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Executive Summary

The report presents an Engagement Strategy for the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA) to use in building mutually rewarding and sustainable relationships with its communities in the Corangamite CMA Region. Although primarily for the CCMA’s use, the engagement strategy is equally applicable to any organisation involved in strategic regional natural resource management. It ultimate value will be guiding relationships with people in a way that encourages day-to-day behaviour that leads to better natural resource management outcomes.

This is the final of several reports to be completed within the Communication, Engagement and Social Change Benchmarking Project for the CCMA.

Defining engagement

Engagement is defined as the relationship that exists between two or more parties when they are working together on programs or projects of mutual benefit. The highest level of engagement is formal partnership, where all the parties are working collaboratively toward shared goals. Proper engagement requires that all parties contribute to and gain from the transactional relationships involved.

The mega-communities

Given the socio-economic diversity in the Corangamite CMA Region, communities are best defined as representing a blend of the main occupations and industries in the Region and the key drivers of NRM behaviour. Separate components have been amalgamated into 10 ‘mega-communities’ on the basis of commonality of interests and behaviour. The mega-communities are a mixture of industries and land uses, spatial entities, and regional governance bodies. Previous Reports have defined and described these mega-communities.

Determining priorities for engagement

Five criteria were used in determining priorities for engagement with the mega-communities. These were based on the known trends for each mega-community in:

1. reliance on natural resources;
2. impact on natural resources;
3. contribution to regional socio-economic welfare;
4. involvement in making decisions about natural resources, and
5. potential to influence other’s thinking or behaviour in NRM.

‘Engagement’ is very different from ‘communication’ as a social process. Some of the mega-communities will have a high priority for engagement, but not necessarily a high priority for stand-alone communication activities. The process of engaging will inevitably lead to closer and more mature communication between the parties. Other mega-communities with a lower priority for engagement will have a high priority for stand-alone communication that can address needs for building awareness and understanding. The Table below suggests the distinction between the priority for engagement and
communication activities for each of the 10 mega-communities. Those with higher priorities for both activities are highlighted.

Engagement and communication opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mega-community</th>
<th>Priority for building relationships to engagement level</th>
<th>Priority for stand-alone communication activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major resource and secondary industries</td>
<td>Higher priority – large resource users, influential employers, high economic capacity.</td>
<td>Lower priority – number of organisations is sufficiently low to enable direct engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary industries and service providers</td>
<td>Medium priority – large employers, well connected with wider community through many programs.</td>
<td>Medium priority – these industries and services can use information on the NRM implications of their programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers of land use change</td>
<td>Higher priority – long-term influence on how land and water is used in urban/rural environments.</td>
<td>Higher priority – shires and other organisations need up-to-date and readily available NRM information to enable them to discharge their roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support organisations for agricultural land and water use</td>
<td>Higher priority – increasingly important strategic role in determining land and water use and management for agriculture.*</td>
<td>Higher priority – agricultural knowledge brokers are enthusiastic seekers of information. Also need to be aware of the CCMA’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural industries and communities</td>
<td>Medium priority – important land and water users, but communities are rather fragmented.</td>
<td>Medium priority – need information about sustainable practices and to be kept aware of trends in NRM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Lower priority – native forestry is a declining land use, resource use is relatively benign, industry engaged on a number of other fronts*</td>
<td>Lower priority – industry has own well developed linkages and is already closely regulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban settlers in rural/coastal areas</td>
<td>Lower priority – community is too fragmented for direct engagement.</td>
<td>Higher priority – important growth area in Region. Community needs information about where to source direct assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support organisations for environmental values</td>
<td>Medium priority – organisations play important role in raising community consciousness and are sources of information</td>
<td>Medium priority – have their won good networks, but need to kept aware of the larger NRM agenda and their opportunity to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban populations</td>
<td>Lower priority – communities are too fragmented for direct engagement.</td>
<td>Higher priority – a steady flow of mass media information is required to keep urban populations informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Higher priority – rapidly growing industry highly reliant on quality and appeal of the natural environment.</td>
<td>Medium priority – important target for engagement, tourism operators and planners will need to be able to access NRM information on demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For this analysis, plantation forestry use could be better considered under the Support organisations for agricultural land and water use – see Section 3.3.

Ranking priorities for engagement

**Higher priority**

1. Managers of land use change (direct and indirect influence on how land and water is used and managed by most other sectors).
2. Major resource and secondary industries (direct influence on employees’ behaviour, and on resource use, and indirect influence on urban communities).
4. Tourism (growing direct influence on the socio-economic health of the region, and on use and management of natural resources).

**Medium priority**
5. Tertiary industries and service providers (major employers, and significant investors in community economic and social development).
6. Rural industries and communities (significant users of land and water resources)
7. Support organisations for environmental values (important advocates for environmental needs, direct influence on natural resources within their care)

**Lower priority**
8. Forestry (declining importance of native forest harvesting)
9. Urban populations (difficult to engage with directly)
10. Urban settlers in rural areas (difficult to engage with directly)

**A staging process for engagement**
The Figure below summarises one view of the changing strategic environment for engagement in the Corangamite CMA Region. This staging process commences with the ‘Declining needs’ of the CCMA’s current strategic environment and extends through to ‘Innovative opportunities’, in a clockwise direction.

**Staging process for the CCMA’s engagement strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declining needs</th>
<th>Mainstream business</th>
<th>Innovative opportunities</th>
<th>Emerging priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct contact with individual landholders and small rural groups</td>
<td>Support to local governments in their planning and environmental management roles.</td>
<td>Promotion of regional icons to inspire personal NRM behaviour.</td>
<td>More joint program projects with agricultural knowledge brokers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with the native forests industry.</td>
<td>Support for rural NRM groups.</td>
<td>Working with local governments in building new cultures in peri-urban and coastal communities.</td>
<td>Collaborative investment in projects with major resource and secondary industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for environmental organisations.</td>
<td>Support for environmental organisations.</td>
<td>Integrating NRM focus into community economic and social development programs.</td>
<td>Establish NRM standards and targets with food processing industries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Planning for tourism expansion
- Engagement with government beyond DNRE.
As suggested in this and other Reports completed in this consultancy, direct contact with rural landholders, small rural groups and the native timber industry is declining importance for the CCMA. The mainstream business for engagement is seen as strengthening support and involvement in the local government NRM agenda, and continuing support for the larger rural and urban NRM groups (e.g. Leigh Landcare Network, Geelong Environment Council). The emerging opportunities are for more collaborative programs with the well resourced and influential players in agricultural, tourism and industrial development. Engagement with these stakeholders will encourage leveraging of resources to achieve desired NRM outcomes. Further out are the opportunities to use regional icons to inspire personal behaviour, and develop programs that integrate NRM more fully into all aspects of social and economic life in the Region.
1 Introduction

The report presents an Engagement Strategy for the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA) to use in building mutually rewarding and sustainable relationships with its communities in the Corangamite CMA Region. Although primarily for the CCMA’s use, the engagement strategy is equally applicable to any organisation involved in strategic regional natural resource management. It ultimate value will be guiding relationships with people in a way that encourages day-to-day behaviour that leads to better natural resource management outcomes.

1.1.1 About this Report

Section 1 introduces the Engagement Strategy and defines the terms used.

Section 2 presents the priorities for engagement for each of the 7 higher and medium priority mega-communities, based on criteria around their use, impact on natural resources, and their contribution to regional socio-economic welfare.

Section 3 presents generic principles of engagement and how these can be applied in developing specific Engagement Strategies for individual stakeholders.

Section 4 considers the requirements for implementing the Engagement Strategy.

Section 5 lists acknowledgements and references.

The Annexes provide information about processes and tools that can be used in implementing the Engagement Strategy.

1.2 Background

This is the final Report for the Communication, Engagement and Social Change Benchmarking Project. Previous Reports have addressed the following issues.

- The demographics and socio-economic profile of the Corangamite CMA Region and its segmentation into 10 ‘mega-communities’.
- An analysis of the values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviour of the mega-communities in respect of the management of the natural resources.
- A communication strategy addressing opportunities provided by each of the mega-communities.

This Report documents an overall engagement strategy for the CCMA, focusing on the mega-communities defined in previous reports. It is accompanied by a Guide to the Mega-communities which aggregates the material in the previous reports.

The first part of this report presents, in some detail, the nature, rationale, processes, targets and indicators of engagement for the most important mega-communities. This provides a ‘road map’ for engagement in natural resource management in the Corangamite CMA Region. Supporting the tables is a commentary on the considerations and processes that may be applied in order to implement the engagement strategy. These additional comments include:
• A suggested staging process for the implementation of the engagement strategy. The analysis considers current and potential engagement with each of the mega-communities in terms of their importance and significance to the CCMA and its impact on the natural resources. The analysis concludes with innovative (‘blue sky’) opportunities that that should be considered in natural resource management policy and action.

• Three methodologies that can be used to describe what is known and understood about each of the major stakeholders within each of the mega-communities, and what the focus of engagement should be. These tools recognise the need to refine the ‘gross’ nature of the descriptions for each of the mega-communities if the engagement strategy is to be perceived as relevant both by the mega-communities at a broad scale and by the stakeholders, specifically.

• Processes to determine ways in which the CCMA may effectively approach and partner stakeholders. Theories such as ‘resource dependence’ are presented for consideration.

• Suggestions as to how engagement within the CCMA may be undertaken. Key concepts and questions to engage and influence organisational change are presented.

• Additional attachments (Annex A) provide comment on the need to consider the process of building engagement skills and commitment. A further section (Annex B) also includes an Engagement Proforma for use by CCMA staff in planning an implementing a specific engagement project with a target group.

• Finally, the Report considers evaluation principles and processes to review the influence and impact of the engagement strategy. Logical frameworks, Goal Attainment scoring and benefit cost analysis principles are presented (Annex C).

1.3 Relevant definitions

This Engagement Strategy recognises the differences between the following terms.

1.3.1 Awareness

Awareness is defined as the conscious act of reflecting upon one’s understanding and knowledge of the surrounding environment, and using that reflective process to review and question one’s position and actions.

1.3.2 Capacity-building

Capacity-building is a means of increasing the ability of people in communities to build on their strengths and address community-scale problems to enhance their individual and collective, social and economic futures. Capacity-building is a bottom-up process that takes account of the resources, knowledge interests and concerns of people in a local community or community of interest. (adapted from Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2001).

1.3.3 Communication

The process that takes place if people or groups exchange idea’s, thoughts and beliefs with each other. This process involves sending and receiving messages through channels
which ensures common meanings between a source (one person or a group) and a receiver (another person or group) (adapted from Ban and Hawkins 1985).

1.3.4 Community

Communities occur in two forms:-

- ‘Local or regional communities’ are geographical entities which include all of the residents in a given defined area, irrespective of the quality of the relationships between the people in the community. For example, the urban mega-community consists of all the residents of the geographical entities of Geelong and Ballarat.

- ‘Communities of interest’ form around issues and include people with a common point of reference for their inter-relationships and membership of networks. Communities of interest need not have defined geographical boundaries. For example, the major resource and secondary industries and component firms are a mega-community of interest (adapted from Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2001).

1.3.5 The Corangamite CMA Region

The Corangamite Catchment Management Authority Region is also described by the shortened term of the ‘Corangamite CMA Region’. This term has been used throughout this Report. This term is preferred to the use of ‘Corangamite Catchment’ to describe the Region over which the Authority has responsibility.

1.3.6 Education

A purposively organised process of learning either within set courses run by formally structured social institutions, or through non-formal means such as news programs on the radio (Ban and Hawkins 1985).

1.3.7 Engagement

Engagement is defined as the relationship that exists between two or more parties when they are working together on programs or projects of mutual benefit. The highest level of engagement is formal partnership, where all the parties are working collaboratively toward shared goals. Proper engagement requires that all parties contribute to and gain from the transactional relationships involved.

1.3.8 Extension

A form of conscious social influence. The conscious communication of information to help people form sound opinions and make good decisions at the time (Ban and Hawkins 1985).

1.3.9 Sectors/segments/components

In this Report, the terms ‘sectors’, ‘segments’ and ‘components’ are used inter-changeably to describe discrete and separate parts of the mega-communities.
1.3.10 Stakeholders

From the point of view of the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA), a ‘stakeholder’ is a formal or informal group of persons who:

- share some identifiable interest in common with the CCMA;
- is able to provide something of importance to the CCMA;
- expects something in return, and
- can affect the CCMA’s activities / goals / objectives or are affected by its activities / goals / objectives.

1.4 The Corangamite CMA Region

The Corangamite CMA Region has a total area of 13,340 sq km\(^1\) with a population of approximately 320,000. The Corangamite Catchment Management Authority has administrative responsibilities for natural resource management in this area. The Region includes the Shires of Surf Coast, Golden Plains, Colac-Otway, and the Borough of Queenscliffe. Also included in the Corangamite CMA Region are most of the Cities of Ballarat and Greater Geelong, and parts of the Shires of Corangamite, Moorabool and Moyne.

1.5 The Corangamite ‘mega-communities’

Viewed from the perspective of the CCMA’s need for engagement, the definition of ‘communities’ must recognise the opportunities for the most effective and efficient way in which NRM outcomes across the region can be influenced. Given the socio-economic diversity in the Corangamite CMA Region, communities are best defined as representing a blend of the main occupations and industries in the Region and the key drivers of NRM behaviour. Separate components have been amalgamated into ‘mega-communities’ on the basis of commonality of interests and behaviour. The mega-communities are a mixture of industries and land uses, spatial entities, and regional governance bodies. Previous Reports have defined and described these mega-communities.

An understanding of how the mega-communities work, the motivations for their natural resource management behaviour, and what they can influence through their activities is an essential precursor to an analysis of the needs and opportunities for engagement by the CCMA.

**Mega-community - Major resource and secondary industries**

- Major companies
- Business Networks

**Mega-community - Tertiary industries and service providers**

- Health and education services

---

\(^1\) CCMA website - http://www.ccma.vic.gov.au
• Community development services

**Mega community - Managers of land use change**
• Shires
• State government agencies involved in land and water use and management
• Private sector developers

**Mega-community - Support organisations for agriculture**
• Food processors
• Agricultural knowledge brokers
• Agricultural service providers
• NRM networks in Ag areas

**Mega-community – Rural industries and communities**
• Rural towns
• Broad-acre croppers and grazers
• Intensive agriculture – dairy, horticulture, poultry, pigs

**Mega-community – Forestry**
• Native timber harvesting
• Agro-forestry
• Timber processing

**Mega-community - Urban settlers in rural/coastal areas**
• Otway communities
• Peri-urban communities associated with Geelong and Ballarat
• Coastal towns

**Mega-community – Support organisations for environmental values**
• Peak environmental organisations (e.g. Geelong Environment Council, Ballarat Environment Council)
• Environmental ‘ethics’ groups
• Indigenous groups

**Mega-community – Urban populations**
• Geelong
• Ballarat

**Mega community - Tourism**
• Tourism managers – public and private sectors
• Tourism developers
2 Priorities for engagement with mega-communities

2.1 Determining priorities for engagement

Five criteria were used in determining priorities for engagement with the mega-communities shown in Section 1.5. These were based on the known trends for each mega-community in:

- reliance on natural resources;
- impact on natural resources;
- contribution to regional socio-economic welfare;
- involvement in making decisions about natural resources, and
- potential to influence other’s thinking or behaviour in NRM.

Higher priority

1. Managers of land use change (direct and indirect influence on how land and water is used and managed by most other sectors).
2. Major resource and secondary industries (direct influence on employees’ behaviour, and on resource use, and indirect influence on urban communities).
4. Tourism (growing direct influence on the socio-economic health of the region, and on use and management of natural resources).

Medium priority

5. Tertiary industries and service providers (major employers, and significant investors in community economic and social development).
6. Rural industries and communities (significant users of land and water resources)
7. Support organisations for environmental values (important advocates for environmental needs, direct influence on natural resources within their care)

Lower priority

8. Forestry (declining importance of native forest harvesting)
9. Urban populations (difficult to engage with directly)
10. Urban settlers in rural areas (difficult to engage with directly)

As discussed in Section 1.3, ‘engagement’ is very different from ‘communication’ as a social process. Some of the mega-communities highlighted will have a high priority for engagement, but not necessarily a high priority for stand-alone communication activities. The process of engaging will inevitably lead to closer and more mature communication between the parties. Other mega-communities with a lower priority for engagement will have a high priority for stand-alone communication that can address needs for building
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awareness and understanding. Table 1 suggests the distinction between the priority for engagement and communication activities for each of the 10 mega-communities. Those with higher priorities for both activities are highlighted.

**Table 1: Priority for engagement and communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mega-community</th>
<th>Priority for building relationships to engagement level</th>
<th>Priority for stand-alone communication activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major resource and secondary industries</td>
<td>Higher priority – large resource users, influential employers, high economic capacity.</td>
<td>Lower priority – number of organisations is sufficiently low to enable direct engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary industries and service providers</td>
<td>Medium priority – large employers, well connected with wider community through many programs.</td>
<td>Medium priority – these industries and services can use information on the NRM implications of their programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers of land use change</td>
<td>Higher priority – long-term influence on how land and water is used in urban/rural environments.</td>
<td>Higher priority – shires and other organisations need up-to-date and readily available NRM information to enable them to discharge their roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support organisations for agricultural land and water use</td>
<td>Higher priority – increasingly important strategic role in determining land and water use and management for agriculture.*</td>
<td>Higher priority – agricultural knowledge brokers are enthusiastic seekers of information. Also need to be aware of the CCMA’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural industries and communities</td>
<td>Medium priority – important land and water users, but communities are rather fragmented.</td>
<td>Medium priority – need information about sustainable practices and to be kept aware of trends in NRM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Lower priority – native forestry is a declining land use, resource use is relatively benign, industry engaged on a number of other fronts*</td>
<td>Lower priority – industry has own well developed linkages and is already closely regulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban settlers in rural/coastal areas</td>
<td>Lower priority – community is too fragmented for direct engagement.</td>
<td>Higher priority – important growth area in Region. Community needs information about where to source direct assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support organisations for environmental values</td>
<td>Medium priority – organisations play important role in raising community consciousness and are sources of information</td>
<td>Medium priority – have their won good networks, but need to kept aware of the larger NRM agenda and their opportunity to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban populations</td>
<td>Lower priority – communities are too fragmented for direct engagement.</td>
<td>Higher priority – a steady flow of mass media information is required to keep urban populations informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Higher priority – rapidly growing industry highly reliant on quality and appeal of the natural environment.</td>
<td>Medium priority – important target for engagement, tourism operators and planners will need to be able to access NRM information on demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For this analysis, plantation forestry use could be better considered under the Support organisations for agricultural land and water use – see Section 3.3.

Following sections present separate Engagement Strategies for those mega-communities and components that have been judged as having higher and medium priority for engagement. Separate strategies have not been developed for those with lower priorities, except in the case of plantation forestry, which is addressed as a higher priority in 3.3.
3 Engagement Strategies – higher priority

This section presents suggestions for separate engagement strategies for the mega-communities judged to have higher priority as stakeholders for continued or enhanced engagement initiated by the CCMA. Further development of the engagement strategies should use the analytical techniques presented in Section 5.

3.1 Managers of land use change

This mega-community, which includes local and state government agencies involved in land and water use and allocation and property developers are an important target for close engagement. Their actions have a major influence on NRM outcomes across the Region and in general, they are looking for support and information to assist them in carrying out their role. Suggested components of the Engagement Strategy are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Engagement - Managers of land use change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why engage?</td>
<td>• High reliance and impact on natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very important decision makers who can influence NRM behaviour over long future time-scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the relationship now</td>
<td>• Solid relationships exist, some confusion about CCMA’s roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shire planners are eager for assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives for engagement</td>
<td>• Provide strategic and tactical information to assist in the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To build stakeholder skills and knowledge and actions in natural resource management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement methodology?</td>
<td>• Regular direct contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of information and training to stakeholders that will assist them in discharging their NRM responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal MOUs for allocation of responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets for engagement?</td>
<td>• Establishment of formal linkages with Shires and Water Authorities with agreement on services provided by each party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output indicators?</td>
<td>• MOUs for allocation of responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information availability and training programs in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome indicators?</td>
<td>• Land and water use decisions reflect best practice NRM and are aligned with outcomes in the Regional Catchment Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Major resource and secondary industries

Increasing the level of engagement with the major resource and secondary industries, located mainly in Geelong will result in a significant expansion of the CCMA’s influence. The points of contact are relatively few and concentrated in location which means that frequent contact is relatively easy to achieve from the CCMA’s Colac base. Suggested components of the Engagement Strategy are shown in Table 1.
Table 3: Engagement - Major resource and secondary industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Why engage?                   | • High users of water, producers of waste.  
• Important decision makers at regional scale.  
• Large employers, most support/ maintain external environmental projects involving community and employees. |
| The quality of the relationship now | • Limited contact through Geelong Business Environment Network and through some environmental programs (e.g. Alcoa’s investment in Wody Yaloak Catchment).  
• CCMA’s profile is low. |
| Objectives for engagement     | • Work with key partners to achieve mutually desirable environmental outcomes.  
• Assist companies to develop/ maintain reputation as good environmental managers for business reasons.  
• Leverage resources for additional NRM projects.  
• Raise CCMA’s profile as potential partner. |
| Engagement methodology?       | • Direct contact with major players and through active participation in the Geelong Business Environment Network.  
• Development of projects for joint CCMA/ partner support. |
| Targets for engagement?       | • Establishment of new projects worth $1million over the next 12 months. |
| Output indicators?            | • Investment by major companies in projects that will deliver Regional Catchment Strategy outcomes. |
| Outcome indicators?           | • NRM outcomes achieved through major company investment.  
• Reduced pressure on natural resources by major companies. |

The corporate entities in these industries are large resource users and are important players in determining the socio-economic make-up of the Region. As well as implementing environmental programs for themselves, some companies are already supporting some community environmental projects. In summary, they are potentially very powerful partners in influencing and supporting natural resource management in the Region.

### 3.3 Support organisations for agriculture

Growing sophistication in agriculture, closer linkages between the producer and the market and the demand for environmentally responsible production is increasing the reliance of agricultural enterprises on external sources of advice, information and support. On-farm practices will be driven by information and influence coming from knowledge brokers (e.g. SFS; West Vic Dairy); and food processors (e.g. McCains, Bonlac, Steggles). Intensive agricultural industries are designing and implementing Environmental Management Systems (EMS) and Quality Assurance (QA) schemes. Rural landcare groups will be important in fostering and encouraging environmentally responsible agriculture.

Another component of agricultural land use that could be considered within this section is plantation forestry, where the drive for product certification (e.g. Forest Stewardship Certification, implementation of EMS) by consumers will require participating companies to demonstrate regional environmental, economic, and social benefits from their
operations. CCMA could establish linkages with such companies and assist them in defining mutually beneficial environmental programs on land used for plantation forestry.

Suggested components of the Engagement Strategy are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Engagement - Support organisations for agriculture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Why engage?**                | • Indirect reliance on natural resources is very high.  
• Decisions made will have indirect impacts on natural resource management.  
• NRM networks have direct involvement in managing natural resources.  
• Moderate to high potential to influence others’ behaviour depending on leverage they have over individual landholders. |
| **The quality of the relationship now** | • Close involvement with NRM networks.  
• Moderate involvement with other components.  
• Some joint R&D projects operating. Profile with the CCMA could be solidified. |
| **Objectives for engagement** | • Develop close collaboration with most influential support organisations.  
• Work with key partners to improve environmental performance of agricultural industries supported by the stakeholders.  
• Assistance provided to partners with implementation of environmental accreditation needs (e.g. EMS, product stewardship)  
• Leverage resources for additional NRM projects. |
| **Engagement methodology?**   | • Direct contact.  
• Formation of alliances/partnerships around mutual needs.  
• Assistance for industries seeking environmental/product certification needs.  
• Provide support for organisations promoting improved agricultural practice. |
| **Targets for engagement?**   | • Development of joint projects using CCMA, stakeholder and third party (RDC, NHT) investment.  
• Joint development of standards and targets for agricultural (including agro-forestry) practices. |
| **Output indicators?**        | • Jointly set and accepted standards and targets.  
• Jointly supported R&D projects that will develop better management practices. |
| **Outcome indicators?**       | • Market structure for regional commodities rewards good NRM behaviour and penalises poor behaviour.  
• Quality of land management practices. |

### 3.4 Tourism

Tourism is already a very large industry, a significant employer and an important user of and beneficiary of the Region’s richness in natural resources. CCMA must engage with the member organisations in this mega-community to help ensure that tourism handles its NRM requirements properly. It must also engage to help the industry address NRM needs in its strategic planning for further growth. CCMA can also be an important source of information for the industry. Suggested components of the Engagement Strategy are shown in Table 5.
Table 5: Engagement - Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why engage?</td>
<td>• Very high reliance on amenity values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Growing demand for land and water to support growing industry, involved in NRM decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Growing industry is exerting influence through local/ regional government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be powerful influence on thinking of visitors to the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the relationship now</td>
<td>• Limited relationship with the CCMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives for engagement</td>
<td>• Develop formal relationships with peak tourist bodies in the region (and at state scale if necessary) around areas of mutual interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build NRM capacity in the tourism industry to assist it to meet growing requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement methodology?</td>
<td>• Direct contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formation of alliances/ partnerships with peak bodies around mutual needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide support for tourism planning and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets for engagement?</td>
<td>• CCMA seen as having a central role in long-term planning for tourism development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output indicators?</td>
<td>• Tourist development plans and activities respect NRM needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome indicators?</td>
<td>• Tourism activities make a positive contribution to the maintenance and protection of natural resources in the region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Engagement strategies – medium priority

This section presents separate engagement strategies for the mega-communities judged to have medium priority as stakeholders for continued or enhanced engagement initiated by the CCMA. Further development of the engagement strategies should use the analytical techniques presented in Section 5.

4.1 Tertiary industries

The tertiary industries and services, particularly those that invest in community economic and social welfare are major employers in the Region and actively involved with most sectors in the Region’s communities. Suggested components of the Engagement Strategy are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Engagement - Tertiary industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Why engage?                        | • Low reliance on natural resources, low (direct) involvement in making decisions about natural resources.  
                                         • High potential to influence others – major employer and large numbers of professionals in these fields through the community.  
                                         • Important sector in a period of high change. |
| The quality of the relationship now | • Limited relationship with the CCMA.  
                                         • Level of awareness is quite varied and could be strengthened. |
| Objectives for engagement          | • Development of projects/programs with mutually beneficial outcomes.  
                                         • NRM considerations included in policy and strategic planning conducted by member organisations. |
| Engagement methodology?           | • Direct contact with regional managers of target organisations.  
                                         • Contact/membership of regional peak councils. |
| Targets for engagement?            | • Engagement through joint projects with mutually beneficial outcomes.  
                                         • CCMA’s expertise is used in strategic planning and policy development. |
| Output indicators?                 | • Level of contact with member organisations.  
                                         • Level of involvement of CCMA in strategic planning, policy development. |
| Outcome indicators?                | • Policies and strategies that address relevant NRM needs.  
                                         • Number and value of specific projects with NRM benefits. |

The level of understanding of NRM and the alignment between their activities and those of the traditional NRM agencies is low. There is an opportunity for collaboration in ensuring that the programs and projects in economic and social development address NRM needs, and that mainstream NRM programs include wider community development considerations.

4.2 Rural communities

This has been a traditional point of contact and engagement for the CCMA. Continued engagement is justified through collaboration around the need to assist agricultural
industries and their members in addressing the requirements for environmentally responsible agriculture. CCMA can contribute information, and support with sourcing investment to the partnerships. Suggested components of the Engagement Strategy are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Engagement - Rural communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why engage?</td>
<td>• Very high reliance on natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large users of land, water and generators of waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collective impact of individual landholders’ decisions is significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential to influence is generally low at individual scale, limited at collective scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the relationship now</td>
<td>• Limited with individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good contact through industry organisations and Shires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives for engagement</td>
<td>• Strengthen links with industry organisations, particularly in intensive agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build further contacts with Shires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage and support organisational initiatives in sustainable land and water use and management, in areas like EMS and QA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement methodology?</td>
<td>• Direct contact with and membership of peak regional bodies, and close support for identified ‘NRM champions’ in the various component communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets for engagement?</td>
<td>• Development of joint projects that encourage responsible agricultural practices, with particular focus on management of off-site impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output indicators?</td>
<td>• Level of contact with member organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of involvement of CCMA in strategic planning, policy development and individual projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome indicators?</td>
<td>• NRM content of activities undertaken by rural organisations and Shires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of investment by rural industries in management of off-site impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Support organisations for environmental values

There are well over 100 groups in the Region whose main focus is environmental management at either issue or locality scale. These community groups, whose motives are usually altruistic, can be important allies in ensuring natural assets are managed well and in the influencing behavioural change in the wider community. CCMA is already well linked with the basis established for productive relationships. Suggested components of the Engagement Strategy are shown in Table 8.
### Table 8: Engagement – Support organisations for the environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why engage?</td>
<td>• Low direct reliance of natural resources, except as focus for personal and collective activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linkages with major local governments (Geelong and Ballarat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence on others varies, but can be high, according to particular issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the relationship now</td>
<td>• Links established but some groups are unsure of CCMA’s role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sufficient basis for building long-term relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives for engagement</td>
<td>• Develop formal relationships with peak bodies in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build NRM capacity in the environmental groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement methodology?</td>
<td>• Active membership and support of Peak Councils (Geelong Environment Council, Ballarat Environment Council). Provision of information and assistance with leveraging funding from third parties (corporates, government).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets for engagement?</td>
<td>• Development of joint projects, particularly those that focus on achieving community-based management of natural resources and those that are aimed at behavioural change in the urban and peri-urban communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output indicators?</td>
<td>• Number and value of joint projects that deliver outcomes of value to both the CCMA and the partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome indicators?</td>
<td>• Level of formally-recognised community-based custodianship of the region’s natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of behavioural change in urban and peri-urban communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Developing Engagement Strategies with stakeholders

In the previous Section, the overall priorities for engagement with the mega-communities is suggested. This section introduces some principles and processes for developing engagement strategies with separate stakeholders within the mega-communities. For example, the Managers of Land Use Change have been identified as high priority for engagement. The requirement is then to develop an engagement strategy with separate stakeholders in this community – for example with Barwon Water, or the Shire of Golden Plains.

This Section commences with a consideration of how engagement should be staged over time. This is followed with three alternate but complementary approaches to analysing stakeholders for the desired nature of engagement with them, first steps in engagement and principles of influence in managing relationships.

5.1 A staging process for engagement

Figure 1 summarises one view of the changing strategic environment for engagement in the Corangamite CMA Region. This staging process commences with the ‘Declining needs’ of the CCMA’s current strategic environment and extends through to ‘Innovative opportunities’, in a clockwise direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declining needs</th>
<th>Mainstream business</th>
<th>Innovative opportunities</th>
<th>Emerging priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Direct contact with individual landholders and small rural groups.</td>
<td>• Support to local governments in their planning and environmental management roles.</td>
<td>• Promotion of regional icons to inspire personal NRM behaviour.</td>
<td>• More joint programs and projects with agricultural knowledge brokers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement with the native forests industry.</td>
<td>• Support to rural NRM groups.</td>
<td>• Working with local governments in building new cultures in peri-urban and coastal communities.</td>
<td>• Collaborative investment in projects with major resource and secondary industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrating NRM focus into community economic and social development programs.</td>
<td>• Establishing NRM standards and targets with food processing industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning for tourism expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement with government beyond DNRE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As suggested in this and other Reports completed in this consultancy, direct contact with rural landholders, small rural groups and the native timber industry is declining importance for the CCMA. The mainstream business for engagement is seen as strengthening support and involvement in the local government NRM agenda, and continuing support for the larger rural and urban NRM groups (e.g. Leigh Landcare Network, Geelong Environment Council). The emerging opportunities are for more collaborative programs with the well resourced and influential players in agricultural, tourism and industrial development. Engagement with these stakeholders will encourage leveraging of resources to achieve desired NRM outcomes. Further out are the opportunities to use regional icons to inspire personal behaviour, and develop programs that integrate NRM more fully into all aspects of social and economic life in the Region.

A useful activity would be to compare the current allocation of CCMA resources to the suggested priorities given in previous sections and the analysis of trends given in Figure 1. For example, based on discussions held with CCMA staff and stakeholders, it is likely that, compared to suggestions in this report, current activities place a higher emphasis on relationships with rural industries and communities and a lower emphasis on relationships with major resource and secondary industries.

5.2 Stakeholder Analysis - Method 1

This method focuses on a tabular analysis of what is known about the stakeholder and its involvement in activities of relevance to the CCMA. The first requirement is to use the chart shown in Table 9 as a basis for analysis of a stakeholder’s attitude to an objective, goal, outcome or desired action of importance to the CCMA. At the level of Objectives and Goals, it can be used as an overall check of the priority for that particular stakeholder for engagement. At the level of specific outcomes or actions, the assessment can guide engagement for a specific purpose.

Table 9: Stakeholder analysis chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the Objective? Goal? Outcome? Desired Action?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E=estimate   C=confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mega-community member (stakeholder)</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Next Step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column 1 is for listing the specific stakeholder being targeted. The subsequent columns are for determining, in a five category code, the CCMA’s estimate of the stakeholder’s characteristics.
**Column 2**  
$[E]$ is the best guess or estimate of the stakeholder’s attitude towards the objective/desired action from willingness to participate (supportive) to unwillingness to participate (unsupportive).

- ++ strongly supportive
- + somewhat supportive
- o indifferent or undecided
- - somewhat unsupportive
- -- strongly unsupportive

The second part of this Column $[C]$ defines the level of confidence in the estimate in Column 2, using the following scoring.

- ✓ for fully confident that estimate is correct
- ? for reasonably confident (some missing information, perhaps, or some doubts about interpretation)
- ?? for an informed guess
- ??? for wild guess or sheer fantasy

Unless the assessment team in the CCMA achieves immediate agreement, then at least one question mark is warranted.

**Column 3** is about the best guess/estimate of the influence of that stakeholder will have in helping to achieve the objective? Goal? Outcome? Desired Action?. A three-category code is used.

- H high: without the support of this group little success in achieving the goals etc will be possible (has the power of veto, formally or informally).
- M medium: goals could probably be achieved without this group's support, but not easily.
- L low: this group is indifferent in terms of needing support to influence the outcomes of the intended actions

The second part of this column determines the level of confidence in the estimate in Column 3. The same categories apply as previously used.

- ✓ for fully confident that estimate is correct
- ? for reasonably confident (some missing information, perhaps, or some doubts about interpretation)
- ?? for an informed guess
- ??? for wild guess or sheer fantasy

In general, question marks indicate a need for more information. The more question marks and the more influence the stakeholder possesses, the greater the need to engage with them. In general, high influence indicates a need to involve/engage with the stakeholder in some way. The stakeholders who require most attention are those who are most influential. Whether or not they are supportive will also help to determine the next steps. Column 4 is used to record the ‘next steps’ to be taken. For example, where
confidence is low, this may be a commitment to learn more about the stakeholder before repeating the analysis.

5.3 Stakeholder Analysis - Method 2

An alternative means for assessing and confirming stakeholder influence and opportunity to partner, shown in Table 10, is by creating a summary profile of how the different stakeholders within the mega-community are affected by specific NRM issues. This approach is therefore focused around separate issues, such as water quality in the Barwon River, or effluent management from dairies. This analysis would be valuable in determining who to engage with in addressing a specific issue.

Table 10: Stakeholder analysis matrix – issues and their impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mega-community member (stakeholder)</th>
<th>How impacted by the issue?</th>
<th>What is their capacity / motivation to participate / support / influence in addressing the issues?</th>
<th>Relationship with other stakeholders (eg partnership or conflict)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second matrix shown in Table 11 summarises how a proposed action / intervention might affect the different stakeholders. The second matrix would therefore not be completed until after potential project objectives had been identified.

Table 11: Stakeholder analysis matrix – impacts of intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mega-community member (stakeholder)</th>
<th>Stakeholder’s main objectives</th>
<th>Positive impacts/benefits</th>
<th>Negative impacts/costs</th>
<th>Net impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Stakeholder analysis – Method 3

The NRM outcomes of importance at regional scale will be of varying relative importance to CCMA and the mega-communities in the Region. Some of the outcomes will be of value mainly to the CCMA, while others will be within the Framework of Interest to both the CCMA and members of a mega-community. A sustainable and worthwhile relationship between the CCMA and a stakeholder is most likely to be built by firstly focussing on those outcomes that will deliver benefits to both parties.
The schematic figure shown in Figure 2 identifies the frameworks of interest for the CCMA and the Tourism managers and services, using the strategies contained in the regional NRM strategy (Working Draft as at August 2002).

**Figure 2: Overlapping frameworks of interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCMA Framework of Interest</th>
<th>Overlapping Framework of Interests</th>
<th>Tourism Framework of Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build up information on ecosystems</td>
<td>• Set targets for each landscape of the region</td>
<td>• Enforce critical regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build the human interface between government and community</td>
<td>• Market environmental management</td>
<td>• Support local learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate priorities at local catchment scale</td>
<td>• Integrate service delivery</td>
<td>• Provide incentives for efficient resource use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cap water use from streams</td>
<td>• Pay for environmental services</td>
<td>• Require efficient resource use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve the water allocation process</td>
<td>• Improve management of public lands</td>
<td>• Encourage responsible innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build up environmental education with young people</td>
<td>• Work with local communities and wider interests to set goals for native forests</td>
<td>• Support local innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan for environmental health in land use planning schemes</td>
<td>• Develop sustainable best management practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delegate more authority to local government</td>
<td>• Set standards for efficient resource use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mobilise mainstream community groups</td>
<td>• Build up environmental education in tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop relationships between communities</td>
<td>• Provide better information on the environment and an environmental policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult local communities in ways that capture their interest</td>
<td>• Plan for sustainable development at regional scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place facilitators in the interface between government and community</td>
<td>• Help local communities plan for a sustainable future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give local government the resources to meet its responsibilities</td>
<td>• Take more time and care developing partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ask for leadership by Government</td>
<td>• Develop the regional agenda for sustainable development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement regulations within partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure highlights those overlapping interests that sensibly form the focus of joint action to establish a long-term relationship. It also identifies strategies that will be mainly for the Tourism industry to act on directly, without the need for much involvement from the CCMA. Other partners such as government agencies and industry will get involved in
delivering these strategies with the Tourism industry. Conversely, Figure 2 shows that there will be strategies of much less interest to the Tourism industry that will need to be acted upon by the CCMA through relationships with other mega-communities.

The analysis shows a high degree of overlapping strategic interests in NRM between CCMA and Tourism – mainly in the area of setting standards and planning to achieve them in the context of tourism’s reliance on and use of land and water resources.

The analysis shown in Figure 2 could be repeated for all of the high priority mega-communities in determining the scope and nature of the relationships required.

5.5 Approach and influence

When attempting to understand and thinking about how to approach and influence stakeholders in developing relationships, three general questions must be answered:

- Who are they?
- What do they want?
- How are they going to try to get what they want?

The last question relates particularly to the methods and strategies stakeholder’s use to get what they want. If the CCMA wants to be able to influence stakeholder decision making and behaviour, then an understanding of the different stakeholder influence strategies and why such strategies are used, will be helpful. Further, by altering the perspective of these three questions from the ‘stakeholder’s’ to the CCMA, potential influence strategies can be identified, that is:

- Who are we?
- What do we want?
- How are we going to try to get what we want?

5.5.1 Control and Influence

One framework for answering these questions is resource dependence theory. Simply put, resource dependence theory means that organisations are dependent in some way on external stakeholders for some of their resources. When stakeholders provide a resource to the organisation and are able to exert some form of control over the resource, then this is termed resource dependence. A resource can be viewed as influence, support as well as money, time, goods etc.

The types of resource control (‘means of control’) and the way in which influence is used (‘influence pathways’) determine what influence strategies are available to stakeholders in their dealings with the CCMA. There are two primary ‘means of control’ over an stakeholder are detailed in Table 12 below.

The CCMA can use this same way of thinking to determine how it can influence its own stakeholders.
• *Withholding strategies* are those where the CCMA stops providing resources to an organisation with the intention of making it change certain behaviour.

• *Usage strategies* are those in which the CCMA continues to supply a resource but attaches conditions to its use.

### Table 12: Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy type used by Stakeholder</th>
<th>Primary Means of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withholding -</td>
<td>Determining whether or not the organisation gets the resources it wants / needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage -</td>
<td>Determining whether or not the organisation can use the resources in the ways it wants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary ‘means of control’ involves the resource dependence that arises from relationships between stakeholders. Withholding and usage strategies could be performed by a partner or supporter (e.g. fellow industry organisations) of the stakeholder with whom the organisation has a resource dependence. This is called an influence pathway, which can be direct or indirect.

• *Direct strategies* are those that the stakeholder itself manipulates the flow of resources by withholding or through usage conditions.

• *Indirect strategies* are those where the stakeholder works through a supporter who manipulates the flow of resources by withholding or through usage conditions. It should be noted though, that indirect strategies require substantial communication and cooperation between stakeholders and are difficult to sustain.

### Table 13: Influence pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Influence Pathway&quot; Means of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder manipulates flow of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect</strong> -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporter/partner manipulates flow of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An understanding of stakeholders and their influence can be gained by using a matrix (see Figure 3). By forecasting the influence strategies that may be used, the CCMA can create their own strategies to influence and engage stakeholders.
**Figure 3: Matrix of influence strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the CCMA dependent on the stakeholder?</th>
<th>Is the stakeholder dependent on the CCMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect/withholding (Low interdependence)</td>
<td>Indirect/usage (CCMA power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct/withholding (Stakeholder power)</td>
<td>Direct/usage (High interdependence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.6 Planning next steps**

After completing the stakeholder analysis and determining the desired level and type of engagement, the CCMA needs some next steps for approaching and involving each stakeholder. This may include meetings, obtaining further information or making a direct approach to key persons in the group. Questions to ask in planning the next steps include:

- To what extent, does the CCMA want the group involved? Does the Authority want the stakeholder to provide explicit support? Commitment of resources? Exertion of influence? Be directly involved in decision-making processes? Direct participation of everyone, or representation?
- What does the stakeholder group want from the CCMA? How strong is their want?
- What would be the benefits / advantages to the CCMA? The stakeholder?

In essence, the process is now to determine what each partner contributes to and gains from the relationship. Clearly, the total benefits from the transactions must exceed the costs for the engagement to be beneficial. The schematic shown in Figure 4 can be used to capture and analyse this information. Once this information is completed, specific actions and tasks can be developed.

**Figure 4: Provision / benefits matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What will the CCMA provide?</th>
<th>What will the stakeholder provide?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the benefits to the CCMA?</td>
<td>What are the benefits to the stakeholder?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Implementing the Engagement Strategy

6.1 Engaging the staff

The success of any strategic change lies in the combination of a well-thought out and considered strategy and the level of its implementation. Implementation will, by its very nature, be embedded within the actions and behaviours of the CCMA’s staff. To this extent it will be critical to engage internally with CCMA staff in a way that will question existing views and test existing organisational boundaries so that the NRM engagement strategies can be fully realised.

How can staff be engaged and why is it so important to do so? In the same way that the CCMA undertook research in order to elicit and obtain an understanding of the beliefs and values of the community in relation to NRM, the CCMA needs to elicit the beliefs and values of its staff in relation to the role of the CCMA in implementation of the engagement strategy. Individual views and organisational views need to be challenged and reviewed to ensure that they are aligned and that staff are able to proceed with confidence. Mis-alignment between these two views will impede the CCMA from moving forward and embracing the key concepts of engagement.

The CCMA need to foster an internal work environment that encourages people to speak out and ask questions. In order for people to be able to ask questions and commence the process of thinking how and what to ask questions about, tools are required so that challenges to current organisational thinking can be created. How do we challenge our beliefs within an organisational context? How can we test our individual thinking in the organisational context?

Some starting information on processes and tools to be used in management engagement are provided in Annex A. Further work in this area can be developed as part of training programs in engagement.

6.2 Supporting the staff

Implementation of any organisational initiative, in this case, engagement strategies in NRM, requires support to the staff. This support will take a variety of forms and will also be dependent on the existing knowledge, experience and responsibilities of the CCMA staff. Considerations for supporting the CCMA staff in the successful implementation of the engagement strategy include:

- **Resource Allocation:** providing sufficient time for the increase in work for the implementation of the engagement strategy. For example, examining and undertaking the stakeholder analyses within each mega-community will require an upfront burden of time. This may benefit from additional assistance from boosting internal resourcing or by accessing external help.

- **Underpinning knowledge and skills:** in order for staff to be able to communicate the engagement strategies and establish partnerships with key people / stakeholders within the
mega-communities, an understanding of the basic principles of human behaviour would be beneficial. Ideally, the principles of negotiation and issue resolution would also be learnt. This implies a need for formal training.

- **Time for reflection and review:** With all new directions and learning experiences, time for reflection on actions taken is beneficial. This can be a designated time each week or another regular time period, where staff consider what is working and why; what is not working and why; improvements that can be made (large or small) to current practice and what further needs for learning or training they require.

### 6.3 Evaluating the engagement strategy

#### 6.3.1 The benefits of evaluation

Evaluation – oriented frameworks imply that a decision has been made to intervene purposefully with a program of stakeholder engagement. The role of evaluation is to determine if the relationship is generating the desired benefits for the CCMA and stakeholders. This is an area in stakeholder engagement that has been traditionally weak in application. Arguments that the outcomes are too difficult to measure, that qualitative methodologies are unreliable and that quantitative methods can’t be used have been presented as reasons for not evaluating activities in stakeholder engagement. The possible results for organisations of this loose approach to investment management include:

- Cessation of useful programs because it is not seen how they contribute to outcomes and goals;
- Promotion of ‘pet projects’ by management that have little real value; and
- Loss of organisational credibility within stakeholder networks who see or have to live with the results of ineffective relationships.

Fortunately, in recent times considerable work has been done in adapting and applying the rigour of conventional evaluation theory and methodology to social programs that have a mixture of quantitative and qualitative outcomes. Technologies for evaluating investments in evaluation are shown in Annex B.

#### 6.3.2 Investing in evaluation

How much to invest in evaluation is an issue for organisations. Evaluations incorporated in the World Bank project cycle typically cost between 0.6 and 1.0 percent of total investment in programs. More specifically, a usual *ex post* evaluation of a World Bank or Asian Development Bank project of US$5 million costs between US$50,000 and US$100,000. The Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research allocates 0.7 percent of its budget to evaluation of easily quantified investments, and the Land and Water Australia Corporation allocates 1.4 percent of its budget to evaluation of less quantifiable research and development programs.

Using the above benchmarks as a guide, the CCMA could justify allocating between 1.0 and 1.5 percent of program investment to evaluation of its investments made through this engagement strategy.
7 Acknowledgements and References

7.1 Acknowledgements

The consultant team acknowledges with gratitude the assistance provided by the following organisations and individuals.

- Don Forsyth, Chief Executive Officer, Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA) and his staff for logistical and contractual support.
- Tony Overman, Manager Biodiversity Program (CCMA), Peter Codd, Manager NAP Planning, and Jo Roberts, Project Officer, Regional Planning for support with the project and in identifying contacts within the Corangamite CMA Region.

7.2 References


Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2001). Social capability in rural Victoria: The food and agriculture and natural resource management sectors. Unpublished report prepared by the Monash Regional Australia Project and the Centre for Research and Learning in Regional Australia.


Annex A

Processes and tools in building engagement capability
Using the Johari window to understand motivation and behaviour

The four panes of the Johari Window shown in Figure 1 represent the following and can be considered in the context of an individual within the organisation that is the CCMA as well as in the context of the CCMA as a single entity.

**Figure 1: Johari Window**

- **Open**: The open area is that part of our conscious self - our attitudes, behaviour, motivation, values, way of life - of which we are aware and which is known to others. We move within this area with freedom. We are "open books".

- **Hidden**: Our hidden area cannot be known to others unless we disclose it. There is that which we freely keep within ourselves, and that which we retain out of sensitivities. The degree to which we share ourselves with others (disclosure) is the degree to which we can be known.

- **Blind**: There are things about ourselves that we do not know, that others are able to see more clearly; or things we imagine to be true of ourselves for a variety of reasons but that others do not see at all. When others say what they see (feedback), in a supportive, responsible way, and we are able to hear it; in that way we are able to test the reality of who we are and are able to grow.

- **Unknown**: We are more rich and complex than that which we and others know, but from time to time something happens - is felt, read, heard, or identified – and that something from our unconscious is revealed. Then we "know" what we have never "known" before.

It is through disclosure and feedback that the **open** pane of the CCMA and individual staff can be expanded. It will enable access to the potential within us represented by the **unknown** pane.
Principles of change within the Johari Window

At a practical level, the Johari Window (Luft 1969) can be used firstly by the individual staff members, and then by teams of staff members for the CCMA. (that is, the CCMA). In doing so however, a number of key principles of change need to be kept mind.

1. A change in any one window pane will affect all other panes.
2. It takes energy to hide, deny, or be blind to behaviour which is involved in interaction.
3. Forced awareness (exposure rather than disclosure) is undesirable and usually ineffective.
4. Interpersonal learning means a change has taken place so that the open window is larger, and one or more of the other window panes has grown smaller.
5. Working with others is facilitated by a large open window pane. It means more of the resources and skills can be applied to the goals or tasks at hand.
6. The smaller the open window, the poorer the communication within the CCMA.
7. There is generally a lot of curiosity about the unknown area; this is held in check by organisational norms, lack of resources or fear of the unknown.
8. Sensitivity means appreciating the concealed or secret aspects of behaviour in the open, hidden and blind window panes and respecting the desire of others to keep them so.

And finally, remember, a caterpillar may be perfectly happy without awareness, but after all, he restricts himself to crawling under rocks.

Other Tools

There are a number of other tools and theories around that can be utilised for the examination of individual and organisational values, beliefs and behaviours. They include:

- Cognitive Mapping (mind-mapping of how thoughts / views are connected, Eden 1988);
- The Ladder of Inference (identifying basis of beliefs and assumptions, Senge et al 1994);
- Core Values and Principles Model (reflecting on and eliciting organisational and individual values, Mink et al 1993); and
- Double-loop Learning (not just asking if what is being done is working, but questioning whether what is being done needs doing at all, Argyris and Schon 1974).
Annex B

Engagement Proforma
Target Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Summary:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target Group/Sector**
- Describe the characteristics of this target audience or sector and what makes them a distinct group.
- Outline what we would want them to do and what are their motivations.
- What encouragement they require to do it.
- What barriers do we need to overcome to enable the change to happen.
- What is the relative priority of this group with respect to other target groups in terms of importance and urgency.

**Tangible benefits resulting from engagement strategy**
- What are the measurable communication strategy objectives that effective engagement with this group will deliver.
- What will the CCMA gain from engagement.
- What will the target group gain from engagement.

**Identifying the relationship**
- What relationship would best achieve the CCMA’s and target groups needs
- What is the message we want to convey to this group so that they will take the desired action.

**Current Situation**
- Outline results of surveys/of the group in terms of their perceptions of how effectively we are engaging them
- How do they see us (like we want them to or not)
- What are the current strategies we employ to attempt to engage this group and how effective are they in achieving the desired outcome

**Strategies Required**
- What are the new strategies or changes to existing strategies required to engage with this group more effectively to deliver the desired outcomes
- Include aspects of all steps in the behavioral cycle change

**Resources**
- What resources are required to put the desired engagement strategies in place

**Schedule**
- Identify the high level milestones of the engagement strategy and identify the appropriate stages and processes for monitoring and evaluating the results

**Reference**
Annex C

Evaluating investments in stakeholder evaluation
Inputs, outputs and outcomes
Evaluation can be used to compare actual outputs and outcomes from the implementation of projects and activities with objectives or expected outputs and outcomes. This information is useful for management and preparation of subsequent projects. This sort of evaluation should focus on outcomes (the most important criteria for allocating resources and evaluating effectiveness) and outputs (often leading indicators of outcomes) rather than inputs (which don’t necessarily result in change).

As an example, monthly meetings with the CEO and Environmental Manager for a Shire would be an input which might lead to more open communication and information exchange as an output, which in turn might contribute to the outcome of more environmentally sound planning decisions being made by the Shire.

Evaluation has two main purposes - as a basis for allocation of resources, and to account for the efficient and effective use of those resources to achieve planned outcomes. Figure 1 summarises the evaluation choices available to project managers and investors. Evaluations performed after a program has been implemented completely are termed historical evaluation or ex post evaluations. That is, they occur after the event. Assessments carried out during the implementation of a project are termed monitoring, progress evaluation or life-of-project evaluation and are used as a measure of accountability for resourcing and to provide some guidance for the future allocation of resources. Ex post evaluation is facilitated by the presence of a monitoring framework including milestones or benchmarks relating to specific project objectives or outputs.

Performance measurement
Performance measurement can be used at any time in the life of a relationship between one or more parties to measure:
- changes resulting from investment in the relationship and its joint activities;
- differences between expected and actual outcomes;
- reallocation of remaining resources to improve outcomes;
- justification for allocation of further resources; and
- the performance of the people responsible for managing the relationship.

Performance measurement should be based on simple indicators that are directly linked to agreed activities. The logical framework is the best tool for developing simple indicators of this type. Tools such as Goal Attainment Scaling are also useful, but these are best used for periodic evaluation rather than regular monitoring work.

Principles for effective performance measurement
Effective performance measurement needs to use sensible units for measuring change; be able to distinguish between outputs and outcomes; measure effectiveness and efficiency; use leading and lagging indicators and deal with qualitative and quantitative data.
 Outputs vs Outcomes
The ultimate return to the CCMA’s investments in engagement and relationship building comes from changed attitudes and behaviour in managing natural resources by the stakeholders. Since project outcomes may take some time to be realised - because of the time lags from attitudinal to behavioural change and then to observed differences in the condition of the natural resources.

- **Leading indicators** measure project outputs and other changes that are expected to result in the desired project outcomes when conditions are right for this to occur. For example willingness of major resource companies to participate in joint programs would be a leading indicator of change.

- **Lagging indicators** measure project outcomes and other changes that are the desired return on investment in the project. For example on-ground benefits from investment by major resource companies in NRM would be a lagging indicator of change.

 Qualitative and quantitative change
Many benefits from engagement activities will be difficult to quantify and so either surrogate measures must be used, or estimates made of likely relations and effects without the project.

Engagement with stakeholders aims to develop an environment which will enable the CCMA to operate more efficiently and effectively. Many benefits from engagement will be difficult to quantify financially, so evaluation of such efforts requires estimation of values for qualitative change. Techniques used to estimate values for qualitative change can be classified as market based, next-best scenario, surrogate market-based, or survey data. Goal attainment scaling is a very practical tool that can be used to measure performance of activities with qualitative outcomes.

 Objectively verifiable indicators
Performance measurement should be based on objectively verifiable indicators, to ensure that measurements of change by one group are accountable to all stakeholders as well as being repeatable by other groups if needed.

Examples of indicators that can be used for measurement of engagement performance include:

- Level of commitment shown by key stakeholders to CCMA engagement overtures (leading indicator, input).
- Proportion of key stakeholders involved in engagement arrangements with the CCMA (leading indicator, output).
- Level of investment by partners in joint NRM projects (lagging indicator, output).
- Trend in area of bushland managed to achieve specified biodiversity outcomes (lagging indicator, outcome).
- Trend in *per capita* natural resource use and waste generation (lagging indicator, outcome).
Figure 1: Selecting the focus for evaluation

- **Appropriateness**
  - The extent to which project objectives/desired outcomes align with corporate priorities/policy and client needs.

- **Effectiveness**
  - The extent to which project outcomes are achieving project objectives.

- **Cost-effectiveness**
  - The relationship between inputs and outcomes expressed in dollar terms.

- **Efficiency**
  - The extent to which project inputs are minimised for a given level of project outputs, or to which outputs are maximised for a given level of inputs.
Evaluation at any time can be used to measure:

- changes resulting from investment in engagement activities;
- differences between expected and actual outcomes;
- reallocation of remaining resources to improve outcomes;
- justification for allocation of further resources; and
- the performance of the engagement implementation team.

An effective evaluation strategy needs to: use sensible units for measuring change; be able to distinguish between outputs and outcomes; measure effectiveness and efficiency; use leading and lagging indicators and deal with qualitative and quantitative data.

**Logical frameworks in evaluation**

Monitoring and evaluation processes can be summarised with logical frameworks which provide a clear definition of the objectives of evaluation, the indicators to be used and how to measure them. As such, a logical framework is a summary work plan for implementation of the evaluation process. This approach is simple and effective. It is also strongly linked to the investment cycle and so allows evaluation outputs to support subsequent investment planning and implementation management activities.

Information from logical frameworks provides the raw data for qualitative and quantitative benefit cost analysis. Flexibility within the structure of logical frameworks allows this approach to have direct linkages with a mining company’s planning and operational systems.

The underlying principles of a logical framework are summarised in Figure 4, and their application to evaluation summarised in Tables 1 and 2. An example logframe matrix for an engagement strategy with an agricultural knowledge broker is shown in Table 3.

**Table 1: Logical Framework for designing evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The impact engagement has on stakeholder behaviour.</td>
<td>The effectiveness with which the outputs from engagement are used to satisfy the needs of stakeholders and CCMA.</td>
<td>The efficiency with which engagement activities are translated into outputs which benefit CCMA and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**URS Australia and AgInsight**
This matrix can be used to develop an evaluation process which defines the indicators, their means of verification and proposed responsibilities for their measurement and reporting. The process can be developed with all stakeholders as part of developing the engagement strategy. The extent to which stakeholders are involved in development of an evaluation process is flexible. Experience in other community based investment projects shows that participatory evaluation processes result in information and relationships which easily contribute to subsequent project activities. In this case evaluation adds value to ongoing activities designed to achieve CCMA outcomes and goals.

Table 2: Logframe matrix for developing indicators of engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative summary</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Important assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong>: The regional objectives to which the engagement strategy contributes to</td>
<td>Indicators of goal achievement.</td>
<td>Statement of how data on achievement of a goal are to be collected and measured.</td>
<td>Assumptions for achieving goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong>: The primary reasons for the engagement</td>
<td>Conditions that will indicate that the outcome has been achieved.</td>
<td>How data on achievement of outcomes will be collected and measured.</td>
<td>Assumptions for measuring achievement of outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong>: The direct, measurable results of the engagement</td>
<td>Quantified or objectively qualified results to indicate that inputs have been used effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td>How data on achievement of outputs will be collected and measured.</td>
<td>Assumptions for measuring achievement of outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong>: The resources invested in, or allocated to engagement.</td>
<td>Budgets of resource inputs (by type and quantity).</td>
<td>How implementation targets will be monitored.</td>
<td>Assumptions for measuring provision of inputs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CCMA will use the Regional Catchment Strategy outcomes and goals in designing the evaluation process. The indicators, their means of verification and proposed responsibilities for measuring and reporting indicators during implementation of the evaluation process can be presented in a logical framework. Results from the measurement of evaluation indicators can be reported in a logframe summary reporting matrix. These raw data can then be developed to provide information for inclusion in a benefit cost analysis framework so that change can be quantified where possible.

Table 3 below presents an example logical framework for a program of engagement with a significant Agricultural Knowledge Broker. The aim of the engagement strategy is to increase joint investment in R&D into sustainable land management practices.
### Table 3: Logframe for collaborative R&D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CCMA plan</th>
<th>Ag Knowledge Broker perceptions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improved land management practices on broadacre agricultural land</strong></td>
<td>• Farmers able to meet environmental requirements.</td>
<td>CCMA and Ag Knowledge Broker recognised for their contribution and the quality of the engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Culture of innovation developing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>• Enhanced links with stakeholder.</td>
<td>• Readily adopted management changes</td>
<td>Participants want to expand collaborative efforts into other areas of R&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R&amp;D program yields useful information.</td>
<td>• Increased farmer interest in working with Ag Knowledge Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farmer support for CCMA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>• R&amp;D program into sustainable practices funded..</td>
<td>• R&amp;D program is worthwhile.</td>
<td>Number of trial projects in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Farmers support and are interested in R&amp;D program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal attainment scaling**

Assuming objectives have been set for a program of stakeholder engagement, the focus of the evaluation is the relative progress towards them. Ultimately, the objectives for a program will be realised through outcomes. However, since most stakeholder engagement programs have long lead-times between activity and outcome, the progress towards the objectives will be evidenced by outputs which will indicate the extent to which the outcomes are likely to be achieved given the progress to date. Goal Attainment Scaling is an internationally recognised tool that allows the stakeholders and CCMA people to directly track progress towards the ultimate objective. Because it can be used to evaluate different people’s perceptions of performance, the outputs can detect differences between CCMA and stakeholder perceptions of an issue of shared interest.

The Objectives can be framed as key questions around the indicators. These form a common framework for personal consultations, analysis of engagement performance and review of documentation. The key questions lead logically to a Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) framework that enables the researcher to determine the degree to which the objectives are being achieved.

Table 4 below presents an example Goal Attainment Scoring sheet for the tracking of CCMA and major resource and secondary industry perceptions of an engagement program that has been initiated by the CCMA. In this example the objective has been transformed into a key question that queries the quality of the engagement program. Five levels of achievement are suggested against the question, with the respondent able to score each separately. Using this instrument with CCMA personnel and major industry representatives can detect areas where the perception of the performance of the
engagement program differs between the parties. The results can also be used to establish benchmarks that can be tracked for change over time.

**Table 4: GAS sheet for assessing the engagement program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Attainment Score</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Score (n = 25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Engagement program leads to a mutually beneficial relationship between company and major resource and secondary industries?</strong></td>
<td><strong>CCMA 10 people</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Most unfavourable outcome</td>
<td>The engagement program is poorly regarded with the level of contact between the parties being low and ineffective.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Less than expected success</td>
<td>The engagement program is regarded as generally well run, in that contacts are friendly, but are not progressing far in establishing a sound relationship.</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Expected level of success</td>
<td>The engagement process is developing the basis for a sound and fruitful relationship between the parties.</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) More than expected success</td>
<td>The engagement process has evolved into a solid relationship, based on mutual trust, open exchange of issues and ideas and a shared framework of interests.</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Most favourable outcome</td>
<td>The relationship between the parties has been formalised and is recognised as very important by both parties.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is easy to represent the results in graphic form to make it easier for management and stakeholders to analyse quickly changing trends in perceptions of the success of the programs being evaluated.

**Benefit-cost analysis**

The basic principle underlying all evaluation techniques is estimation of the costs and benefits of the activity in a way that facilitates comparison of project results with conditions which may have prevailed without a project. In essence, all techniques are variations of a benefit cost analysis (BCA) framework.

A benefit cost analysis (BCA) framework forms the basis of a range of evaluation techniques which can be applied *ex ante* or *ex post*. These techniques include:

- Descriptive BCA: social surveys, qualitative measurement of beneficiary perception and outcomes;
- BCA: includes quantified benefits;
- BCA (Multi-Criteria Analysis): explicitly includes other criteria such as qualitative benefits; and
- BCA (Investment Decision Analysis): explicitly includes risk.
All BCA should include:

- additional comment on qualitative factors not included in the BCA; and
- a description and assessment of major sources of risk if not explicitly included.

The key sources of risk and uncertainty which require consideration in evaluation are the likelihood of project success, staff capability, capacity of the stakeholder group to participate over time and physical and financial factors affecting participation.

A range of scenarios based on the probabilities of particular outcomes is often included in a BCA to incorporate the effect of risk. This is called sensitivity analysis. Incorporation of Investment Decision Analysis (IDA) into BCA is a formal and transparent way of incorporating the effect of risk.

Table 5 summarises the major capabilities of evaluation techniques and when their use is and is not appropriate.

Table 6 provides a guide for selection of evaluation methods appropriate to projects at differing stages of the investment cycle. Because some project components are larger than others, and some require substantially more investment than others, care should be taken when choosing the evaluation method. For example, while IDA provides more information than either BCA or MCA on the value of a project, it can be an expensive evaluation tool. In the same way, projects which will be greatly affected by stakeholder preference or prejudice should be evaluated by using MCA or Qualitative BCA, rather than Quantitative BCA alone.

Table 5: Comparison of evaluation techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Evaluation Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative BCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major capability:</td>
<td>Qualitative estimates of benefits and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most appropriate when:</td>
<td>Outcomes are qualitative and are affected by stakeholder perceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not appropriate when:</td>
<td>Outcomes are quantified and may be affected by risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Selection of evaluation techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation purpose</th>
<th>Qualitative BCA</th>
<th>Quantitative BCA</th>
<th>BCA (MCA)</th>
<th>BCA (IDA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ex ante</em> allocation of funds between project components.</td>
<td>Used if stakeholder preferences may affect outcomes.</td>
<td>Used if stakeholder preferences do not differentiate between project components and <em>are unlikely</em> to affect outcomes.</td>
<td>Used if stakeholder preferences <em>are likely</em> to affect outcomes.</td>
<td>Used if large projects are to be evaluated and compared, and risk is explicitly included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-of-project evaluation.</td>
<td>Used to assess if stakeholder preferences do affect outcomes.</td>
<td>Used if stakeholder preferences <em>are not likely</em> to affect outcomes.</td>
<td>Used if stakeholder preferences <em>are likely</em> to affect outcomes.</td>
<td>not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure effectiveness of project <em>ex post</em>.</td>
<td>Used to assess qualitative outcomes, information uptake, and attitude and behavioural change.</td>
<td>Best used where results <em>are not greatly affected</em> by stakeholder preference.</td>
<td>Used if change has major stakeholder impact.</td>
<td>not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess how projects complement other development projects.</td>
<td>Used if stakeholder preferences may affect benefits attributable to different projects.</td>
<td>Used if benefits can be partitioned between investors or projects.</td>
<td>May be used where overlap of projects is not expected to be great.</td>
<td>Gives good indication of project overlap and benefits to other investors or projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>