions about how change will occur throughout the levels of outcomes over time.

Table 5 shows the assumptions made in developing the program logic. These assumptions will be tracked and tested throughout the life of the program, through the annual review process in the final Program Evaluation to ensure that the logic model is rigorous.

Table 5: Managing risk

Assumptions	Likelihood of assumption being wrong 1–5 (1 = rare, 5 = almost certain)	Consequences for longer-term outcomes if assumption is wrong 1–5 (1 = extreme, 5 = insignificant)	Key evidence to support this	Assumption will be tested
We assume that in developing partnerships we are engaging the Indigenous community in Caring for our Country	3	2	A wide range of partnerships are being established through the program – including local groups	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
We assume that the Indigenous community want to share Traditional Ecological Knowledge	3	2	The number of Indigenous applicants for small grant funding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We assume that the community are seeking information available through the WNRM project	3	3	Measure of the number of downloads of Indigenous information from the WNRM website	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
We assume that Indigenous land managers attending training will improve their knowledge and skills in NRM	3	2	Measure of knowledge and skills through Measure 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4. Evaluation questions

Table 6 below illustrates the key evaluation questions and the other evaluation questions that relate to them.

Key evaluation questions are the high-level questions that the evaluation wants to answer in relation to the Caring for our Country targets.

Other questions are questions that are asked and for which data will be monitored to test the accuracy of program logic assumptions and measure the success of implementation strategies for the funded program activities.

The key evaluation questions will be addressed through evidence from various sources, such as:

- Reviews of existing data and program management strategies and processes.
- Mandatory program progress reports
- Internal Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management program management reports including Immediate Outcome Reports and Project Status Reports
- Monitoring of social outcomes against levels of knowledge, skills and engagement, using qualitative methods such as one to one land manager interviews, extension activity satisfaction surveys, most significant change stories (written and/or visual), case studies, and telephone and/or postal surveys.

Table 6 presents the data sources/evidence that will be gathered to address questions and the monitoring methods and frequencies.

Table 6: Data sources and methods to address evaluation questions

KEQs	Other-evaluation questions	Method	Frequency
IMPACT			
<p>1. In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program used traditional Nyungar knowledge from local communities in projects?</p>	<p>How has recording traditional ecological knowledge been integrated into existing NRM knowledge or projects?</p> <p>To what extent is traditional knowledge being used to sustainably manage land?</p> <p>In what ways has the program improved the understanding of traditional ecological knowledge within the targeted engagement networks of Avon River Basin?</p> <p>Were there any issues or concerns associated with the recording or use of traditional knowledge? How can these issues or concerns be addressed, in a way that is agreeable to the Nyungar community?</p>	<p>The following measures will be collected twice yearly by project delivery organisation staff and will be reported via the Immediate Outcomes Reporting process to Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management Plans, strategies, arrangements (Measure 2) • Use of traditional ecological knowledge (Measure 3) <p>Analysis of KEQs 2 and 3 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>Data will be analysed by WNRM staff and recorded in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against Caring for Our Country targets, Key Evaluation Questions, and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November, 2009-2011</p> <p>Annual: July 2010 – 2011</p>
<p>2. In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i> program engaged Nyungar communities in delivery Caring for Our Country?</p>	<p>How many Indigenous partnerships were established, supported or contributed to?</p> <p>Did these partnerships successfully engage the Indigenous community? Are there other strategies that could be more appropriate to the needs of the community and thereby improve the relationship?</p> <p>What were the benefits of the partnerships and how could they be improved?</p>	<p>The following measures will be collected twice yearly by project delivery organisation staff and will be reported via the Immediate Outcomes Reporting process to Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships (Measure 6) • Knowledge, skills and engagement (Measure 10) <p>Analysis of KEQs 1 and 3 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>Data will be analysed by WNRM staff and recorded in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against Caring for Our Country targets, Key Evaluation Questions, and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November, 2009-2011</p> <p>Annual: July 2010 – 2011</p>
<p>3. In what ways and to what extent has the <i>Aboriginal NRM in the Avon River Basin</i></p>	<p>How many and what kinds of awareness raising events</p>	<p>The following immediate measures will be collected twice yearly by project delivery organisation staff and will be reported via the</p>	<p>Biannual:</p>

	Other-evaluation questions	Method	Frequency
<p>program assisted local communities to access knowledge and skills in NRM?</p>	<p>and displays were conducted?</p> <p>How many brochures, newsletters, posters, fact sheets or websites have been developed? How many people were these targeted at?</p> <p>How many training sessions and workshops were conducted?</p> <p>How many land managers participated in these events?</p> <p>How many community support positions have been developed and supported?</p> <p>How many Indigenous Rangers are actively employed through the program?</p> <p>*Other Evaluation questions for the Nyungar Budjar Carer Rangers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you feel that the program is working? • Are there any changes that you would like to suggest? • What do you feel your main achievements have been to date? • Do you see the program giving any benefit to the overall Aboriginal community? • Do you have any ideas or suggestions about how you can become more involved in the community? • How can we best use your skills and experience in the future? • Do you have any issues or concerns we need to address before moving forward? • Have you experienced any difficulties? Do you have any suggestions for how these issues could be managed? • Do you feel you need further training in any specific area? 	<p>Immediate Outcomes Reporting process to Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events/Displays (Measure 5) • Publications/Websites (Measure 7) • Training Sessions (Measure 8) • Indigenous Rangers (Measure 9) • Knowledge, skills and engagement (Measure 10) <p>Analysis of KEQs 1 and 2 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>Qualitative social data will be sourced from land managers, program participants and program staff to determine changes of knowledge, skills and engagement levels.</p> <p>Information will be collected throughout the year, in an ongoing basis, at the time of engagement with program participants. Results will be analysed annually. Information will be collected using a set of five semi-structured questions implemented one-on-one through phone or personal interviewing and/or through a forum of selected stakeholders.</p> <p>The (draft) 5 generic questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you understand the importance and/or relevance of cultural information? 2. How have you used this knowledge in NRM? 3. What issues have you faced in the trying to use this information? 4. What have you learnt? 5. What would you like to see WNRM do next? <p>Additional data relating to knowledge, skills and engagement will be collected through extension activity satisfaction surveys.</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence will also be recorded by Supervisory staff (of the Nyungar Budjar Carer Rangers) in the Department of Environment and Conservation and WNRM program staff.</p> <p>The Nyungar Budjar Carer Rangers and their DEC Supervisors will also be interviewed (see 'other evaluation questions') to facilitate</p>	<p>June and November, 2009-2011</p> <p>Ongoing throughout the program</p> <p>2010 – 2011</p>

KEQs	Other-evaluation questions	Method	Frequency
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel WNRM could support you better in any way? <p>*Other Evaluation questions for Nyungar Budjar Carer Ranger Supervisory Staff, DEC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you feel that the program is working? • Are there any changes that you would like to suggest? • What do you feel the main achievements of the Carers were? • Do you feel that additional Noongar Budjar roles would benefit DEC, WNRM and the community to strengthen relationships and foster engagement? • Do you have any ideas or suggestions about how WNRM can better utilise and integrate the role of traditional knowledge in future biodiversity programs? • How can we best utilise the skills and experience of both DEC and the Noongar Budjar Carers in the future? • What are the issues we need to address moving forward? • Have you experienced any difficulties? Do you have any suggestions for how these issues could be managed? • Can we offer/partner with DEC for any training in Indigenous or cultural areas? • Do you feel WNRM could support you better in any way? 	<p>improvements in their roles, and the engagement process.</p> <p>In addition, methods such as case studies (written and/or audio-visual formats) will also be used to record and demonstrate levels of knowledge, skills and engagement, and impact and appropriateness of program engagement strategies.</p> <p>Analysis of data will be undertaken by the WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, Indigenous NRM Coordinator and Sustainable Communities Program Manager and reported in the Annual Knowledge, Skills and Engagement (KSE) Evaluation.</p> <p>Summarised quantitative and qualitative results will be recorded in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against targets, Key Evaluation Questions and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date. The Case Studies will also be used to communicate program outcomes to new or existing sectors of the community and program participants for ongoing impact and legacy, as well as to program participants as part of the community engagement strategy.</p>	<p>Annual: July 2010-2011</p>
<p>4. To what extent have Nyungar land managers and farmers demonstrated an improvement in knowledge and skills in natural resource management, as a result of being engaged in the <i>Aboriginal</i></p>	<p>Did participation in extension activities encourage farmers and land managers to take up the use of the recommended practices? Why or why not?</p> <p>What kinds of practices are land managers and/or</p>	<p>The following immediate measures will be collected twice yearly by project delivery organisation staff and will be reported via the Immediate Outcomes Reporting process to Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management:</p>	<p>Bi-annual: June and November 2009 -2013</p>

KEQs	Other-evaluation questions	Method	Frequency
<i>NRM in the Avon River Basin program?</i>	community groups using to manage their land in a more sustainable way, particularly for wind erosion? What kinds of traditional methods are land managers using to manage their land?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable Land Management (Measure 4) Knowledge, skills and engagement (Measure 10) <p>Analysis of KEQs 1 and 3 will also be used to address this question.</p> <p>*Social (qualitative) data will be collected annually and analysed as per the methodology outlined in KEQ 3.</p> <p>Data will be analysed by WNRM program staff and recorded in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against Caring for Our Country targets, Key Evaluation Questions, and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date.</p>	<p>Ongoing: 2009 – 2013</p> <p>Annual: July 2010 – 2013</p>
5. What, if any, unanticipated positive or negative changes or other outcomes have resulted?	What were the unexpected outcomes?	<p>Data will be sourced program participants and WNRM program staff and will be reported to the WNRM through Immediate Outcome Reporting process.</p> <p>This information will also be identified during program participant interviews, case studies and from anecdotal data collected by program staff.</p> <p>Data will be analysed by WNRM staff and recorded in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against Caring for Our Country targets, Key Evaluation Questions, and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009 -2013</p> <p>Annual: July 2010 – 2013</p>
EFFECTIVENESS			
6. To what extent have the planned activities and milestones been achieved? Why or why not?	<p>Were there any issues that arose for the program delivery due to any lack of appropriately skilled staff?</p> <p>How well did the planned activities achieve their objectives?</p> <p>What other activities/strategies that might be more effective?</p>	<p>Data will be sourced via program management records and project status reports and through the collection of Immediate Outcome Reporting. Project Status Reports track progress towards deliverables throughout the year, and identify any risks or issues associated with expected delivery. This facilitates early intervention and adaptive management requirements.</p> <p>Comparison of expected versus actual activity and milestone delivery will also be reviewed as part of the annual review process. Results</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009 -2013</p> <p>Annual: July 2010 – 2013</p>

KEQs	Other-evaluation questions	Method	Frequency
		recorded in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against Caring for Our Country targets, Key Evaluation Questions, and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date.	
APPROPRIATENESS			
7. To what extent are the investment strategies proving useful in engaging and influencing the targeted stakeholders?	<p>Have the engagement strategies been an appropriate way of influencing and encouraging the Nyungar community to participate in NRM related activities? Why or why not?</p> <p>Are there any other strategies that could be used?</p>	<p>Data will be sourced through Key Evaluation Questions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and associated measures and methods.</p> <p>The annual review process will determine the effectiveness and appropriateness of engagement strategies and identify any improvements.</p> <p>Audio-visual case studies and the DVDs produced as part of the program will also be used to communicate program outcomes to new sectors of the community for ongoing impact and legacy, as well as to program participants as part of the community engagement strategy.</p> <p>Data will be analysed by WNRM and summarised in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against Caring for Our Country targets, Key Evaluation Questions, and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009 - 2013</p> <p>Annual: July 2010 – 2013</p>
EFFICIENCY			
8. To what extent has the program attained the highest value out of available resources? Why or why not?	<p>Could resources be used in a more productive way to increase efficiency?</p>	<p>Analysis of data sourced through all Key Evaluation Questions and associated measures and methodologies, program staff, program management records, Immediate Outcome Reporting and Project Status and Financial Reports and Audits.</p> <p>Data will be analysed by WNRM staff and recorded in the Results Chart, which provides the framework for the annual review of outcomes against Caring for Our Country targets, Key Evaluation Questions, and includes recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt to date.</p>	<p>Biannual: June and November 2009 - 2013</p> <p>Annual: July 2010 – 2013</p>

5. Improvement

5.1 Reviewing the MERI plan

Regular reflection on data, strategies, management processes and progress informs an adaptive management approach for continuous quality improvement of the program.

Table 7 provides a model for the review of the MERI plan, associated program logic(s) and for recording changes to achieve improvements in program implementation.

Table 7 MERI Plan Review Schedule

Date	Participants	Type of review	Resources/materials required	Agreed adaptive management strategy	Communicate results
July 2010 - 2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM Operations Manager, WNRM Communications Officer, WNRM	Annual Review	Program MERI Plan Program Management Plan Community Engagement and Communications Plan Interim Progress Reports Annual KSE Report Results Chart Most Significant Change stories and Case Studies	Program performance will be monitored through the WNRM program management process and project status reports. Data collected will be analysed by project delivery organisation and WNRM staff and summarised in the Results Chart. The Results Chart will be used to provide a framework for the annual review process, showing results to date against the Caring for Our Country targets and key evaluation questions. The review will also identify lessons learnt to date and make recommendations for improvement. This process is coordinated by the Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM.	Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement (and associated implementation decisions) are communicated as appropriate to WNRM staff, project delivery staff, the wider community and natural resource management stakeholders. This process is coordinated by the WNRM Program Manager and the Communications Officer.

Date	Participants	Type of review	Resources/materials required	Agreed adaptive management strategy	Communicate results
	Nyungar Budjar Carer Rangers, DEC and Supervisors, DEC Aboriginal NRM Officer, WNRM				
July 2010 - 2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM Communications Officer, WNRM Aboriginal NRM Officer, WNRM	Management Response	Results Chart (updated with recommendations for improvement and lessons learnt, following outcomes of annual review process)	Recommendations for improvement and lessons learned which were identified from the annual review process are documented in the <i>Management Response Report</i> . Participants review the recommendations and use the report to record the feasibility, roles, responsibilities, timeframes and resources required to implement the recommendations. Actions arising from this session are then tracked in fortnightly staff meetings to ensure that results of are used in the adaptive management cycle. This process is coordinated by the Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM	Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement (and associated implementation decisions) are communicated as appropriate to Wheatbelt Natural Resource Management staff, project delivery staff, the wider community and natural resource management stakeholders. This process is coordinated by the Program Manager and the Communications Officer.
July 2013	Program Manager, Sustainable Communities, WNRM Indigenous NRM Coordinator, WNRM Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, WNRM Operations Manager, WNRM Communications Officer,	End of Program Review	Program MERI Plan Program Management Plan Community Engagement and Communications Plan Interim Progress Reports Annual KSE Report Results Chart Most Significant Change stories and Case Studies	Management Response process (as above) used to feedback into the next program planning phase.	Key outcomes will be communicated via the Indigenous NRM Coordinator, with assistance from the Communications team to appropriate stakeholders as outlined in the Community Engagement Strategy. The WNRM Final Program Evaluation Report will be available in both audio-visual and written format, and will be re-packaged and communicated as appropriate to add value to the evaluation products delivered as part of the MERI process.

Date	Participants	Type of review	Resources/materials required	Agreed adaptive management strategy	Communicate results
	WNRM Aboriginal NRM Officer, WNRM				

5.2 The feedback cycle

The feedback cycle is facilitated through the annual review and management response process, as outlined in Table 7 (MERI Plan Review Schedule). Any improvements identified will be reflected through revisions to the Program Management Plan and associated work breakdown structures, the MERI Plan and the Community Engagement and Communications Plan. The WNRM program management methodology underpins the MERI process to ensure the timely and effective communication of adaptations to project staff to ensure delivery of project adaptations and inform staff of program delivery status.

5.3 Communicating results

Key messages and outcomes resulting from the evaluation process will be communicated to the following key stakeholders:

- Australian Government:
 - Ann Connelly, Assistant Director, WA Team, Australian Government Land and Coasts
 - Drue Edwards, Director, Program Performance, Australian Government Land and Coasts

Western Australian Government

- John Holley, Acting Director State NRM Office, Government of Western Australia
- Community including:
 - Caring for our Country program participants
 - 3 Sub-catchment community reference groups for Avon, Yilgarn and Lockhart
 - Aboriginal community network including Recording Traditional Knowledge advisory group
 - WNRM Membership and Associates
 - General land manager and town community in the Avon River Basin
- Other Natural Resource Management Stakeholders including regional groups and local governments
- WNRM Nyungar Budjar Carers and Department of Environment and Conservation, WA

Using the Programs *Community Engagement and Communications Plan*, the WNRM Communications Team will repackage and communicate evaluation outcomes in appropriate formats to these key stakeholders. A variety of mediums will be used including written and/or audio-visual (DVDs), websites, newsletters and through verbal delivery of key messages at targeted events such as partner and community meetings, and field days.

Attachment 1

