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Foreword

This publication sets out to identify who funds capacity building in rural Australia and the implications of this research for institutional arrangements. A previous review of the relationship between institutional arrangements and capacity building (Macadam et al, 2004) established the principles which might lead to improved capacity building. However, this review did not quantify the funding of capacity building.

This study is designed to inform funders of capacity building and those using capacity building as an instrument of policy. It is based on a literature review and the collection of primary data through interviews. As part of the study an inventory covering who provides funding for capacity building, how much and with what effect was developed. To support this, two case studies were also undertaken. The aim of the case studies was to find out in more detail what was available for capacity building within a region as well as to study capacity building related to a specific issue (irrigation).

Overall, there is adequate funding for capacity building in both the public and private sectors. The most common concern expressed by those interviewed in relation to institutional arrangements was the fact that the vast majority of all funds were dispersed on a short term, competitive, project basis. Other arrangements reported to inhibit capacity building were:

- Intergovernmental agreements. These were quite prescriptive, especially in the NRM field.
- Requirement for cash or ‘in-kind’ contributions to the project.
- Much of the funding for NRM projects was tied to regional plans.

Better institutional arrangements can be created by:

- Developing an understanding that building capacity is about empowering individuals to take control and manage their own futures. This is not always translated into an increase in productivity but it does translate into a rural community that has a better chance of managing change and being sustainable.
- Developing partnerships at a local level to build capacity so that expertise and resources are shared, combined and properly channelled.
- Providing longer term funding where proven gains have been made in building capacity.
- Making the funding application process commensurate with the amount of funding applied for.

This project was funded by the Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building for Innovation in Rural Industries. The Cooperative Venture is managed by the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation for the partners who are: Australian Wool Innovation, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Meat and Livestock Australia, Dairy Australia, Land and Water Australia, the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, the Grains Research and Development Corporation, the Sugar Research and Development Corporation, the Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation and the Cotton Research and Development Corporation.

Publications from the Cooperative Venture are available for viewing, downloading or purchasing online through our website: Downloads at www.rirdc.gov.au/fullreports/index.html.
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Executive Summary

What the report is about
Institutional arrangements are known to have an impact on capacity building. The work discussed in this report was undertaken to investigate the role that institutional arrangements in rural Australia play in helping and hindering capacity building, and identifies changes to institutional arrangements that would improve capacity building in rural Australia.

Background
Macadam et al (2004) (funded by the Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building (CVCB)) explored the concept of capacity building and developed a set of five propositions for effective capacity building in rural Australia. One of these argued that:

‘Effective capacity building depends on political and institutional commitment to the goal of capacity-building programs and the alignment with it of strategically important organisations.

The CVCB funded this research to review the institutional arrangements that affect capacity building in rural Australia. It follows on from work that explored the concept of capacity building and developed a set of five propositions for effective capacity building in rural Australia. One of these argued that:

‘Effective capacity building depends on political and institutional commitment to the goal of capacity-building programs and the alignment with it of strategically important organisations.


Who is this report targeted at?
The target audience for this report is policy makers in State and Federal Government. It will also be useful to the Regional Bodies responsible for natural resource management in much of Australia, and to industry groups and associations.

Objectives
The aims of the study were to:
1. Review current published work on funding of capacity building activities in rural Australia
2. Prepare an inventory of organisations which fund capacity building activities in rural Australia
3. Undertake a regional case study
4. Determine the distribution of capacity building activities
5. Explore the constraints and opportunities created by the funding patterns for capacity building

Methods used
The data on which the study was based were derived from a review of literature and the web, the compilation of an inventory (based on website searches and telephone interviews) and two case studies. Entries were completed by first identifying that the organisation was involved in capacity building through documents and a website search and then followed up by contacting representatives from relevant organisations.

2 Capacity building is defined by Macadam et al (2004) as externally or internally initiated processes, designed to help individuals and groups in rural Australia to appreciate and manage their changing circumstances, with the objective of improving the stock of human, social, financial, physical and natural capital in an ethically defensible way.
The first case-study looked at capacity building in the Glenelg-Hopkins Catchment Management Authority in South-West Victoria. The second looked at capacity building with respect to water use efficiency. In all, over 90 people were interviewed.

Results
The inventory has approximately 140 entries of organisation which fund capacity building. They include:
- Commonwealth Government departments
- State Government departments
- Local Government Associations and Local governments
- The research and development corporations
- Statutory bodies such as catchment authorities
- Philanthropic organisations
- Foundations and trusts.

The inventory covered the funding of capacity building, the division between public and private providers, the recipients and relevant institutional arrangements. One of the prime objectives of the inventory was to ascertain the scope of capacity building and the quantum of funds devoted to that endeavour. Forming a total picture was an impossible task for two reasons:
1. funding of capacity building was often not separated from other monies
2. what was described as capacity building by funders was not according to the definition used here.

It was found that 73 organisations funded 137 different capacity building programs across the public and private sectors. While the dollar figures were not always available, it appeared that the bulk of the funds come from the Commonwealth, and a much lesser amount comes from the State. Industry and private funds contribute only a small amount relative to the Commonwealth. Given the definitional difficulties mentioned earlier, this ratio also has to be read with caution. What was surprising was the range of government programs included, with, for example, 12 Commonwealth Departments involved.

The investment in capacity building at a Commonwealth level can be seen in the inventory. The main recipients of funding were both public and private providers but some funds went directly to researchers and the community. A number of recipients also act as donors.

Institutional arrangements
The most prominent institutional arrangement was that the vast majority of all funds were dispersed on a short term, competitive, project basis. There were another four dominant arrangements:
1. Intergovernmental agreements which were quite prescriptive, especially in the NRM field;
2. Requirement for cash or ‘in-kind’ contributions to the project such as the FarmBis contributions;
3. Much of the funding for NRM projects was tied to regional plans; and
4. Partnerships created as a consequence of the institutional arrangements of funders varied between those where the funders see a benefit for themselves and form their own partnerships, where collaboration arises cooperatively or where funders insist that applicants form partnerships.

Constraints
The constraints caused by the institutional arrangements were identified to be:
- An institutional culture which puts values on material and economic outcomes over social outcomes and which assumes it is possible to tie capacity building to set outcomes. Organisations did not realise that generalised capacity building will increase the capability of producers to determine their own futures and not necessarily the futures prescribed for them by industry or government.
• The timing of funding rounds caused difficulties for a number of reasons such as the timing of payments not coinciding with project objectives. In some cases there was a surfeit of funds because two funding rounds arrived at the same time.
• Competition with other groups for funding was not well regarded by some groups. It was seen as unproductive by these groups and led to less sharing and cooperation between community groups who anticipated competing for the same funds.
• Application processes were seen as too difficult, especially by community groups. This, and the uncertainty of funding, was amongst the most commonly heard complaints. Often the amount of the funding was not commensurate with the time and effort involved in preparing the application.
• Funding availability was limited by specific requirements of funder organisations which were often seen as favouring one group (such as youth) or, for example, by making applications industry or sector specific.

Capacity building as a policy instrument
From the discussions with those interviewed the main messages regarding capacity building as a policy instrument were:

• Compliance needs capacity building for it to work
• Regulation alone will not work in natural resource management
• Capacity building is not a tool that should be used for coercion of change
• Women are change agents in rural industry
• Building capacity is critical for sustained, long term outcomes

Criteria for funding capacity building
One of the objectives of this work was to identify patterns in the funding of capacity building. One of the most important themes to arise from the data was the lack of planning and organisation for capacity building or discernible pattern of funding on the part of the funders.

Institutional arrangements would be greatly aided, in our view, if there was a more systematic approach. In this context the following two main criteria for the funding of capacity building have been developed:

• The concept of lower to higher order capacity building;
• The notion of public and private good.

Lower to higher order capacity building
There is a need to see the building of capacity as a progression rather than as the product of a model. In this research project, the focus was on those activities that can be regarded as building capacity and because of this we concentrated on three extension/education models used in agriculture: Group facilitation/empowerment, Technology Development, and Mentoring (Coutts et al 2005). While activities using these models certainly build capacity, looking at them in isolation does not describe how the capacity of individuals, groups or organisations develops. In many situations there is a discernible progression from the development of basic level skills such as being able to perform a task, to higher order skills such as evaluation of the task. Criteria for the application of this continuum are developed in this project in relation to two groups: the clients of capacity building and the providers of capacity building. Funders could consider how applicants propose to deal with, and plan for, the lower to higher progression for both clients and providers.
Private v public good

A second way to look at capacity building outcomes is to consider the outcome for the person or organisation involved. Is the increase in knowledge, skills or attributes for the private or public good? This question has implications for funding capacity building. The level of contribution to the cost of capacity building required of a participant should be highest where there is a private good outcome and reduce to no contribution where the outcome is solely public good. This is not the case today. The FarmBis subsidy, for example, does not discriminate between the private and public good.

There was little or no evidence in the data of the differentiation between lower or higher order capacity building (as described in Coutts and Roberts [in press]), for example, or between the public and private good.

Discussion

An inventory of organisations that fund capacity building was developed and analysed to identify the constraints and opportunities created by the funding patterns and institutional arrangements. The results from the research showed that there is adequate funding for capacity building at both the public and private levels. Capacity building is occurring in agricultural industry, natural resource management and in community development. The most negative of the institutional arrangements is the use of competitive short term funding dispersed on a project basis. Given that funding is likely to remain short-term, this study has focused on identifying ways in which the institutional arrangements can be applied within that parameter.

Recommendations

The recommendations from the research fall into four categories:

1. Capacity building and its relationship to culture, attitude and practice. Capacity building funders should:
   - Deal with issues associated with how capacity building is seen (for example, the value of economic/material compared to social outcomes), the misconception that capacity building is a tool to deliver external outcomes, the need to target groups other than single male farmers and the effect on capacity building of external factors such as infrastructure.
   - Understand that building capacity is about empowering individuals to take control and manage their own futures. This is not always translated into an increase in productivity but it does translate into a rural community that has a better chance of managing change and being sustainable
   - Improve the application process and in particular ensuring that the effort in making an application is commensurate with the amount funding being sought.
   - Provide better resources for those involved in capacity building at the various levels.
   - Focus on the needs of a particular group or an issue.

2. Fostering better and new partnerships. Improvement would include better links between local researchers, practitioners and universities, more efficient ways to channel monies for capacity building, funding regional scholarships, an increased role for local government and the role of supplementary funding.

3. Long term funding. This should be provided especially where there have been proven gains. The need for a long term approach relates to the progression from lower to higher levels of capacity building, amongst other factors.

4. A regional approach to capacity building. Such an approach is valuable especially with regard to extension and community development.
1. Background

The Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building (CVCB) was established in 2001 by research and development corporations to enhance capacity building in rural industries in Australia.

The CVCB invests in research and development that focuses on enhancing the understanding of learning, improving organisational arrangements to support rural human capacity building, and inspiring innovative farming practices.

Its partner members are the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry; Australian Wool Innovation; Dairy Australia; Grains Research and Development Corporation; Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation; Land & Water Australia; Meat & Livestock Australia; Murray-Darling Basin Commission; Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation and Sugar Research and Development Corporation.

The CVCB has funded several review projects to determine the principles underpinning effective capacity building, participation in capacity building activities and the appropriate institutional arrangements to support capacity building.

A recent project (Macadam et al 2004) funded by the CVCB explored the concept of capacity building and developed a set of five propositions for effective capacity building. One of these proposed that ‘Effective capacity building depends on political and institutional commitment to the goal of capacity-building programs and the alignment with it of strategically important organisations.’

The CVCB wishes to document the current funding systems for rural capacity building activities and to explore the constraints and opportunities created in terms of current and potential institutional arrangements.

This project was designed to contribute to the achievement of the CVCB’s key result area ‘Optimising institutional arrangements’ which has as its objective ‘to promote and rethink rural extension/education through government, industry, and community groups so they respond to new and changing environments and enhance rural learning and practice’.
2. Introduction

The terms of reference of the study were to:

1. Review current published work on the funding of capacity building activities in rural Australia, especially work published in the last three years, to determine providers, recipients, areas of focus, trends and outcomes.
2. Prepare an inventory of organisations which fund capacity building activities in rural Australia outlining the organisations’ capacity-building aims, type/s of capacity building activity, amount of funding provided, outcomes sought, client base/recipients, as well as the achievements/results/outcomes delivered and obtained. This should include any monitoring and/or evaluation undertaken.
3. Undertake a regional case study to provide insight into institutional arrangements that are considered to be effective and efficient in delivering capacity building.
4. Determine the distribution of capacity building activities according to the following criteria:
   a. Formal or informal delivery mechanisms
   b. Public or private provision
   c. Public or private funding.
5. Explore the constraints and opportunities created by the funding patterns for capacity building in terms of current and potential institutional arrangements. The role that capacity building activities can play as a policy instrument in conjunction with regulation and economic instruments should be considered.

This project looked at the funding of capacity building in rural Australia and the implications for institutional arrangements. ‘Institutional arrangements’ are defined by Macadam et al (2004) as the ‘complex of laws, customs, markets, norms and associated organisations that channel our energy towards social goals and the ways we relate to others’. The principal focus of this project was on the organisations who have a role in providing funds for capacity building. While the ‘complex of laws, customs, markets, and norms’ was touched upon, this was done only with reference to how they might create barriers or provide opportunities for funding capacity building activities. The project did not, for instance, intend to paint a total picture of the ‘complex of laws, customs, markets and norms’ at play in rural Australia, as this has been covered extensively elsewhere (see for instance, Cocklin and Dibden, 2005; Coutts, Frost and Roberts, 2004; Macadam et al, 2004).

What the project did do, however, was provide an inventory of those organisations who provide funds for capacity building, outlining the organisations’ capacity building aims, types of capacity building activity, amount of funding provided, outcomes sought, client base, as well as the achievements delivered and obtained. The term ‘institutional arrangements’ was therefore interpreted in slightly narrower terms, looking at the effects internally within organisations, as well as how their relationships with external institutions might also impact upon capacity building in rural Australia.

The Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building (CVCB) defines capacity building as ‘externally or internally initiated processes designed to help individuals and groups associated with rural Australia to appreciate and manage their changing circumstances, with the objective of improving the stock of human, social, financial, physical and natural capital in an ethically defensible way’ (taken from Macadam et al, 2004). For the purposes of this project, the focus was primarily on the human and social capital dimensions of capacity building, although the fact that various dimensions of capital rely on the existence of other forms, also came into consideration.

The CVCB offers the following indicators of what capacity building is not:

- Capacity building is not education and training or technology transfer although they are tools that can be used to develop capacity.
• It is not about experts imparting knowledge to others, rather capacity building is based on the concept of everyone learning together (co-learning), and this can be with input from people who have special expertise.
• It is not a process where an organisation external to the process can determine the final outcome.

Coutts, Roberts and Frost (2005) state that extension can take five distinct forms:

1. Group facilitation/ empowerment
2. Programmed learning
3. Technology development
4. Information access
5. Individual consultant/ mentor.

The five models of extension are not mutually exclusive and it is likely that a combination of all or some of them will be required to build capacity in any given circumstance.

1. **Group facilitation/ empowerment model**
   Under this model, participants increase their own capacity in planning and decision-making and seek their own education and training needs based on their situation. Groups may undertake their own research. Group facilitation/ empowerment projects often provide or fund a facilitator to help groups define their own goals and learning needs and to help them realise these.

2. **Programmed learning model**
   This model refers to activities where specifically designed training programs/ workshops are delivered to targeted groups of landholders, community members, government personnel and others to increase understanding or skills in defined areas. These can be delivered in a variety of modes and learning approaches.

3. **Technology development model**
   This is where individuals work together to develop specific technologies, management practices or decision support systems which will then be available to the rest of the industry or community. Technology development activities often involve local trials, demonstrations, field days and on-site visits.

4. **Information access model**
   This capacity building model refers to where individuals and groups can access a broad range of information from a distance at a time that suits them. It can be based on a website, information centre or other centralised locations.

5. **Individual consultant/ mentor model**
   This is where a mentor or consultant works over time with an individual or community to improve their managerial, technological, social or environmental situation.

While the group facilitation/ empowerment, technology development, and individual consultant/ mentor models contain elements of co-learning that assist groups and individuals in rural Australia to manage their changing circumstances (co-learning and interdependence being an important aspect of capacity building), the information access and programmed learning models may or may not include elements of co-learning. As such, for the purposes of this project, only funding for those activities which have a stated or inferable intention of capacity building, as defined by the CVCB, were included. Excluded were projects and programs related to education, training and technology transfer that do not have an expressed intention to build the capacity of individuals and groups.

While there was a focus on the role played by extension in capacity building, the study also drew on theory and practices from the fields of health, philanthropy and community development. The intention was to provide recommendations on how institutional arrangements and funding procedures
can be developed so as to maximise their effectiveness in delivering capacity building and thereby improving the stock of human and social capital. While the report was tailored for the CVCB partners, some utility may also be found by other stakeholders involved with capacity building in rural and regional Australia. The input from the *Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal* is particularly pertinent here.

In addition to the inventory of organisations funding capacity building in rural Australia, the project also undertook a regional case study of the Hamilton region in South-West Victoria in order to provide insight into institutional arrangements that were considered to be effective and efficient in funding and delivering capacity building. An issue-based case study, looking at capacity building in relation to water use also formed part of the project, providing a cross-check for data gathered in the regional case study and inventory.

Macadam et al (2004) have developed five propositions for effective capacity building, with one of these being that ‘effective capacity building depends on political and institutional commitment to the goal of capacity building programs and the alignment with it of strategically important institutions’. Whether there is institutional commitment to capacity building, and whether these institutions are operating strategically and are aligned appropriately formed the focus of the project.

### 2.1. Organisation of report

The parts of this report deal with:

- The methods used to collect and analyse the data;
- A summary of the literature;
- A discussion about the inventory and the findings from interviews associated with it;
- The water use case study;
- The South West Victoria regional case study; and
- Opportunities and recommendations arising from the study.
3. Methods

3.1. Inventory

There are approximately 140 entries on the inventory with regard to who funds capacity building. They include:

- Commonwealth Government departments
- State Government departments
- Local Government Associations and Local governments
- The research and development corporations
- Statutory bodies such as catchment authorities
- Philanthropic organisations
- Foundations and trusts.

Entries were completed by first finding the relevant information through documents and on websites and then followed up by contacting representatives from relevant organisations by email or telephone and going through a series of questions (see attached). Approximately 50 people were contacted by telephone or email.

The information that was most difficult to trace was the amount spent on capacity building as distinct from other extension activities. Sometimes the funds could be separated and at other times they were found to be integrated and could only be estimated as a percentage of the total budget. In many cases institutions were not in a position to or were not prepared to provide figures. An added difficulty was how the institutions defined capacity building compared to the term as used in this study. Some, for example, included infrastructure or financial capital and wages for staff.

Organisations were found by:

- Searching known sites;
- Searching for websites through links such as Grantslink;
- Searching links within websites;
- Using the Grants and Incentives guide developed by the Glenelg Hopkins CMA; and
- Referrals from individuals involved with capacity building.

They are organised according to the categories listed above.

Basic data appear on the inventory but questions about barriers and opportunities were also asked. This information was collated to form the discussion of the barriers and opportunities associated with institutional arrangements.

The following headings were used in the inventory:

- Name of capacity building project or program
- Contact details
- Funder
- Is the funder also the recipient?
- Public or private provider
- Total Project funding
- Funding per annum
- Funding since inception
- Percentage of the project which can be considered capacity building
- Funding committed in future
- Capacity building aims
• Types of action
• Clients
• Outcomes sought
• Outcomes delivered
• Monitoring & Evaluation
• Institutional arrangements
• Constraints and barriers of institutional arrangements
• Opportunity for better institutional arrangements
• Role of Capacity Building activities as a policy instrument in conjunction with regulation and economic instruments
• Other comments

3.2. Case studies

3.2.1. Irrigation in the Mallee region

The methodology involved contacting a range of stakeholders who were involved in capacity building of irrigators in the Mallee region. Before the study was thus narrowed down, the intention had been to undertake a broader study of capacity building regarding water use and quality. It was subsequently discovered, however, that a more useful approach was to focus on capacity building for a specific group, in this case, irrigators in the Mallee. This group in this region was chosen because there was already a substantial body of information (published and unpublished) that was known to the researchers and on which they could build for this work.

It was also selected because of a complementary study being conducted for the Mallee CMA. This other study was an evaluation of the effectiveness of water use efficiency programs and the delivery of incentives in the region. Due to privacy considerations, neither the Department of Primary Industries nor the CMA were able to provide names and contact details for successful growers in the region. However industry personnel who had previously worked in the area (and continue to do so) were able to nominate three of the most efficient growers with regard to water use efficiency. Despite only a few growers being contacted, their notably prominent position within their industries (citrus, wine grapes, table grapes and avocados) meant that data from them was of a particular interest.

The data collection also employed a ‘snowball’ technique wherein respondents were asked to nominate other people who would be able to offer a unique insight into the range of services available to irrigators in the region.

In addition to interviews with the three growers, interviews were also conducted by telephone with the following stakeholders:

| 2 Waterway Health staff at the Glenelg Hopkins CMA | Victorian Waterwatch Project Officer, Department of Sustainability and Environment |
| Executive Officer at SunRISE21 | Waterway Health Officer at the Mallee Catchment Management Authority |
| Extension Officer at the Department of Primary Industries, Mildura | Industry Development Officer at the Murray Valley Winegrape Industry Development Committee |
| Head of Primary Industries and Environmental Science Centre at Sunraysia Institute of TAFE | Irrigation consultant at Yandilla Park |
| Irrigation consultant at Sunraysia Environmental | |
Other information was collected from:

- E-mail contact with the Land and Water Management Officer with the First Mildura Irrigation Trust;
- The Mallee Evaluation of Water Use Efficiency Programs draft report, provided by the Mallee CMA;
- The Evaluation of the Irrigation Management Course, provided by the DPI;
- The Milestone Report for Training in Irrigation Best Practice Management; also provided by the Mallee CMA; and
- Various web-sites, including those for the Murray Valley Citrus Board, Grain & Graze, and the Murray Valley Winegrape Industry Development Committee.

### 3.2.2. South West Victoria

The area chosen for the case study was the Glenelg Hopkins catchment region of South West Victoria. Focusing the study at the catchment level was considered to be useful given that the majority of Commonwealth funding for natural resource management is now delivered on a regional basis. This area was thought to be appropriate to respond to Term of reference 3

> Undertake a regional case study to provide insight into institutional arrangements that are considered to be effective and efficient in delivering capacity building.

The institutional arrangements were thought to be effective because there were a number of institutions delivering capacity building and the area was known to the researchers because of the previous study they had done looking at related fields such as community engagement.

The research for this case study was based on:

- Review of documents and websites;
- Three previous studies by the research team in the region;
- Two site visits; and
- Interviews in person or by telephone with 30 people made up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenelg Hopkins Catchment Management Authority</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Department of Primary Industries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain and Graze</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Green Triangle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landcare</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Councils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Environment Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Farming Systems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management Systems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMIT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Victorian Communities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenormiston College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestVic Dairy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 31**
4. Summary of Literature

There was only a limited amount and range of literature relating to institutional arrangements for funding capacity building. The work by Macadam et al (2004) shaped much of this current study, as did other work commissioned by the CVCB partners (the National Extension/ Education Review by Coutts, Roberts and Frost 2005; and the Mapping of rural service providers by Roberts et al 2005). The evaluation report of the Commonwealth’s Rural Communities Program, conducted in 2001, offered considerable insight into the challenges facing a grants program for rural and regional communities. Aside from this, however, there does not appear to be very much written on the funding of capacity building. Much of this review necessitated searching and analysing the web-sites of relevant capacity building institutions. This information then formed the basis of the search for organisations to include in the inventory.

4.1. Providers of funding for capacity building

4.1.1. Commonwealth Government

The organisations funding capacity building activities and initiatives in rural and regional Australia are many and varied. They include, as one might suspect, a substantial contribution from the Commonwealth Government – in particular through Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) and National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) for funding – as well as the State Governments, who match this funding, in addition to funding their own programs. The Regional Solutions Program (now amalgamated as Regional Partnerships), administered by the Department of Transport and Regional Services, also offers financial assistance supporting capacity building, as do numerous more targeted programs, such as Waterwatch and the National Weeds Strategy. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry runs the Agriculture Advancing Australia program as well as providing funding for farmer training through FarmBis. As noted earlier, within each of the Government programs, it is seldom easy to determine exactly how much money is spent on capacity building, as capacity building is often one objective or aim among many that reinforce rural and regional development. Capacity building is generally not seen as an end unto itself, but rather as a means to other ends such as more sustainable agricultural practices or more resilient communities.

4.1.2. State Governments

In addition to co-funding NHT and NAP, State Governments also run programs to deliver or fund capacity building activities. The New South Wales Government’s Community Builders Program, and the Victorian Government’s Department for Victorian Communities, for instance, are two good examples of state government agencies with a strong focus on capacity building and community development. They, along with the other states, also have capacity building programs supported by departments of agriculture, natural resources and environment. Indigenous affairs and the health sector receive particular attention at this level.

4.1.3. Regional and Catchment Bodies

Regional bodies such as Catchment Management Authorities have an extremely important role to play in rural and regional capacity building. NHT and NAP money is channelled through these regional bodies who fund activities according to regional plans. The planning phase for these regional bodies is complete in some states (such as Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland), and nearing completion in others. Bilateral agreements signed between the Commonwealth and the states and territories hold that these regional bodies must include a significant capacity building and/or community empowerment dimension to their plans, in addition to resource condition targets that are measurable and achievable. Regional bodies occupy a unique place in rural and regional capacity building as they can be conceived of as both providers and recipients of capacity building funds. To the Commonwealth, for instance, they might be seen as the recipients of funds, and to community
groups, they may well be seen as the providers. In any case, the role that regional bodies play is vitally important, especially because – as noted by Macadam et al (2004) – effective capacity building ‘requires a reallocation of resources and authority away from the centre to the regions’. The influence of regional bodies in capacity building is further explored in the case studies.

4.1.4. Web portals
The Commonwealth-run web-sites community.gov.au and regionalaustralia.gov.au list a range of funding opportunities for Australian communities, both in rural and metropolitan contexts. The sites grantslink.gov.au and communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au are also useful resources. State governments host similar resources.

4.1.5. Industry Research and Development Corporations
Outside of government provision of funding for capacity building, industry bodies, business and philanthropic organisations also play a role. Industry research and development corporations, both independently, and in conjunction with other industries, through the CVCB are actively seeking to address capacity building issues in order to maintain viable and sustainable industries into the future. The CVCB invests in research and development that focuses on ‘enhancing the understanding of learning, improving organisational arrangements to support rural human capacity building; and inspiring innovative farming practices.’ The CVCB does not, however, invest in capacity building activities per se.

4.1.6. Business
Business is also an increasing provider of funds for community initiatives – banks in particular are placing more funds in this area, partly because of complaints about branch closures in rural and regional Australia. A brief scan of the major banks shows that all offer donations to, or act in partnership with, charitable organisations, although not necessarily in a rural and regional context. One exception is the Bendigo Bank, whose capacity building activities are well known (see Bendigo Bank website – Community Enterprise). In addition, a number of banks have a focus on environmental initiatives, and on those communities that are most disadvantaged (such as Indigenous communities in the Cape York Peninsula). The ANZ Bank in particular, has partnered with the Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal to offer a program called Seeds of Renewal in rural and regional Australia, although these projects have more of a focus on history, heritage, tourism and the environment, as opposed to community capacity building or development in its own right. The example does, however, show the potential for partnerships in the provision of this type of funding.

4.1.7. Philanthropic organisations
The Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal (FRRR) supports rural and regional development by facilitating partnerships with government, business and other philanthropic organisations. Funding is offered to communities through various programs, and communities can apply directly to the foundation for funding if it meets the criteria supporting the Foundation’s objective, which is ‘to promote for the public benefit rural and regional renewal, regeneration and development in Australia in social, economic, environmental, and cultural areas’. Often, provision is in the form of ‘seed funding’ which allows a community project to start up, and then leverage other funds from a range of business, philanthropic and government organisations. The provision of funding through partnerships is again a key characteristic of this organisation, as is the fact that initiatives are designed locally so that they meet community needs and expectations.
Another important role played by FRRR is that as a charitable organisation it can act on behalf of organisations which do not have that status through the provision of donation accounts providing tax deductibility to approved projects and organisations.

The FRRR also has a strategy to encourage local community philanthropy through the formation of community foundations in rural and regional Australia. It has assisted around 15 community organisations throughout Australia to achieve foundation status.

Other philanthropic organisations include:

- The Ian Potter Foundation
- The George Alexander Foundation
- R.E Ross Trust
- Mazda Foundation
- William Buckland Foundation
- Norman Wettenhall Foundation
- The Foundation for Young Australians

4.2. Recipients of funding for capacity building

As noted previously, regional bodies such as Catchment Management Authorities can be seen as both the recipients and providers of funds for capacity building. Community groups, as opposed to individuals, are more often than not the recipients of funding for capacity building, and these include Landcare, Bushcare, Rivercare and Coastcare groups (some administered through the National Landcare Program) although increasingly in Victoria, individual land managers are being included here. Exceptions are courses that are specifically targeted at individuals such as the Australian Rural Leadership Foundation, which supports and builds the capacity of individuals. However, it must be noted that the course is structured so that these participants can then go back to their communities and industries and assist in capacity building there.

Many government initiatives have a capacity building element to them, even if they do not directly provide funds or grants to communities. The philosophy of capacity building – namely the empowerment of communities to enable them to manage and adapt to change – certainly permeates much of government’s activity in rural and regional Australia. Community engagement and capacity building are key tenets of many rural extension, learning and change projects (for instance, the Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment Developing Social Capability Project).

Farmers and other primary producers are also the beneficiaries of capacity building activities, and often this can take place through the informal networks generated by training and learning activities (which may not in and of themselves equate to capacity building). Andrew et al’s (2005) work (also commissioned by the CVCB) found that learning can take place informally, and so too can capacity building. People’s capacity can often be built without direct provision of funds by government or other organisations, but for the purpose of this research, the focus was on where funding has taken place directly through recognisable institutions. That is, the funding of capacity building needed to be more or less easily observable to be included in this study.

The Centre for Rural and Regional Innovation – Queensland (CRRI-Q) is a collaborative venture between the Queensland Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, the University of Queensland, and CSIRO. CRRI-Q goals include ‘capacity building for innovation’, ‘innovative and entrepreneurial rural development’, and ‘creative thinking for possible futures’. It aims to achieve these goals by offering courses and subjects related to the field, and in particular, subjects called ‘rural community development’ and ‘innovation for rural development’. CRRI-Q plays a significant role in training capacity builders and other community development workers in Queensland.
The collaborative nature of the Centre – supported by government and the university – approximates the system that operates in the United States where the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (CSREES) is an agency within the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and collaborates with a network of local universities. It is responsible for advancing knowledge in agriculture, the environment, human health and well-being, and communities by supporting research, education and extension programs in the Land-Grant University System and partner organisations. Murray (1999) conducted a comparison of the California Extension Service and the extension situation in Australia. Extension in California is co-funded by federal, state and county governments. The counties are considered a crucial link in extension because they often provide office and other administrative support for advisors and agents funded by the State. The author states that ‘this linkage to the counties results in an important “check and balance” that insures that Extension is responsive to local needs and is delivering programs appropriate to the community’ (Murray 1999). This contrasts with the work by Roberts et al. (2004) which found that many service providers considered programs and projects were not necessarily meeting local community needs.

Industry research and development corporations also receive funds from government (most on a dollar-for-dollar basis with industry levies), and direct at least a portion of those monies to capacity building activities. There is a greater focus on training and extension for farmers and producers, and as noted previously, this does not necessarily amount to capacity building, even though they may help develop capacity. The dairy industry, for example, has Regional Development Programs in each of the eight major dairy regions in an attempt to ensure that regional needs are being met by research and development activities.

4.3. Areas of focus in capacity building

4.3.1. Communities being empowered to adapt to, and manage for, change

In recent years, much attention has been paid to the factors negatively impacting on rural and regional Australia and capacity building has been one process aimed at addressing the noted decline in these regions (see for instance, Regional Australia Summit, 2000). The focus on empowerment, and the development of projects (or the provision of funds) which are responsive to, or initiated by, community groups, is being increasingly favoured as a means to avoid the perception that government is acting in a “top-down” manner. The increasingly important role played by regional bodies such as Catchment Management Authorities is a significant indicator of devolving power to the regions (Steering Committee findings 2002; Ridley 2005; Pannell 2004).

4.3.2. Rural leadership, women, Indigenous and youth

The provision of funds and activities for rural and regional areas in decline is the central thread of capacity building discourse, although some attention is also paid to particularly disadvantaged groups. Indigenous communities in particular receive special attention, as do provisions to support or attract women and youth in rural industries. Rural leadership – enhancing the capacity of rural leaders to then enhance the capacity of their communities and industries – is also a focus of funds for capacity building (www.rural-leaders.com.au).

4.3.3. Industry focus

From an industry perspective, funding for capacity building is provided on the basis that their industries and the people who support them remain viable into the future. There is a focus on profitable production, although some attention is also being paid to environmental and natural resource management issues.
4.3.4. Environment and Natural Resource Management

Funding from government (be it through federal and state/territory departments or NAP/ NHT) is increasingly focused on capacity building for environmental and natural resource management. Capacity building is seen to offer public good outcomes that the free market would otherwise not necessarily promote.

4.3.5. ‘Seed funding’ for communities

The provision of ‘seed funding’ for communities to develop community and regional plans has been an important aspect of funding capacity building, and often these funds are used as ‘leverage’ for communities to then attract funding from other sources (Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal 2005). The aim appears to be to broaden the resource-base, and eventually to foster economic and social self-sufficiency in communities. Resource constraints on the part of funders also play a part in this trend. Funding for short-term projects appears to be a result of this development, and some evidence suggests that this may be causing undesirable outcomes. These include the lack of employment security (and subsequent loss of corporate knowledge if staff leave), and the creation of an uncertain operating environment overall (uncertainty over whether funding will continue in the future or not) (DAFF 2001). Short term funding by governments also has obvious links to the election cycle and government priorities.

4.3.6. Provision of grants

Funding and grant applications (be they for regional bodies or community groups) generally require a high level of detail to be successful. When capacity building is cited as a criterion to be met by funding applications it is often seen as a means to other ends, such as better environmental management, rather than an end in itself. Project applications tend to be fairly structured, with requirements for applicants to identify the goals, objectives and activities of the project, as well as how the project will be measured and assessed. Some may find this application process overly rigorous and sometimes confusing. An evaluation of the former Commonwealth Rural Communities Program suggested that those groups already possessing the highest levels of social capital may be most successful at accessing funds, whereas those who were most disadvantaged might miss out because they are ill-equipped to apply (DAFF 2001). These studies are consistent with the findings from this project.

4.4. Institutional arrangements for funding capacity building

Just as Nettle (2003) noted that there is no such thing as ‘best extension practice’, similarly, it can be said that there is no best practice approach to the delivery or funding of capacity building. Each circumstance will require a different mix of activities, in conjunction with various other forms of government regulation and economic incentives. Indeed the very process of capacity building embraces this fact and attempts to address it by conferring at least some decision-making power to local and regional communities. Such a bottom-up approach is seen to be more effective, responsive, and ultimately more democratic (Macadam et al 2004).

The results of this literature review found that there are several key features of institutional arrangements for funding capacity building. There appears to be an increasing reliance on competitive grant processes whereby citizens apply directly to government departments, regional bodies or philanthropic foundations for project funding. The potential problems associated with this trend have been noted above.

A variation of this approach is to fund community facilitators or coordinators to assist groups to access funds from various organisations. This is the case with a range of Community Facilitator programs in Victoria, and has been trialled in previous Commonwealth initiatives such as the Rural Communities Program. It is also used by the Department of Victorian Communities. Another important feature of institutional arrangements for funding capacity building is ‘networked’ delivery of grants through the
formation of partnerships between public, private and philanthropic bodies. One example of this is for a government agency to fund an overarching project employing a facilitator who assists community groups within a particular locality to access a range of public and private sources depending on the specific objectives of the projects.

Macadam et al. (2004) outlined five propositions for effective capacity building. Two of them that are most relevant here are:

- Effective capacity building creates a common agenda and a willingness to collaborate among members of relevant communities of practice; and
- Effective capacity building depends on political and institutional commitment to the goal of capacity-building programs and the alignment with it of strategically important organisations.

Macadam et al (op cit) noted that alignment of institutional arrangements ‘depends to a large extent on the establishment at the regional level of coordinating and regulatory mechanisms that enable the formation of a partnership between community-based organisations and communities of practice on one hand and those within the complex of strategically important organisations on the other. Effective action by the partnership requires a reallocation of resources and authority away from the centre to the regions’ (2004: xii). Macadam et al also observed that ‘the needed realignment is inhibited by institutional inertia in strategically important organisations, where closed organisational boundaries and a command-and-control management style based on a compartmentalised world view are perceived as holding sway’.

Cavaye (1999, 2003, 2004) focuses on the importance of building community capacity and the role of institutions in that. While this project has not assessed institutional perceptions of capacity building over time, a review of many web-sites and documents of institutions related to capacity building in Australia did show a strong commitment to capacity building and the devolution of decision-making power to the regions and local communities (for instance, the Department of Transport and Regional Services, NHT, NAP, Steering committee findings 2002). Whether the ‘institutional inertia’ and ‘command-and-control management style’ described by Macadam et al (op cit) is still pervasive within institutions who are responsible for capacity building is uncertain. There appears to be, at least in sentiment, a strong push towards community and regionally driven capacity building initiatives that are supported by partnerships. The extent to which this is leading to change and improvement is explored during the case studies in this project. According to Macadam et al, ‘support for leadership and expertise critical of the status quo will play a large part in achieving the alignment needed for capacity building’, and it appears that institutions are indeed placing greater emphasis on the need for community leadership, innovation and creativity. Despite the fact that institutions do indeed appear to be paying a significant amount of attention to capacity building, there is still significant scope to better align these institutions (through partnerships, for instance) so that the best outcomes are achieved for rural and regional Australia.

There have been a number of initiatives within State and Federal governments to improve the alignment of institutions to achieve ‘whole of government’ approaches across various departments, especially at the regional level. One example is the establishment of the Area Consultative Committees by the Commonwealth Department of Transport. The NHT is another example of where this is already happening, at least between the Commonwealth and state governments. The Joint-Ministerial Council for NRM appears to be a positive step and there appears to be potential for a greater capacity building discourse to take place within this forum.

One of the terms of reference for this project states the need to explore ‘the role that capacity building can play as a policy instrument in conjunction with regulation and economic instruments’. It is perhaps fair to say that capacity building in and of itself will not be able to address all the problems facing rural and regional Australia, and that it forms only one tool among many required to assist in rural and regional renewal. This matter is explored elsewhere in this report, including the water case study.
5. The Inventory

In this section, we analyse the data collected at the time of the development of the inventory. This is done by first outlining who are the main providers and recipients of funding, the institutional arrangements and then the constraints and opportunities. The inventory itself appears as a separate document in Appendix 1 of this report.

5.1. The main providers of funding

Who is doing the funding (public, private, federal, state, local)? Who is funding provided to (public or private provision)? Who provides the capacity building services?

In our search for funders we found 73 who collectively fund capacity building through 137 different programs. This number is by no means exhaustive but the result of a concerted effort over three months. It cannot claim to be exhaustive at the very least because some programs that build capacity are nowhere described as such. The funders fell into the broad categories of government (Commonwealth, State and local) various industry research and development corporations and other research organisations, and private sources (including charitable foundations) which are largely sponsored by private donation.

While it is impossible to obtain an accurate figure for the amount spent in this area, it is possible to predict approximate ratios between government (Commonwealth and State), industry and funds from private sources. From the figures we obtained it seemed that the ratio between these four groups was that the Commonwealth provided the bulk of the funding, the States second and way below the Commonwealth, Industry provided less than the States and concentrated more on productivity and private sponsorship offered least. This ratio is based on funding and not necessarily on effect. In some cases, small grants from philanthropic organisations have a great effect.

5.1.1. Commonwealth

As expected, the Commonwealth is by far the major funder of capacity building programs. The programs come from a variety of Departments such as Defence; Attorney Generals; Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry; Family and Community Services; and Transport and Regional Services. While the emphasis of this search was on agriculture and natural resource management, our previous research shows that to build the capacity of individuals, approaching it from several perspectives was both appropriate and useful (Roberts 2005a, Roberts et al 2005; Roberts Evaluation 2005).
Table 5.1: Commonwealth government funders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Generals</td>
<td>National Community Crime Prevention Program - Community Partnership Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</td>
<td>Agriculture Advancing Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Industries Development Program and Agribiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building the future Sharing the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar Industry Reform Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Heritage Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The National Landcare program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF, CSIRO and the University of Qld</td>
<td>Leadership in Extension: Nurturing Young Leaders workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF/ DEH</td>
<td>National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greening Australia - National Vegetation Knowledge Exchange Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport and Regional Services</td>
<td>Sustainable Regions Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment and Heritage</td>
<td>Waterwatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program of Grants to Voluntary Environment and Heritage Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Defence</td>
<td>Family Support Funding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Health and Ageing</td>
<td>Office of rural health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education, Science and Training</td>
<td>Workplace English Language and Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Australian Technical Colleges Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Industry Skills Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural and Regional New Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Immigration Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td>The Migrant Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant Service Agency network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Settlement Services Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Australia</td>
<td>EMA Research and Innovation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Family and Community Services</td>
<td>Family and Community Network Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stronger Families and Communities Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Answers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a similar diversity at the State level (see inventory).

5.1.2. Industry

Industry research and development corporations dedicate specific amounts in their budgets to capacity building and some, for example, horticulture, grain, red meat and wool have dedicated capacity building programs. These are programs where farmers work in groups, for example, farming systems in the grain industry, Bestprac and BestWool in the wool industry, BeefPlan, BeefCheque, LambCheque in red meat and GrapeCheque and CITTG groups in horticulture. There are many other such groups. Other industries such as dairy have programs, in this case the Change Management and Delivery Program dedicated to capacity building. Within this dairy Program, courses are developed that have a heavy skills component that can be regarded as building capacity. These are courses such as CowTime, InCalf, and Countdown Down Under.
Table 5.2. Industry Research and Development Corporations who fund capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry R&amp;D Corporations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Water Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Research and Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Research and Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Wool Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Research and Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains Research and Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat and livestock Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Industry organisations who fund capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birchip Cropping Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondinin Training Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondinin Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Farming Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Seeds Technical Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Farmers Federation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the private sector, there are many foundations, fellowships, trusts and corporations

Table 5.4. Trusts and Foundations fund capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trusts and Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspire/ Reach out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire/Beanbag Net Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazda Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitre 10 Junior Landcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuffield Farming Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian Rural Leadership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation for Young Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The George Alexander Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Helen McPherson Smith Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gardiner Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ian Potter Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Norman Wettenhall Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The R.E. Ross Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Buckland Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Resource Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost all banks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2. The main recipients of funding for capacity building activities
The funds for capacity building are largely directed to public and private providers of training. They also go to researchers and some funds flow directly to the community. Funds are also channelled through organisations such as foundations and then on to the final recipient.

5.2.1. Public and private providers
The main recipients of funding for capacity building are public and private providers of training programs. They often work together delivering the same program. For example, facilitators for the Bestprac program in the wool industry can come from either the public or private sector. They are not treated differently.

There are however some areas in which funding recipients are wholly public or private. For example all of the business organisations cited in the inventory (businesses such as the Bendigo Bank, and agribusiness organisations like the Kondinin Group), provide capacity building programs on their own without a public partner.

5.2.2. The role of educational institutions in capacity building
While this project focussed on the funding of capacity building, as distinct from providing it, we looked nationally at the pivotal role played by universities and agricultural colleges in this field. Contact was made with the universities that offer agricultural or extension courses including Melbourne University, University of Queensland, the Centre for Rural and Regional Innovation – Queensland, University of Sydney, La Trobe University and the University of Western Sydney. Colleges of agriculture who provide practical work experience were also contacted. These were the Dalby Agriculture, Longreach Pastoral College, Glenormiston campus of the University of Melbourne and the Rural Industry Skills Training provider. Data were also drawn from the role of universities and other tertiary institutions in the regional case study.

Potentially the role that universities can play in capacity building is as follows:

- Offering extension courses either as stand alone subjects or as part of other units of study;
- Funding research by students or staff;
- Collaborative research with extension practitioners or community groups;
- Providing advice to community groups such as CMAs as well as serving on committees and boards; and
- Providing capacity building courses for farmers or the public.

Extension courses
One of the findings of the Mapping of Rural Service Providers, Roberts et al (2005 p40) were that primarily the training of extension providers takes place at the postgraduate level with the undergraduate students concentrating on the more technical aspects of agriculture. The research carried out for this project suggests that this trend is still continuing. The only provider who offers a range of extension courses is the Centre for Rural and Regional Innovation - Queensland. For others it tends to be single subjects at either the undergraduate or post-graduate level. It was found here that even short courses were funded externally.

Research nationally by students or staff
Within their normal budgets, universities are funding research by students as part of honours or postgraduate courses. Staff receive funds through external sources or from within Faculty research budgets and some work is being done on capacity building, especially involving the community. The regional case study showed that a number of universities have set up centres to concentrate on community development and sustainability. The centres are as follows:

- Deakin University: Research Priority Area in Sustainable Natural Resources Management
- RMIT: Centre for Regional and Rural development
Ballarat: Institute for Regional and Rural Research.
Bendigo: Institute for Sustainable Communities.

In the South West area of Victoria environmental research is conducted through Deakin and Melbourne Universities and RMIT has a Catchment Research Group.

Universities nationally have similar research in capacity building. For example:

The University of Queensland through the School of Natural and Rural Systems management and The Centre for Rural And Regional Innovation – Queensland
The University of Western Australia through the School of Agriculture and Resource Economics.

**Collaborative research**
The regional case study shows that important work is being done by universities in conjunction with local groups. The role of RMIT in working on the Sustainable Dairy Farming Families project is discussed elsewhere as is the effects of sand mining on the community at Pyramid Hill. Grain and Graze and Southern Farming Systems use university staff and postgraduate students in their research projects and provide limited funding. Staff from the Institute of Land and Food Resources at the University of Melbourne mentor dairy extension staff in Victoria to build their skills in the facilitation model and other forms of extension.

The important feature of this work was that it builds the relationships necessary for ongoing work and the local knowledge of researchers. This is valued by the local community. In the community development field in particular, the point was made that local residents have little time for external researchers or consultants coming to the area, conducting research and then leaving.

**Community work**
There is a valued role for university staff by serving on the boards and committees of community organisations such as CMAs. Deakin University, for example, has representatives on various committees of the Glenelg Hopkins CMA providing expert advice on technical matters. Staff from RMIT at Hamilton are similarly involved at the local level in community groups.

The difficulty here is that for this type of liaison work to continue it needs the presence of regional universities or campuses. In this context the current uncertainty over the future of RMIT at Hamilton and the Glenormiston campus of Melbourne University does not aid the process.

**Providing short courses and training**
One role that universities can perform is to provide capacity building courses for a range of participants such as farmers, CMAs and those involved in community strengthening or development such as Victoria University does at present. There is a wide range of courses already provided by registered training organisations however additional opportunities are always presenting themselves. The Glenormiston campus, for example, offers a range of courses for hobby farmers that could amount to capacity building.

**Opportunities**
Given the current budgetary constraints faced by universities it is unlikely that there will be a growth of extension courses or the funding of research outside the parameters discussed above. However, there are opportunities for capacity building activities to be augmented by universities by the following collaborations:

- Linking with government to provide training to community groups. Victoria University currently does this as part of the Community Building Resource Service of the Department of Victorian Communities;
- Conducting research with farming systems groups and community groups. Funds could be provided by the university or gained by partnerships with external funders, such as the Gardiner Foundation. There is real potential here to carry out joint research across a range of
disciplines that really does examine issues such as triple bottom line effects. The research can act to build capacity building of all concerned;

- Closer mentoring between those experienced in capacity building and community organisations. For example CMAs in Victoria are struggling with their role capacity builders and could do with some assistance from those experienced in the field, especially in the areas of human and social capacity building; and
- Universities funding scholarships for those resident in rural areas to carry out Masters and PhD studies would be a potential contribution to capacity building. RMIT at Hamilton was able to provide a course for Masters students working locally but this now has now become full fee paying and its viability is in question.

5.2.3. The community

Community groups and organisations receive funding from all levels of government and directly from trusts and foundations. In other cases, an intermediate body may act to disperse the funds. An example of the latter is the role played by CMAs and some foundations such as Foundation for Regional and Rural Renewal.

The Commonwealth provides funds to the community across a range of programs and departments such as Family and Community Services and Department of Transport and Regional Services. In the environment field, funds from the Commonwealth go to community groups through the Natural Heritage Trust *Envirofund* to help with their on ground projects and *FarmBis* also provides assistance. Funds provided through the trusts and fellowships are made available directly to the community to individuals or groups.

As outlined in the regional case study, there are many state government programs that deliver directly to the community. One example is the *Communities Regional Industry Skills Program* (CRISP) program. CRISP is funded by the Victorian State Government and aims to strengthen rural and regional communities by providing targeted funding to address skill shortages and create sustainable industries and jobs in country Victoria.

Local government also provides some limited funds to the community for capacity building.

5.3. Institutional arrangements for funding capacity building

Institutional arrangements and funding patterns for capacity building are influenced by the following factors:

- Project-based funding;
- Intergovernmental agreements;
- Requirement for cash or ‘in-kind’ contributions to the project;
- Funding tied to plans;
- Partnerships created as a consequence of the institutional arrangements of funders;
- Funders see the benefit of partnerships for themselves;
- Funders insist that applicants form partnerships; and
- Applicants form partnership to maximise the value they receive from their projects.

5.3.1. Project-based funding

Results from previous research found that much capacity building activity is funded on a project basis (Roberts 2005). Many projects and programs are generally not developed to achieve capacity building per se – rather capacity building is one component designed to help achieve other aims and objectives. Capacity building in these cases can be seen as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. The aims and objectives for capacity building vary greatly, as do the target audiences (see inventory in Appendix 1)
There are programs, however, which have capacity building as their primary aim. The Environmental Management Systems (EMS) Program initiated by the Federal Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry is one example, as is the Australian Rural Leadership Foundation funded by a coalition of sponsors. For the remainder who have some component of capacity building see the table below.

Table 5.5. Programs where the majority of funds are allocated for capacity building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONWEALTH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Extension: Nurturing Young Leaders workshops</td>
<td>Environmental Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envirofund</td>
<td>Farm Change Management/Improving Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain &amp; Graze</td>
<td>Kondinin Training Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Farming Systems</td>
<td>Bestprac phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bestwool 2010 phase 2</td>
<td>Specialised Approach to Recruiting Wool Producers into Extension and Adoption Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined capacity-building projects (including RITA)</td>
<td>RITA (Regional Innovation and Training Adoption Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW SOUTH WALES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sunrisc Champions Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASMANIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishwise - Recreational Fishery Trust Fund</td>
<td>Resource Management Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN TERRITORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Funding</td>
<td>Community Benefit Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support - Strengthening Communities (formerly Community Support Fund)</td>
<td>Local Learning and Education Networks (LLENs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoriar Agribusiness Networks</td>
<td>Community Regional Industry Skills Program (CRISP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNDATIONS AND TRUSTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire/ Reach out</td>
<td>Inspire/Beanbag Net Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dillon Fellowship</td>
<td>Mazda Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitre 10 Junior Landcare</td>
<td>Nuffield Farming Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal</td>
<td>The Foundation for Young Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The George Alexander Foundation</td>
<td>The Ian Potter Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The R.E. Ross Trust</td>
<td>William Buckland Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The institutional arrangements are, first, that funders generally have ‘rounds’ of funding for projects where groups or individuals can apply for grants in accordance with the program guidelines or very specific briefs. Second, some funders set aside funds for non commissioned projects where applicants write their own research proposals, including content, outcomes, timelines and budget. Third, the allocation of funding is competitive and projects are funded according to merit where merit is determined by the culture and norms of the funder and the capacity of the applicant to present an application that fits with this culture and norm. About half of the funding providers contacted for this project make funds available through short term projects (one year or less) or training courses. The other half fund longer term initiatives such as employment and other programs.

The implications of shorter term funding arrangements are that service providers can be more reactive and flexible in what they can offer to meet the needs of funders. For example, when one short term project ends, the provider is ready to go onto the next. They are not tied for years to any one project which itself may not produce satisfactory results. Also for each project, they are bound by its terms of reference and objectives set by the funder which means that the project will likely be well targeted. However, this flexibility comes at the cost of the career development of staff, especially those on short term contracts. For example, young researchers cannot build a research career for themselves because their research is only as long as the funded project and is dependent on the request of the funder (pers comm. researcher, Rutherglen Research Institute, Roberts et al 2005). Another downside of the need to secure short term funding is the time taken and the constancy of having to apply for funds. In some cases, particularly in the NRM field, the funding cycle can be as short as one year and the application process from conception to approval can take up to eight months. This introduces a level of anxiety in the process where project leaders constantly feel under pressure. A related issue is whether short term funding is appropriate where long term planning and implementation is required to bring about real change.

The advantage of short term funding is that each project proposal is scrutinised for value by applicants and funders and is, therefore, much more accountable in terms of potential outcome. As one person put it, it made them much sharper about what they applied for. The implications for this type of funding for the funder is that they can see a quick return for their investment; and have researchers who are available to carry out requested research at times suitable for funders.

5.3.2. Intergovernmental agreements

An intergovernmental agreement for community capacity building for the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality exists between the Commonwealth of Australia and each of the States and Territories.

The agreement states that:

The Parties agree to support capacity building of communities and landholders to assist them develop and implement integrated catchment / regional plans by:

i) providing relevant information and data to catchment / regional communities on natural resource condition to enable catchment / regional bodies to develop catchment / regional plans for government investment;

ii) initiating relevant training and extension networks; and

iii) facilitating initiatives involving new market-based incentives and research and development of new sustainable production systems.

Interestingly, none of these three agreed actions touted as capacity building would (on their face value) be regarded as such by Macadam et al (2004) and, therefore, should not be considered as capacity building by this study. The funds set aside for capacity building by the Commonwealth and matched by the states should be seen in that light. Having said that, it is noticeable that the definition of capacity building as used in the NHT Capacity Building Framework is more in keeping with the term as used in this study. The definition contains these words:
It [capacity building] focuses on enhancing genuine community engagement in all aspects of NRM, from planning to on-ground actions. Therefore, in addition to the transfer of technology and technical capability, capacity building should foster social cohesion within communities, and build both human and social capital.

In the end it may be a matter of which definition is used by governments when funding but the variation does not help to provide any certainty to this area.

The intergovernmental agreement regarding the National Action Plan relies on institutional arrangements for implementation. The main features of the agreement are:

1. Matching Commonwealth and state funding.
2. Establishment of 21 priority areas affected by salinity and water quality problems and the development of Action Plans for those areas.
3. At the regional level the NAP and the NHT are jointly delivered and driven by a single regional plan.
4. There is an agreement to support capacity building of communities and landholders to assist them develop and implement integrated catchment / regional plans by:
   i) providing relevant information and data to catchment / regional communities on natural resource condition to enable catchment / regional bodies to develop catchment / regional plans for government investment;
   ii) initiating relevant training and extension networks; and
   iii) facilitating initiatives involving new market-based incentives and research and development of new sustainable production systems.
5. There is foundation funding for the development of catchment management plans.
6. The agreement determines funding priorities such as the alignment of proposals with the NAP, the extent of innovative strategies and public and private benefits.

The intergovernmental agreement clearly has the potential to support capacity building and to provide a concerted approach to environmental issues at the catchment level. However the percentage of overall funds that are devoted to capacity building (as described in the Agreement) is hard to ascertain.

5.3.3. Requirement for cash or ‘in-kind’ contributions to the project

Some capacity building programs require applicants to contribute cash or ‘in-kind’ contributions to the project such as the Agriculture Advancing Australia Rural Communities Program (Financial and Rural Counselling Service). For financial counselling projects, applicants (community or not for profit organisations) must provide at least 50% of the total cost. For Agriculture Advancing Australia projects in all other categories except community planning, applicants must provide at least 25% of the cost (website: www.daff.gov.au/AAA).

Some state government programs require funding to be matched dollar for dollar by the applicant who is frequently a community organisation. This may not always be an appropriate approach when the objective is community strengthening and applicants are not well resourced. These matters are explored in more detail in the community case study.

5.3.4. Funding tied to plans

The Natural Heritage Trust is jointly administered by the Departments of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, and Environment and Heritage and there is a Natural Resource Management Ministerial Council which comprises the relevant Commonwealth and State ministers. It uses a model which
includes bilateral and regional partnership agreements for regional investment. The centrepiece of the NHT program and the funding is the Regional Catchment Investment Plan which allows for different priorities to be addressed for different regions. Investment proposals for NHT funding submitted to the Commonwealth and relevant State/Territory must demonstrate how the actions for which funding is sought meet the areas of activity for investment established for the NHT.

The Tasmanian Government’s Resource Management Conservation program also requires a plan, this time at the property level. The spokesperson for this Program stated that this simplifies the access point for grants, training and advice.

Funds are delivered jointly with NAP to the community level through the Australian Government’s Enviroyfund. The funds are applied towards four programs: Landcare, Bushcare, Rivercare, and Coastcare and are expected to comply with the regional plan. The funding application form asks questions about:

- Whose land? What permits?
- What work? Where?
- What materials? What cost? What timing?
- Community support? Long-term benefits?

(source: http://www.nht.gov.au/envirofund/preparing.html#whose)

The Murray Darling Basin Commission develops its priorities through its Strategic Plan and business planning cycle. All project based funding is accountable to funders through the achievement of stated objectives and agreed milestones.

Funding according to plans and strategies is also appearing in the initiatives to strengthen communities with the advent of community action plans. In a more general way the Area Consultative Committees are guided by their strategic plans which vary considerably across Australia. This allows them to respond to local needs and issues.

Tying funding to plans has laudable objectives but much depends on the relevance of the plan to the local situation and the level of input by the local community. One concern raised in the regional case study about Regional Catchment Plans is that they can outdate rapidly and there is evidence of that happening with plans that still have two years to run.

5.3.5. Partnerships created as a consequence of the institutional arrangements of funders

There are many types of partnership formed because of the institutional arrangements of the funders. These are where:

- Funders see benefit for themselves and form their own partnerships;
- Funders cooperatively fund a capacity building program;
- Funders insist that applicants form partnerships; and
- Applicants form partnerships to maximise the value they receive from their projects.

However, not all partnership are profitable or valuable.

5.3.6. Funders see benefit of partnerships to them

The Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building partnership itself is perhaps the best example of organisations seeing the benefit of working together, sharing information about capacity building and funding its research (Business Plan 2004). Another example is from the Grape and Wine Research
and Development Corporation (GWRDC). It is reported that staff there have learnt from other Research and Development organisations and the GWRDC Communications Manager meets with other Communications Managers from different capacity building organisations several times a year.

Grain & Graze is a capacity building project funded by a partnership between Land and Water Australia, Australian Wool Innovation, Meat and Livestock Australia, and the Grains Research and Development Corporation. Over recent times many wool enterprises diversified to include the production of grain and meat sheep in an effort to remain viable and Grain & Graze has been involved in research involving these enterprises and finding solutions for problems and emerging issues. The organisation facilitates partnerships between producers, government and university researchers.

5.3.7. Funders insist that applicants form partnerships
The Birchip Cropping Group works collaboratively with other farmer groups and researchers in and outside of Australia. The Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research is a funder that mandates having paired research sites in different countries and insists on bilateral or multilateral projects (ACIAR, Guidelines for the development of project proposals, Dec 2004). The Department for Victorian Communities through its Community Regional Industry Skills Program strongly encourages project applicants to form partnerships between employers, potential employees and employment agencies to solve employment problems and achieve the desired outcomes.

5.3.8. Applicants form partnerships to maximise the value they receive from their projects
The Southern Farming Systems group in Victoria buys in expertise from institutions as is needed to help with their projects. For example, a project that looked at men’s health in dairy farming in the Hamilton area achieved great benefit from collaborating with partners. The skills and expertise of the combined partners served to create a very useful program for its ultimate beneficiaries. In this case the health, rural industry, workplace safety, economics and social research sectors combined to deliver a successful project.

Additionally, the Grain & Graze program has engaged in some regions with the local Catchment Management Authority and other institutions to pull together more funding, and is investigating the possibility of providing tax incentives for farmers who take up new technology.

In the NRM sphere, funders see the benefits of partnerships that deliver the outcomes they seek. One example is the partnership between the project Grain & Graze and the Glenelg Hopkins CMA which assists in the delivery of catchment targets. The CMA supports the work and research of Grain & Graze through the allocation of Landcare funds. A similar relationship exists between the Glenelg Hopkins CMA and the local EMS pilot project.

5.3.9. Partnerships with potentially negative effects
A respondent from the Murray Darling Basin Commission commented that the need to seek agreement with a wide range of partner organisations can be a constraint because of the diverse expectations of each of the partners. Administrators of the Nuffield Farming Scholarships also found some limitations with catering for a number of different organisations. For them, the horticultural industry is the hardest to work with because it is so fragmented. For the agribusiness organisation Pacific Seeds, the main constraint is that of intellectual property rights. The respondent mentioned that often organisations will avoid partnerships because they do not want to risk losing their intellectual property. They felt that the smaller partner funders have to weigh up what value they will get out of a project if the main funders want to retain the intellectual property. They maintained that this can deter smaller stakeholders from investing at all.
A respondent from the Queensland Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries stated that capacity building often is not the first priority for clients. For example, if other issues come up in the district, such as the citrus canker outbreak, then their capacity building programs will not be a priority for clients. This view of capacity building shows the competition that extension staff must feel about the relative value of their approaches but it also indicates that the link between capacity building and the management of crises like a citrus canker outbreak are not always obvious.

Apart from issues of intellectual property and the like, there can be administrative obstacles where the partnership is too large, especially if there is a mixture of public and private institutions which have differing cultures, timelines and imperatives. It was found in some of the CRISP Communities projects, for example, that projects were better managed by having smaller steering committees and perhaps more serious issues or activities.

5.4 Constraints on capacity building imposed by institutional arrangements

The main constraints mentioned by respondents to those spoken to study were to do with the:

- Culture
- Timing of funding rounds
- Competition for funds
- Specific needs of the funders

5.4.1 Culture

A spokesperson for Agriculture Advancing Australia reported that farmers’ language, their attitude to their farm business and adherence to their industry are all factors which can inhibit capacity building programs. The fact that only few members take leadership positions was also cited as an issue which translates into other deficiencies such as leadership coming from a narrow band of individuals and these leaders becoming exhausted and leaving no one to take their place. Their solution was to continue to build the participation of Australian farmers through training, with a greater emphasis on business and resource management skills that would best address the sector’s future challenges.

A spokesperson for West Vic Dairy stated that male dairy farmers are time poor and that in future they will perhaps target women instead. They found that when a recent workshop was called, more women from the dairy industry came to that than the total of all the men for that year. West Vic Dairy also commented that there was an opportunity to build farmers into learning communities so that they work together, much as already occurs in the wool and horticulture industries and with dairy farmers who are part of the Subtropical Dairy Program. The point was made that these dairy farmers take part in the Subtropical Dairy Program not just for their own benefit but for the benefit of the industry as well.

A respondent for the Victorian Farmers Federation observed that farmers have no time to get involved with capacity building activities, a lot of them are too old and do not feel the need to get involved. In Tasmania, a comment from the Department of Primary Industries Water and Environment’s Women in Rural Industries Program was telling. The respondent suggested that encouraging new entrants to the sector means that they need to look outside of those who have already expressed an interest in the industry. By providing support for these other people to attend programs it was hoped that the whole industry will benefit. He went on to state that
"We also need to look at the changing demands of our industry and ensure that any capacity building activity is also strategic (meaning forward thinking about the changes in our industry) rather than just commodity focused. Commodity, social impacts and global forces all impact on our industry and too many of our programs are just commodities focused. We need to equip our people to be ready for change and managing and understanding that change."

The interesting part about this comment was that it exemplified the assumption of some government and industry personnel that it is possible to tie capacity building to prescribed outcomes. Generalised capacity building will increase the capability of producers to determine their own futures and not necessarily the futures prescribed for them by industry or government. For example, building capacity does not necessarily deliver increased productivity, profitability or better natural resource management. It does, however, deliver producers who are more confident and better able to make their own decisions.

On the issue of culture more generally there is a noticeable tension in capacity building between “hard” and “soft” outcomes. This is so in production, NRM or community development. In production it is the divide between a commodity or production focus against social impacts as discussed above. In NRM it is between the drive to achieve on ground works as against the capacity building of the community and in community development it is the tension between the spending on infrastructure as compared to human capital.

The hard outcomes are usually more visible, more definable and more measurable and historically attract the largest funding, especially for research. Human capacity building in this environment tends to get what is left over. It is not unusual for governments to fund infrastructure in the hundreds of thousands and for human capacity building to be allocated sums less than $10 000. A similar pattern is found with some funders operating in the agriculture sector that will often fund commodity based research in the order of hundreds of thousands and place a $15 000 limit on capacity building applications.

5.4.2. Timing of funding rounds

A spokesperson for the Sugar Research and Development Corporation reported that the timing of funding rounds constrains some proposed projects. This was also the case with some of the projects out of the Community Regional Industry Skills Program funded by the Department for Victorian Communities. Timing suitable for government based on annual budget cycles does not necessarily match well with the seasonal cycles to which rural industries are tied.

A member of the Queensland Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries’ project in horticulture in the tropics found that timing of a different sort was their biggest constraint on capacity building projects. For them there was ample time to achieve capacity building, but with the time constraints imposed by funders they found it difficult to find staff in time. They also reported that project funds often came unannounced, and it was difficult motivate people in the short time frame.

A contact person from the NSW Department of Primary Industries agreed that the short term funding cycle constrains capacity building. For this person, it was because current funding has a set percentage reserved for on-ground work and what is left over is available for capacity building. In the opinion of this representative, building research, knowledge and capacity building needs longer time frames, more like 10 years, or at least a couple of 3 year funding cycles.

A respondent from Envirowise in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area reported that they currently have excess monies because their grants were delivered 12 months late, so now they have 2 years of money to spend in one year. It was also reported that because the amount of an Envirowise grant is supposed to receive is often unknown, it can be harder to plan for. Another barrier for them was funding cuts. They stated that their property planning service some years back was very successful, but funding was cut. They are currently trying to rebuild this service but a lot of ground work was lost.
The contact person for Primary Industries and Resources South Australia felt that because the funding cycle is caught up in election processes and only lasts for three - four years, the capacity building programs cannot address the long-term needs of communities. A member of the Queensland State farmer organisation, Agforce, considered that outcomes were expected before the process was properly completed.

5.4.3. Competition with other groups for funding

A member of the Queensland Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries project team Scoping and capacity building of natural resource management issues within the horticulture industry of dry tropics reported that competition between groups for funding can be unproductive. For example they do not work with Landcare because it is too competitive and it competes with the Catchment Management Authorities for funds.

In the regional case study the comment was made that the competitive process led to less sharing and cooperation between community groups who anticipate competing for the same funds.

As discussed elsewhere in this report the competitive process does not suit all applicants, especially those in the community sector. Frequently they do not have high level skills in the grants process which they see as onerous and at times confusing. Failure with the first application can lead to a disinclination to apply at later rounds.

5.4.4. Application process too difficult

The spokesperson for the Sugar Research and Development Corporation reported that a lack of ability to complete an application form may prevent some people from accessing capacity building funds for themselves. A similar comment was made by the contact from the Queensland government Indigenous Business Capacity Building Program. This person observed that while its applicants have a wide range of skills they are often a long way from developing a business plan that they need to secure funds. The amount of time and support they need is beyond the Program to provide. Comments from members of the Regional Investment Fund show that capacity building programs need to be couched in ways that are appropriate for Indigenous people and their cultural values. This needs to happen so that they are not actively excluded.

A member of the South Australian government’s Rural Solutions organisation also cites this as a problem. Often the people who most need the funds do not have the capability and confidence to put in an application and get through the quite complex process. This requires a third party to help develop applications. This supports results from the literature which found that those who already had high skill levels would be most adept at accessing funds, whereas those who were most disadvantaged might miss out because they are ill-equipped to apply (DAFF 2001).

Members from the program Resource Management Conservation funded by the Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment commented that community’s lack of awareness of available funds is their biggest barrier in capacity building. They mentioned that there used to be more departmental facilitators to help the community access this support. The application processes and reporting requirements are very complex, and many groups drop out of doing these types of activities because of this. For example, a group taking part in the whole farm planning program stopped when FarmBis took over because they had a more difficult application procedure.

Difficulties with the application process were not confined to community members. A member of the Dairy program in this same Tasmanian Department cited the time spent in compiling applications and preparation of reports to funders and time delays in approvals as a constraint on capacity building projects. The Birchip Cropping Group also mentions the uncertainty of income as a constraint, as it
means that projects can never be planned beyond three years and staffing is constantly under review pending incoming funds.

In many cases the onerous application process is seen to be out of proportion to the quantum of funds granted. In recognition of this the Envirofund now uses a two tiered process with a simplified application process for amounts up to $15 000, and a form requiring more information for applications of up to $50 000.

Issues explored elsewhere, including project funding, competitive grants and the funding cycle are also relevant to the application process.

5.4.5. Funding limited by specificities of organisations

The Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries Water and Environment’s Women in Rural Industries program’s Program Officer is funded within existing budget frameworks for the Department and Division. In Tasmania the majority of funding for women’s programs for the State Government are funded under Department of Premier and Cabinet ‘Women Tasmania’. However Women in Rural Industries is a separate program as the programs include participation from men and women in the community. The Women in Rural Industries program is, therefore, restrained within the small budget framework provided under Departmental budgets.

A spokesperson for the Centre for Rural and Regional Innovation – Queensland stated that each of its three partners: the Queensland Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, the University of Queensland and CSIRO had different priorities. These different priorities were seen as a distraction from time to time, however, the Director of the Centre and the Centre’s Board balanced the needs of the partners with that of the staff.

The spokesperson for the Environmental Education Section of the NSW Environmental Trust Grants Program believed that the focus of private grants was too narrow, targeting sub-groups such as youth. These funds should be more accessible for everyone. Those who fund the Nuffield Farming Scholarships were of like mind. For them also, a limitation was the focus of many capacity building programs on youth. They believed that while it was important to keep youth interested, the biggest priority should be on skilling people in the prime of their careers, for example, from 28-40 years old. Their program targets this age range, but unfortunately many funders prioritise funding programs for the 18-30 age range. Conversely in the Hamilton area the view was expressed in a number of quarters that the funds available for capacity building was generally adequate, except for the youth. This indicates that the picture is not always consistent across the country.

A spokesperson from the Department of Primary Industries and Resources - South Australia also commented that available funding that was industry or sector specific is another barrier and because of this it was hard to find funding for community needs. There was very little general capacity building funding available. For example, the leadership program required participants to mix across industries and sectors, but it was difficult to find funding for this type of project.

This request for generalist funding raises the question of whether capacity built for a specific outcome flows onto more general capacity building? For example, if a CMA coordinator learns how to work with people through a waterways project, will this person then be able to transfer those skills when working with different people in an unrelated project? The answer is presumably yes, however that matter has still to be explored.

While on the needs and priorities of funding organisations, the policy of the Commonwealth Government in directing its NAP, NHT and NLP funding via Regional Catchment Plans is probably the single most important institutional arrangement impact on the funding of capacity building in Australia, given the quantum of funds involved.
5.4.6. Other

The Kondinin Group claim that they experience very few constraints on their capacity building activities due to their financial independence.

The biggest constraint on the effectiveness of Nuffield Farming Scholarships to help with capacity building programs was not institutional arrangements, but the lack of critical mass in the rural sector. The view from this program was that agriculture was not valued as an industry and as a result many workers left it. For this reason there was just not the critical mass of producers on the ground to make capacity building work. They felt that many farmers were too busy on their farms, and were not interested unless the program on offer had direct commercial outcomes.

A view from a milk processor about the Dairy Moving Forward program was that sometimes industry initiatives, like this, are a bit of a problem for dairy farmers’ groups as they can distract from other, perhaps more serious issues or activities.

A telling comment came from an Australian Wool Innovation representative:

There has been some opposition to this new approach in AWI. The overwhelming sentiment in industry that this type of approach is not worthwhile, that the costs outweigh the benefits. The industry norm is that 20% of the producers produce 80% of the product, therefore, we only need to worry about the biggest/ most progressive producers. The other thing common in the industry is the comment that people who aren’t willing to help themselves aren’t worth helping. Our group is about trying to empower a larger proportion of the grower community. For example, there were 36 producers in the area of our case study. At the outset 8 years ago only 2 producers were actively involved in wool industry extension skills training. That lined up exactly with the broader figure of 6% active participation across Australia. Since recruitment work 8 years ago, 20/36 business in the area are now involved in these programs, such as BestWool 2010. Of course, there is still a residual of 16/36 that haven’t become involved. But the difference – from 5-6% to 50-60% – is fairly significant. The impacts on individuals are profound and the benefits for broader community even greater. Good technology is there - it is the level of uptake which is the limiting factor in the capacity building field. If the industry increased uptake of its already existing initiatives because of the use of a capacity building process and this can be demonstrated this will help justify the original investment.

With regard to the comment from AWI, it should be remembered that capacity building is not necessarily about using this process to meet industry targets. Capacity building will not necessarily produce more or better wool, however, it will produce better growers and an industry that can better manage change as already stated.

5.5. Capacity Building activities as a policy instrument in conjunction with regulation and economic instruments

Nineteen out of 120 (16%) entrants in the inventory were in a position to provide a response to this question about the use of capacity building in conjunction with regulation. Their main messages were that:

- Compliance needs capacity building for it to work;
- Regulation will not work in natural resource management;
- Capacity building is not a tool that should be used for manipulation;
- Women are change agents in rural industry; and
- Building capacity is critical for sustained, long term outcomes.

Following are summaries of the comments that were made.
Subtropical Dairy: Aim to make farmers aware of compliance with regulation and to make it easier for them.

Sugar Research and Development Corporation: Capacity building can play a critical role in achieving awareness, and creating ‘open mindedness’ toward new and different ways of doing things. For example, Queensland cane growers travelled to Northern NSW and learned about the ways the NSW sugar industry has regulated itself to achieve environmental outcomes. Thus building capacity is important in developing a solution to say environmental issues in Queensland other than regulation/financial incentives. It results in self-driven desire to change.

Grains Research and Development Corporation: Capacity building is going to have major ramifications for policy and also in making sure communities are sustainable and that they have leaders going forward. We have three courses in leadership which are designed to keep leaders learning.

Murray Darling Basin Commission: It is increasingly understood that skills development and increased resourcing and capacity is critical for long-term outcomes and these are being addressed where possible.

Grain & Graze: Capacity building is not a ‘tool’ to be wielded and manipulated on unsuspecting farmers, but rather is an intangible process which people on and off the ground have to experience themselves. Yet as a by-product of capacity building activities, policy groups can begin to see the importance of bringing producers and researchers together.

Queensland Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, project Scoping and capacity building of natural resource management issues with the horticulture industry of dry tropics: Capacity Building is everything. Regulation will not work in this area. It is only of value for recalcitrants. People need to change attitudes to take responsibility for what they do on an environmental basis. Capacity building is also about understanding what the wider community wants in regards to farming practices. Building producers’ abilities to communicate with other stakeholders is essential. Economic incentives to implement new practices on farm, or to implement an EMS would be good. There are no market incentives to be green for this industry.

Agforce: In some circumstances capacity building is a requirement of a regulatory instrument. The real outcomes are not always easily interpreted from training or similar activities.

Queensland Department of State Development, the Indigenous Business Capacity Building Program: Capacity building is paramount. Regulation also has a role. For example, in mining a change in regulation required the companies to work more with the regional community. This has resulted in opportunities for capacity building for Indigenous people.

NSW Environment Trust Grant Program: Capacity building is very important. It gets to the core of the problem. It is extremely useful provided a) capacity-building is considered more broadly than just skills and money. b) it is focused on enhancing existing assets rather than (or as well as) on fixing deficits or gaps and c) it is recognised as producing long-term not short-term benefits.

NSW Department of Primary Industries, Envirowise: Capacity building is very important. At the coal face you need continuing advice available for landholders to use best practice.

Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment, Women in Rural Industries Program: Issues such as exotic animal disease outbreak and educating our community work hand in hand with programs such as Women in Rural Industries Program. Women are the change agents in our rural communities and it is important that with any regulation or economic change, we ensure that all of our people are equipped to handle these changes. By working with capacity building programs such as Women in Rural Industries, it means that the message is getting out to a wider audience.

Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment, Dairy Program: Capacity building enables people to understand why and how and learn. It empowers people to take responsibility and/or action, thereby reducing the need to enforce regulation or provide monetary incentives to see change happen. This results in ownership and change happens for the right reasons. There is nothing like a ‘teaser’ to encourage change, for example, the costs
are split between farmer and funding provider in best management dairy effluent programs in Tasmania, Victoria and NSW.

- **Victorian Farmers Federation**: Regulation is always there. It is coming now through the CMAs that if farmers are to be eligible for incentives, they need to have a plan and show that they are complying.
- **Greening Australia**: Capacity building is crucial provided it is focused and what has happened over the last while is the reliance on volunteers without adequate support.
- **Marcus Oldham College**: Capacity Building is pretty important for rural communities. From an educational point of view, most young people leave their communities to get an education. Training should be in the field, to keep farmers in their communities.
- **The Commonwealth Department of Environment and Heritage, National Facilitator Program (Natural Resource Management)**: Facilitators ideally play a key role in supporting a range of capacity building activities, which should complement the use of regulation and economic instruments. For example, facilitators could assist with the understanding of, and compliance with, regulatory instruments. Similarly, facilitators could assist regional NRM bodies and communities with the understanding and use of economic instruments. This could require some specialisation on the part of individual facilitators.

5.6. **Opportunities for better institutional arrangements**

Consideration of better institutional arrangements from the information gained through compiling the inventory falls into three categories. These are that:

- Partnerships are seen as a valuable way to fund capacity building by the funders and recipients;
- Short term funding curtails the careers of staff because they do not have a secure future in which to take out time for development and curtails building the capacity of community members because it is a long term project;
- With projects commissioned by funders, they can ensure that their needs are met but this may not meet the needs of recipients and the opposite happens with non commissioned projects where the applicants ask for funds for projects that may be outside of the priorities of the funders.

5.6.1. **Partnerships**

Partnerships were seen as a benefit for many reasons. In some cases, they were formed by the recipients and in other cases they were a requirement of the funding provider. Their value is that they combine expertise, ideas and ways of operating that in most cases add an advantage to the project. Their disadvantage is that the effort required to maintain them can be time consuming. Even so, working in a partnership is a capacity building exercise in itself.

What emerged from the data was the possibility that linking research projects on capacity with practitioners and providers would be an advantage. For example, this project could have been linked with a provider or a number of providers to understand at some depth what is involved with the funding of their capacity building activities and its implications for their institutional arrangements. While some of this information was found through interviews, a more observational form of data collection would have been more relevant.

This paired form of research is already undertaken by Roberts Evaluation for *Meat and Livestock Australia* when evaluating the delivery of their courses at the pilot stage for capacity building. Data are collected though a mixture of observation, interview and written questionnaire. Paired research is also a feature of a project in South Western Victoria *Sustainable Dairy Farming Families*. RMIT is the researcher in this case. In another example, researchers from Melbourne University are working
side by side with the continuous business improvement extension team in the dairy industry in Victoria to advise the team on its practice.

5.6.2. Tied funds
While competitive, short term funds are a bonus for some organisations, for others a short term process interferes with the operation and careers of their employees. It can be argued that funds should be provided for more than one term to organisations of projects who have a proven record of building capacity. This currently occurs for Registered Training Organisations but there are projects such as the project Sustainable Dairy Farming Families, Southern Farming Systems and Grain & Graze for whom the security of funding for a period longer than 12 months or three years would be useful.
6. Case study: Water Use Efficiency of Irrigators in the Mallee region

6.1. Summary
A case study was undertaken of capacity building services to improve the water use efficiency of irrigators in the Mallee region of north-west Victoria. The intention of the case study was to illuminate what works well and why for building the capacity of a select group of growers in a specific area, for a specific issue. The central focus of the case study was on growers who are considered to be leaders in their field – that is, they are technologically advanced, innovative and efficient. The study looked at how they came to be where they are – what influenced, drove and motivated them, and where they accessed services to build their skills and knowledge in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of their practices. The case was valuable in the context of this research as a whole because service delivery involved a range of approaches including financial incentives, training and extension. The study found that irrigators are driven to build on their skills and knowledge out of a desire to improve water use efficiency and thereby the profitability of their operations. It was also found that irrigators build their capacity through a range of services including government extension and training, industry bodies, private consultants and informal and formal grower networks.

The irrigators contacted for this study will be referred here as Irrigator One, Irrigator Two or Irrigator Three.

6.2. How irrigators build their capacity
The following are some of the research questions that guided the case study:

- What influenced the growers to achieve what they have? What drove and motivated them to improve their practices?
- What are the barriers to building the capacity of irrigators?
- How are capacity building services currently structured and provided to irrigators in the Mallee region? What services are available? How do these services tie in with financial incentives and regulations?
- What do the various actors do which influences the capacity of irrigators? (What are the key success factors?). Comment on the interplay between these actors (the institutional arrangements)

6.2.1. Background to irrigators in the region
Irrigated horticultural practices (citrus, grapes and stone fruits) play a major role in the Mallee region, along with dryland farming (sheep and cattle grazing, grains, legumes, wheat and barley) (Psi-Delta et al., 2005; Grain & Graze, 2004). In the Victorian Mallee there have been initiatives targeted at improving the water use efficiency (WUE) of irrigators for the past 20 years. These have included financial incentives to pay for system upgrades/ changes and strategic planning as well as extension and education activities (Psi-Delta et al, 2005). Achieving greater water use efficiency is seen to depend on both improving farm infrastructure and increasing the skills and knowledge of farmers.

The case study involved contact with three irrigators. Irrigator One was involved with the table grape industry; Irrigator Two with the citrus industry; and Irrigator Three with the winegrape and avocado industries. All had undertaken infrastructure upgrades to their properties by enlisting the services of a private consultant from whom they purchased equipment. The consultant also helped install the equipment and offered support after installation. The irrigators had also received financial incentives to undertake a range of activities and had taken part in an Irrigation Management Course as a requirement for receiving the incentives.
6.2.2. Efficiency, profitability and financial incentives

The three growers contacted as part of the case study indicated that the primary reasons they made changes to their irrigation practices were to improve water use efficiency in order to increase the profitability of their operations.

Financial incentives from external sources provided the impetus for these growers to improve the technology on their properties, although two out of the three growers said they would have eventually implemented the technology without the incentives (albeit at a later date). This was because they could see that making changes to their systems would be profitable in the longer term. This supports results from Psi-Delta et al (2005) evaluation of water use efficiency programs in the Mallee region which found that 41% of irrigators who participated in one of the incentive programs would not have carried out irrigation improvements without financial assistance. The incentives were available from four sources – the Sunraysia Salinity Management Plan (accounting for 58% of all incentives paid), the Nyah to South Australian Border Salinity Management Plan (4%), Water for Growth (33%), and the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (5%). The measures included incentives for:

- Irrigation system upgrades;
- Property management plans;
- Irrigation system checks;
- Purchasing scheduling equipment; and
- Purchasing water meters.

6.2.3. Irrigation Management Course and engaging consultants

The Irrigation Management Course was developed as part of the Sunraysia Salinity Management Plan and according to DPI extension staff provides a valuable source of knowledge and skill development for farmers (DPI Extension Officer, pers. comm 2005). A representative from the Victorian Department of Primary Industries in Mildura indicated that incentives were only provided if irrigators took part in the course, which was designed to give them a basic understanding of irrigation principles and practices. The course was developed on the premise that the best method of facilitating grower education would be through a course designed specifically for the soils, techniques and issues of the Sunraysia region (Lukies 2001). The courses, free of charge to irrigators, began in 1993 and have continually evolved to better meet the needs of irrigators in the region. The two-day workshop involves a range of presenters from government, research institutions and industry. These presenters include:

- Victorian DPI irrigation extension staff;
- Extension staff from the NSW DPI and Primary Industries and Resources South Australia (PIRSA);
- Extension staff from the First Mildura Irrigation Trust;
- Private irrigation consultants;
- Researchers from CSIRO; and
- Other industry experts.

The Irrigation Extension Officer from the Victorian DPI contacted as part of the case study stated that the course was fairly generic and only provided the basics of irrigation principles and practices. More specific courses (such as those covering fertilisers or drip irrigation, for instance) are also provided to growers to add to their knowledge and skills. These are generally done during the winter months when growers have more time to attend.

Irrigator Two in particular was very supportive of the Irrigation Management Course, stating that it were ‘excellent’, ‘essential’ and ‘everyone should do one’. One irrigation consultant contacted, however, indicated that the course was useful in giving people the basics, but did not go far enough in
terms of providing irrigators with the skills to actually apply the new knowledge presented to them. This supports the comments from Irrigator Three who felt that engaging a consultant in one-to-one contact made the new technology and practices easier to adopt and enact. This supports the individual mentor/consultant model highlighted by Coutts et al. (2005) as a useful way to build capacity in the CVCB funded National Extension and Education Review.

The DPI Extension Officer also indicated that irrigators were initially defensive about attending the courses as they felt they already had all the knowledge they needed, but the courses were practical and relevant for farmers – looking at various aspects of the farm business such as how to make it more productive and how to balance environmental and economic concerns. The DPI Officer also found that the motivation of some irrigators had increased as a result of attending the courses, which was evidenced by some landholders making changes to their practices (independently). The mentioned that one irrigator stated that the course had ‘done nothing’ but he had in fact made five changes to his farm irrigation practices subsequently. The DPI took this to mean that the irrigator had ownership of the information and control over the direction of his operations.

In an evaluation of the Irrigation Management Course conducted by Lukies (2001), it was found that the course led to irrigator practice changes such as adopting scheduling equipment, installing water meters and system upgrades. The evaluation also found that the course led to changes in irrigators’ knowledge, attitude, skills and aspirations which included achievements such as providing knowledge about soil water holding capacity and the importance of root zones; changing long held attitudes/perceptions; and increasing irrigators’ awareness of the environmental impacts of irrigation.

It is now a condition of the financial incentives that they are only provided if the grower undertakes the course as well. According to one DPI representative contacted, the incentives were only effective where training was also provided.

The evaluation found that approximately 90% of those who participated in an incentive program believed that this resulted in increased water use efficiency on-farm. The programs had also been successful in stimulating greater community awareness of water issues. Irrigators reported that as a result of the program they could now develop new areas of their property, improve their lifestyle and increase the quantity and quality of their produce.

Significantly, the report noted that ‘the incentives that offered the best efficiency in terms of improvement in relation to inputs appear to have come from educational activities (for example, the course and field days) and information and assistance provided by the Department of Primary Industries Irrigation Extension Officers’ (Psi-Delta, et al 2005: 5).

A significant finding of the evaluation was that incentives and programs that have been found to be effective for increasing water use efficiency may not be the same incentives and programs that will lead to greater improvements in the future as many irrigators may have already implemented practice changes.

6.2.4. Networking with other growers and contact with industry groups

Irrigator Two appeared to be particularly active in terms of accessing new information and skills with regard to his irrigation management practices and was also notable in his connection with other growers both informally and through more formal mechanisms such as CITT groups (Citrus Information Technology Transfer groups). Irrigator Three also indicated that keeping in touch with other irrigators was an important aspect of ‘staying ahead of the game’. The CITT groups, coordinated by the Industry Development Officer at the Murray Valley Citrus Board, appear to be an important example of the group facilitation/empowerment model also noted by Roberts et al. (2003) as a way of achieving capacity building. Despite what their name suggests (‘technology transfer’), these groups are in fact aimed to empower citrus growers and increase their uptake of new technology by engaging in trials, demonstrations, field days and on-site visits. The CITT groups can thus be
considered part of the technological development capacity building/extension model because irrigators have a significant amount of control over the direction of their learning (the Murray Valley Citrus Board sees them as ‘self-help’ groups).

6.2.5. Journals and newsletters
Access to information from industry bodies was also prevalent in the wine industry through journals and newsletters. Irrigator Three, involved in the winegrape industry, indicated that journals, newsletters and articles in newspapers were an important aspect of keeping him up-to-date with the latest developments in the industry.

6.2.6. Summary of how irrigators built their capacity
The three growers contacted indicated that they relied on the following sources to build their capacity and gain new skills and knowledge:

1. Attending the Irrigation Management Course;
2. Engaging a private consultant;
3. Networking with other irrigators informally and formally (i.e. through CITT groups); and
4. Accessing information through journals and newsletters.

These activities were all underpinned by a desire to improve the water use efficiency of their practices and thereby increase profitability. The financial incentives on offer also impacted on their willingness to make changes to their operations.

6.3. Roles of various organisations – effective institutional arrangements
The irrigators contacted as part of this case study (known to be leaders in their fields) were marked by their ability to adapt to and manage for change by accessing services from a wide range of sources. Government, industry groups and private consultants all provide valuable services to irrigators, and significantly, these services can be seen to be fairly complementary with duplication avoided through collaboration, networks and partnerships. The various organisations they depended on includes:

1. The Department of Primary Industries;
2. Murray Valley Wine grape Industry Development Committee;
3. Murray Valley Citrus Board;
4. Private consultants (such as Yandilla Park and Sunraysia Environmental);

Other organisations not mentioned specifically by the three growers we spoke to, but who also have a role to play in delivering services to irrigators include:

5. Sunraysia TAFE; and
6. Water authorities (including First Mildura Irrigation Trust and the Sunraysia Rural Water Authority).

The Industry Development Officer contacted from the Murray Valley Wine grape Industry Development Committee indicated that there was close contact with government and also the Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation (GWRDC). In some instances, the officer attends DPI workshops and activities before passing on information to their own networks. This enables irrigators to access the latest information and knowledge with regard to their practices. The Industry Development Officer identified the role of the Murray Valley Wine grape Committee as representing the interests of growers in the region, and her role specifically as extending information to growers (so that research came into practice), assisting growers to implement ideas and generally building their capacity. Capacity building is delivered through activities such as field walks/days, workshops and
information through newsletters. Funding comes from the GWRDC as well as grower levies. The officer also noted that there was significant liaison with Wine Industry Development Committees from other regions (the Riverina and Riverland). Thus we can see that significant networks and partnerships have formed, which is in line with capacity building theory.

The Murray Valley Citrus Board also houses an Industry Development Officer whose role includes consulting with stakeholders and managing field and research projects to promote the adoption of industry best practices. The role of the Board is to provide industry information, research and extension services as endorsed by citrus producers in the region. The Murray Valley Citrus Board also aims to complement the activities of other regional and national industry citrus organisations. The Industry Development Officer is also responsible for coordinating and facilitating CITTgroup meetings and ensuring new research information is obtained and made available to growers. CITTgroup meetings are attended by key industry personnel including researchers, industry representatives and ‘leading edge growers’ (MVCB web-site, 2005). An evaluation of the CITTgroups by Bessen Consulting Services (1999: 12) identified that the role of the CITTgroup coordinator was one of ‘organisation, promotion and facilitation rather than technical input’, and that ‘the Murray Valley situation is a good example of partnership between Agency research staff and industry extension staff’.

The Murray Valley Citrus Board also sees the role of the Industry Development Officer as expanding the ‘network of growers, industry groups and relevant government bodies and encouraging participation in industry issues through effective communication, study tours and by facilitating and coordinating regional visits by local and overseas experts’. There is also an expectation that the officer will ‘network widely within the industry’.

The citrus grower contacted as part of this case study indicated that his CITTgroup was an invaluable source of information and knowledge and allowed growers to collaborate, share ideas and help each other solve problems. CITTgroups are similar to other industry funded grower groups such as the Australian Wool Innovation’s Bestprac groups. They are seen as ‘self-help’ groups and can also assist in overcoming the isolation that many landholders experience.

A consultant from Yandilla Park (an agribusiness consultancy) indicated that their business assisted irrigators with a range of services including supplying and installing equipment, developing strategies and programs and conducting soil surveys. Significantly, the company provides ongoing support to irrigators who may need help with equipment or with the overall direction of their irrigation business. The consultants establish good working relationships with clients and work with them to ensure strategies are appropriate and in accordance with where the client wants to take his or her business. As noted before, consultants are a good addition to the more generalist advice and services offered by the DPI and provide the support which allows irrigators to actually implement changes to their properties. One irrigator believed that this particular company was the only one who provided ongoing support services and this was a major selling point for purchasing the equipment from them in the first instance.

The consultant from Yandilla Park believed that good clients (i.e. successful irrigators) were those who were keen, eager and willing to take advantage of the opportunities available to them. One issue to arise was that to some extent, those most willing and able to access the consultancy’s services were those irrigators who were somewhat successful in the first instance. One grower commented that while there had been a cultural shift towards greater willingness to adopt new technology and practices, there still remained irrigators who were stubborn and unwilling to change. While networking and informal contact with other growers was one means of overcoming this (in addition to the financial incentives on offer), not all irrigators would strive for innovation in their operations.

In the opinion of this particular consultant, DPI Extension Officers are limited in the role they can play on properties and are less likely to offer direct advice due to possible legal ramifications (i.e. the potential of being sued if they provide incorrect advice). One of the growers indicated that he trusted
private consultants more than DPI officers because they had a direct financial interest in ensuring the quality of the services they provided. Consultants were also seen to be ‘honest brokers’ in that they provided reliable and independent advice.

Despite the trend away from government and towards increasing reliance on agribusiness consultants for advice and support (noted by Marsh and Pannell 1998, 1999 and 2000), the Victorian Department of Primary Industries still has an important role to play in building the capacity of irrigators in the Mallee region. In addition to administering financial incentives available to irrigators, the DPI still offers extension services and coordinates the Irrigation Management Course and other training activities in more specific areas. The Department also has a responsibility for driving activities which have a public good dimension to them (that is, improving water use efficiency benefits the wider community and the Mallee catchment as well) and operates where there is market failure (such as the provision of training courses).

The Department has also undertaken research (commissioned by the Mallee Catchment Management Authority) into what irrigators require for training in irrigation best practice management. The study, which involved contact with 35 irrigators and adopted a market research approach, looked into how they wanted training delivered (length, timing, content) and how they wanted to be informed about it. It was recommended that future courses be developed to cover specific topics (crop nutrition, scheduling information, irrigation strategies and drip management) and that courses be one-day in length, and held during weekdays during winter months.

The research also had a focus on generating behavioural changes by tapping into the ‘individuals’ inherent drivers’ and was based on the principle that ‘the key to understanding the adoption of new technologies is whether it is relevant to the primary producer’ (DPI 2004: 3, citing Linehan and Kane 2002). This supports comments from the three growers contacted who stated that their main motivation (their ‘inherent drivers’) for adopting new technology and changing their practices was to increase water use efficiency and thereby the profitability and productivity of their businesses. Relevance to their operations is a key criterion to whether they adopt new technology or not. The DPI Extension Officer contacted indicated the Department supports the ethos of capacity building and designs its courses so that the farmers feel in control of what they are learning. It was noted that there is a cultural reluctance by some irrigators to seek outside help but slowly, many stakeholders felt this culture was changing.

The DPI also liaises with industry bodies, Sunraysia TAFE, private consultants, SunRISE21 (mapping and information services), the CMA and water authorities (including the Sunraysia Rural Water Authority and the First Mildura Irrigation Trust), providing further evidence of the establishment of partnerships and networks. Sunraysia TAFE, while not mentioned by any of the three irrigators spoken to, assists in the delivery of the DPI’s Irrigation Management Course and also has accredited courses to Certificate and Diploma level. The TAFE has experienced trainers in irrigation, horticulture and viticulture and provides services to apprentices and trainees mainly at the larger corporate properties. The TAFE has formal and informal links with the Victorian and NSW DPIs, the CRC for Viticulture, the Australian Dried Fruits Association and the First Mildura Irrigation Trust.

The First Mildura Irrigation Trust is a statutory water authority that provides irrigation and drainage services to the Sunraysia region. It has recently appointed a Land and Water Management Officer to progress on farm irrigation efficiency initiatives, provide on farm help and advice and work jointly with environmental groups within the Sunraysia region. The role of this person is to help with the delivery and promotion of the Irrigation Management Courses run through the Department of Primary Industries Victoria. This includes the evaluation of operating irrigation systems and identification of soil types to assist with irrigation management techniques and reduction in irrigation drainage. The Officer was responsible for identifying suitable irrigators for this program and they included irrigators operating flood/furrow irrigation, who are growing dried fruit or table grapes, and who have never participated in any irrigator incentive program run through the DPI. The evaluation of past and current incentive programs funded through the Mallee Catchment Management Authority was another
of this officer’s tasks and this involved surveying the crops of up to 100 past incentive recipients, collecting information including crop types, irrigation system types, scheduling techniques, soil moisture monitoring/measuring devices installed, crop ages, drainage details, and crop rootstocks. This information was then measured against total water consumption and current climatic data to assist in the determination of the efficiency of water applied to crops on a monthly, quarterly, and/or yearly basis. The final outcome determined whether incentives were effective and whether there is benefit in funding future incentive programs.

A comment made by the Land and Water Management Officer was that there is likely to be a reluctance to upgrade current on farm irrigation systems to make them more efficient because the off farm water delivery system in some pump districts is not up to standard. Therefore, building the capacity of these irrigators to be more efficient about their water use has to be matched with the capability of the system to deliver.

6.4. Relevance of this case study for capacity building

The irrigators who took part in this case study all indicated that they relied on a diversity of sources to build their capacity. Increasing water use efficiency and thereby profitability was the central driving force behind their adoption of new technology and practices. No one institution can adequately provide the advice, knowledge and skills that irrigators require to improve their practices in the future. The network of institutions that assist in building the capacity of irrigators includes government, private consultants and industry organisations (see following diagram). Each of these institutions has networks that extend even further – including, for instance, research institutions and other industry bodies. The role of both formal and informal contact with other growers is also a means to building the capacity of irrigators and a way in which they can keep abreast of new developments in technology and practice, share ideas and help each other with any issues they confront.

While the evaluation of water use efficiency programs conducted by Psi-Delta et al. (2005) found that educational activities (such as the Irrigation Management Course and field days) and information and assistance provided by DPI Irrigation Extension Officers was most effective in generating improvements to practices, this case study found that for three leading edge growers, the use of consultants was the greatest influence on their skills, knowledge and practices. Consultants were considered by the irrigators contacted to be honest, reliable and independent. They all indicated that agribusiness has a significant role to play in building their skills and knowledge, and this would appear to support other CVCB funded work by Stone (2005).

Several stakeholders (including industry representatives and growers themselves) indicated that there has been a cultural shift among growers in the past eight-ten years and that they were now more willing to embrace new ideas and new technology to stay in business. Where growers were unwilling to adopt new technologies and practices, this was seen to be because of the lack of information about potential benefits and due to the costs involved (in spite of the financial incentives available to them). Interestingly, not one of the three growers indicated that regulation was a key driver for their uptake or otherwise of new technology and practices. While some were mindful of the increasing costs of water, by far and away financial instruments and associated training and extension were seen as a more effective means of generating practice change. Again, the productivity, efficiency and profitability of their operations was foremost in their thinking.
Figure 6.1. Learning links of irrigators in the Mallee region.
7. Case study: South West Victoria

7.1. Introduction
The area chosen for this case study is the South West of Victoria and coincides more or less with the region defined by the Glenelg Hopkins CMA (GHCMA). The GHCMA lies south of the Great Dividing Range and covers an area of 25 000 square kilometres and represents about 12% of Victoria’s land area. The CMA includes the cities and townships of Ballarat, Hamilton, Warrnambool, Ararat, Casterton, Mortlake, Port Fairy, Beaufort and Portland. However for the purposes of this case study the focus has been more on the Hamilton-Warrnambool areas and we have excluded the local government area enclosed by the City of Ballarat.

A catchment region was chosen for this case study because of its potential to influence capacity building in regional Australia. The study area is large enough to include regional institutions such as government offices, research stations and universities. The regional case study relates to Term of Reference 3 for this study.

Undertake a regional case study to provide insight into institutional arrangements that are considered to be effective and efficient in delivering capacity building.

7.2. Regional profile
The population of the region is in the order of 100 000 people with the major centres being at Warrnambool, Portland and Hamilton. Approximately 51 000 (52%) of the population live in city areas, while the remainder are rural dwellers. Population growth is steady and densities are sparse in all local government areas, except the City of Warrnambool (source: Victoria On Line at www.vic.gov.au). Local government councils include the Shires of Glenelg, Southern Grampians, Pyrenees, Moyne, Corangamite, West Wimmera, Rural City of Ararat and the City of Warrnambool.

7.2.1. Industry
The economy is dominated by agriculture, producing about $700 million each year. Production consists of extensive grazing industries, including sheep, beef and dairy cattle. Broadacre cropping also makes a significant contribution to agricultural production. Forestry is also an important enterprise, especially on the south west coastal parts of the region (Victoria Online). Approximately 81% of the Glenelg Hopkins region has been developed for agricultural use (GHCMA website at www.glenelg-hopkins.vic.gov.au).

7.2.2. Infrastructure
The region has a well developed road system with a major freight route from Melbourne to Adelaide. It has a shipping port at Portland and two rail lines running through the region. There are seven on site grain storage facilities and one off site. The major population centres have the usual government services.

7.2.3. Physical features
Known as the ‘western districts’, much of the area in the south of the region consists of arable volcanic soils with level topography. To the north lie the Grampians, the Dundas tablelands and the Central Highlands. The climate in the eastern part of the region is temperate Mediterranean, predominantly winter rainfall with warm and dry summers. The rainfall varies from up to 2,000 mm
per year on the ridges to around 500mm per year on the plains. Approximately 2% of the CMA region comprises pine forest and 16% is native forest. Lake Corangamite (a RAMSAR Wetland) and surrounding lakes such as Lake Colac are of international ecological significance for migratory birds including brolgas.

### 7.2.4. State of the environment

In keeping with much of rural and regional Australia, the general state of the natural environment is a cause for concern. It is described by the GHCMA as follows:

*The returns from agriculture to the regional and wider community are acknowledged. However, it has dramatically changed the natural resources of the region. The loss of population from the region, increased urban fringe development and the need to dispose of rising levels of waste all impact adversely on the region’s natural resource assets.*

*The greatest impact on the region is the degradation caused by pest plant and animals, habitat loss, dryland salinity, decline in water quality of waterways and water erosion.* (GHCMA website).

The *Grain & Graze National Benchmarking (Profiling) Project* (2004) also identifies potential threats as acid sulphate soils, waterlogging, soil acidity, soil structure and declining health and abundance of native vegetation.

### 7.2.5. Profile of farming population

The *Grain & Graze National Benchmarking (Profiling) Project* (2004) identified the following characteristics of farmers in the region (these figures include the Corangamite CMA so are indicative only).

- 43% of surveyed farmers in this region are members of *Landcare* or similar groups (this is about the national *Grain & Graze* average), and 78% of which are currently active (above the *Grain & Graze* average of 72%). The average length of membership is eight years.
- 27% of surveyed farmers are members of production groups, where 68% of the production groups involve a sustainable NRM component. Both of these are a little above the *Grain & Graze* average.
- 21% of surveyed farmers are involved in the *National Landcare Program* (c/f 16% for *Grain & Graze* as a whole) and 19% in *FarmBis* (less than the 25% *Grain & Graze* average).
- 57% of surveyed farmers attend farm demonstration or field days, quite less than the 72% for *Grain & Graze* as a whole.
- 53% of farmers completed high school to at least year 11 and 19% completed tertiary education or a trade.

### 7.2.6. Educational and research institutions

Deakin University is situated at Warrnambool and offers courses in a number of areas that are relevant to this research. They are principally in environmental studies such as ecology, sustainability, and park management. In addition, Deakin has research specialisations in marine and freshwater ecology, landscape ecology, fisheries management and aquaculture, sustainable natural resources management, molecular ecology and biodiversity. Deakin has a Research Priority Area in Sustainable Natural Resources Management which deals with sustainable catchment management and covers the technical areas of nutrient management, salinisation and waste disposal. It also deals with areas such as economic alternatives to regional primary industries and socio-economic indicators of catchment condition. Staff at Deakin University are involved with the two local Catchment Management
Authorities (Glenelg Hopkins and Corangamite) particularly through their waterway management committees.

Melbourne University has a campus at Glenormiston which offers a Diploma of Agriculture and an Advanced Diploma of Rural Business Management. These cover the production areas of sheep and cattle and rural management. In addition to this, Glenormiston offers a range of short courses which are discussed below. The viability of the Glenormiston operation is now in doubt as Melbourne University has indicated that the campus will not continue to operate in its present form.

RMIT has a campus at Hamilton which offers a Bachelor of Nursing and maintains a research specialisations arm in regional and rural development and community engagement. It offers a Masters in Education by project. Its continued viability is also in doubt.

On the edge of the area is Ballarat University which houses the Institute for Regional and Rural Research. Further east, Bendigo University has an Institute for Sustainable Communities which conducts research in regional Victoria.

The South West TAFE has its main campus at Warrnambool and branches at Hamilton and Portland. It offers Certificate level courses in agriculture which are described in more detail below. There are a number of private registered training organisations in Warrnambool and Hamilton including Land Connect and Rural Industries Skills Training.

The DPI has research stations at Hamilton and Warrnambool. Hamilton is devoted principally to animal production sciences, plant production sciences and environmental health and chemistry. The Warrnambool site deals with Plant Production Sciences. Westvic Dairy has a research station at Terang.

For the purposes of this case study the capacity building activities in the region have been divided into three groups:

1. Capacity building for natural resource management
2. Capacity building for rural industry
3. Community capacity building or strengthening.

### 7.3. Capacity building for Natural Resource Management

There are four main sources of Commonwealth Government funds for NRM capacity building available to the case study area. These are:

1. National Landcare Program funding (NLP)
2. National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP)
3. Natural Heritage Trust (NHT)
4. Envirofund

These four sources are provided by the Commonwealth although NAP and NHT monies are matched by the Victorian State Government through the Department of Primary Industries (DPI) or Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE). All except the Envirofund monies are channelled through the Glenelg Hopkins CMA. In addition, some state government agencies have their own programs such as the weed control and eradication initiatives by DSE.

Apart from monies supplied by means of grants, some organisations fund the provision of services which help to build capacity such as shire councils, universities, CMAs and state government agencies.
7.3.1. NLP, NAP and NHT

The GHCMA is one of 21 priority areas under the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality and hence qualifies for NAP funding. Having a coastal boundary the CMA also qualifies for NHT Coastcare funds as well as the three other NHT programs: Landcare, Bushcare and Rivercare.

Capacity building

Each of the three funds NAP, NHT and NLP have stated capacity building objectives. The NHT also has a Capacity Building Framework which defines capacity building in these terms:

*Capacity building relates to a range of activities by which individuals, groups and organisations improve their capacity to achieve sustainable natural resource management. Capacity in this context includes awareness, skills, knowledge, motivation, commitment and confidence. While regional bodies are a key target audience for capacity building, it is equally an issue for diverse players such as Landcare groups, Indigenous communities, industry sectors, local government and State/Territory and Commonwealth Government agencies. Capacity building for natural resource management goes beyond the traditional, top-down approach of enhancing skills and knowledge through training and provision of technical advice. It focuses on enhancing genuine community engagement in all aspects of NRM, from planning to on-ground actions. Therefore, in addition to the transfer of technology and technical capability, capacity building should foster social cohesion within communities, and build both human and social capital. For the purposes of this framework, human capital refers to the capability of individuals, and social capital refers to the level to which social networks, relationships and processes within a community support individuals to exercise their capabilities.*

The NAP definition of capacity building provides more of a focus on the catchment. It states:

*Capacity building in communities requires: reorienting the facilitator and coordinator support network, to support integrated catchment/region management planning and implementation; developing management and technical skills of land managers and other stakeholders to ensure wider adoption of sustainable land and water use and to enhance the capacity of communities to prepare, evaluate and monitor the progress of integrated catchment/region management plans.*

The funds for the National Landcare Program are channelled through regional bodies such as the Catchment Management Authorities to community groups and individual landholders. Taking the 2003-2004 year as a guide, a total of $594,000 was allocated to the GHCMA but it would not appear from the projects documented that any of them had a capacity building component. All projects appear to be directed to on-ground works.

The funds of the GHCMA allocated across all programs (NLP, NAP and NHT) during the financial year ended June 2004 was $14.26 m. Of that 16.12% or $2.3m was devoted to capacity building. The definition of capacity building applied by the CMA is as follows:

*Expenditure on projects where the primary objective is to enhance or maintain the human or social capabilities with respect to participation in natural resource management activities and advocacy.*

*Expenditure on projects that are aimed at accessing, sharing, informing, influencing, empowering the awareness and motivation of human resources with regard to Natural Resource Management.*
On the face of it this definition is consistent with that of the NHT and NAP. However given the examples of capacity building occurring in the GHCMA it is apparent that the definition is somewhat extended from the meaning given to it in this study. It includes items not otherwise treated as capacity building, in particular the costs of implementation of the communications plan, and the cost of the facilitators and communications staff (Source: CMA written advice dated 26 June 2005).

These definitional variations makes it difficult to conclude how much of the funding the GHCMA claims it spends on capacity building would actually qualify as capacity building funds in the terms of this study. This has been a problem throughout the research.

Examples of Capacity Building instigated by GHCMA
The CMA structure is set up with staff to deal with the four program areas of the NHT, namely Bushcare, Landcare, Coastcare and Rivercare. Also there are a number of facilitators who work with Landcare groups, other NRM groups and agencies.

Looking beyond funding and definitional difficulties there are a range of educational and engagement activities that could amount to capacity building by the CMA. These include:

- Education days, hosting meetings with the public to seek their comments on documents such as the Draft Regional Wetland Management Plan.
- Working with schools on a number of projects. The Waterwatch team have typically focused on building the skills of school children to monitor water quality. They are now aiming to broaden this to include community water quality monitoring.
- Working with Landcare groups through the facilitators to provide information and assistance to members on NRM matters and on funding applications.
- Funding groups such as Grain & Graze who themselves engage in capacity building with their constituents. This matter is further discussed below.
- Collaboration with other agencies such as local government and the DSE to build the capacity of their officers. For example, the water team from the CMA through one on one contact, or with small groups, work with councillors and council staff to develop and implement projects. Among other activities, this involves showing them the sites to be repaired, and discussing ecological principles and practices. The water staff also work with the DSE to increase their understanding of the sort of projects that need to occur for water management in their catchment.
- Working with community groups who may be inexperienced in environmental management such as the Willaura and District Development Group on environmental projects. The Willaura group was formed as a result of a community building initiative discussed below.
- The provision of capacity building training and skills to the CMA staff.

Funding Process (NAP, NHT, NLP)

As required by the intergovernmental agreement, all funds are allocated by reference to the Regional Catchment Strategy (RCS), the guiding document of the CMA. The GHCMA RCS covers the period 2003-2007. For each funding year the RCS priorities are set through the Regional Catchment Investment Plan (RCIP). Central to the funding process, and the operation of the CMA, are the two implementation committees, namely the Land and Biodiversity Implementation Committee and the Waterways Implementation Committee.

It will be seen from the diagram below that the central aspect of the funding application is the role played by the CMA principally through the Implementation Committee process and the Regional Investment Group. The applications come from four sources: agencies, Landcare groups, community and CMA staff. These are vetted by Implementation Committee Managers to assess their alignment with the CMA guidelines. At this point there may be some negotiation between the Implementation Committee managers and the proponents. Proposals that go forward are those that comply with the RCIP. The final decisions on the application are made by the Regional Investment Group which has State Government representation. From there the proposals are approved by the State and Commonwealth ministers. This is a lengthy process taking in the vicinity of eight to nine months (see Figure 7.1).
Figure 7.1. CMA funding cycle

The funding cycle generally begins in November and runs through to July-August of the next year before Ministerial approval is granted.
Funding for capacity building in Victorian CMAs is delivered in a number of ways. The main sources are the Commonwealth and State, with philanthropic groups also providing some funds. NAP and NHT are the chief delivery mechanisms by which the CMA directs activity through agencies, its own projects, and through groups and individuals.
Annual application process for funding for capacity building (Victorian CMA perspective)

Figure 7.3. Funding flow chart from the CMA perspective

Catchment Management Authorities produce a Regional Catchment Investment Plan which is in line with the Regional Catchment Strategy. Based on this Plan, targeted commissioning of projects takes place in addition to calls for expressions of interest. Deliverers of NRM activity come from state departments, Landcare groups, CMA staff or community representatives (who are often involved in partnerships). A Regional Investment Group made up of representatives from the various catchment Implementation Committees, DSE/DPI, Local Government, CMA Program Managers and CMA Board Members, oversees that activity is in accordance with the Regional Investment Plan.
7.3.2. Envirofund

The current *Envirofund* rounds (5 and 6) have yielded the sum of $168,602 spread across 14 projects. The *Envirofund* program provides an opportunity to community groups in particular those that have had little or no previous engagement with the Trust, to build capacity through:

- gaining experience in addressing NRM issues on a relatively small scale;
- finding out about the range of approaches to addressing these issues;
- building networks with others addressing similar issues; and
- participating in the development and implementation of broader regional approaches to natural resource management.

_The Australian Government Envirofund will assist groups to undertake:_

- small on-ground projects tackling local problems;
- projects in areas where regional plans are not yet well developed; and
- important local projects.

Activities should not be inconsistent with regional plans (*Envirofund* Guidelines).

There are no available figures on how much *Envirofund* money is spent on capacity building in the region and it is not clear from the current GHCMA projects what, if any, capacity building is involved. The national percentage of capacity building for *Envirofund* monies is 7% with 89% on on-ground works (the remaining 4% is spent on resource assessment 3% and planning 1%). (Source: [http://www.nht.gov.au/envirofund](http://www.nht.gov.au/envirofund)).

Accepting that this percentage also applies to the GHCMA would mean that an amount in the order of $11,802 is allocated to capacity building in the current round. This is not a high figure given that capacity building is supposed to be a strong focus of *Envirofund*. However it could be the case that the process of applying for funds builds capacity, as does project management and direct action on the ground.

Since money from *Envirofund* comes directly to the community there is more emphasis on knowledge of the existence of the fund and funding guidelines than for the other main sources of NRM funds which are obtained via the CMA. One issue that has arisen from the data collected from this case study has been the community’s (and Landcare groups’) lack of knowledge of monies available from *Envirofund*. In that context it is interesting to note that of the nine Round 5 Envirofund projects in the GHCMA, only two were from Landcare groups.

The other general issue frequently mentioned by those spoken to was the complexity of application funding processes generally and the resulting fatigue of groups continuing to lodge submissions. In this context it is noteworthy that two improvements have been made recently to the *Envirofund* application process. There is now a two tiered process with a simplified application process for amounts up to $15,000, and also a more simplified form for the applications up to $50,000 but requiring more information. Also now applicants will be allowed 18 months to complete their projects. The latter would appear to be a response, also commonly mentioned, to the concern about short funding cycles.

*Envirofund* monies have to be spent on activities that are not inconsistent with regional plans. This brings in to play the impact of the GHCMA Regional Catchment Strategy on these projects, as discussed above. There is, however, no requirement for matching funds from the states.
7.3.3. Role of the CMA

The central role played by the CMA has substantially altered the funding process in recent times in a number of ways. Much depends on the relevance of the RCS and its priorities. A view expressed in this study was that the RCS is already in need of revision and it still has two years to run. Apart from the RCS, it will be realised that the Commonwealth and State Governments have a strong hand in setting priorities for the distribution of funds. In this context it is noticeable that the next round of Envirofund is called the Drought Round.

The fact that all agencies (including DPI and DSE) and groups have to apply for funds through the CMA has caused some resentment amongst those whose positions may depend on the successful grant of funds. Some have expressed the desire to be able to go directly to the funding source rather than through this additional process because they are constrained by the imperatives and priorities of the CMA. The opposite view is that the flow of funds through the CMA is the best way to meet the catchment targets.

Central to the movement toward better natural resource management (and the building of capacity) in regional Australia has been the role of the Landcare groups. A view commonly expressed in this study was that the role played by the CMA has the potential to shut Landcare groups out of the process. A number of factors are relevant here. In the past the Landcare groups ordinarily would apply for funding and would administer the funds. Now a common approach is for the CMA staff to approach individual landholders and make an application for funds on their behalf. In this way, the CMA can target its priority areas but the view is put that this renders the Landcare groups redundant in the funding process. Another view is that the Landcare groups (many of which are over 10 years old) have had sufficient time to develop their capacity and in fact some are relieved to have the burden of grant applications taken from them. This study was not designed to investigate these issues fully, however, it is apparent that change is moving through this area.

Previously, the coordinators of Landcare groups were answerable to their Landcare members but now the coordinators are employed by the CMA. This means that the priorities of the CMA have become paramount. One example in the Glenelg Hopkins catchment is the difficulty caused by the so-called ‘20 metre rule’ which required funding applications to include a provision that trees would be planted in bands of no less than 20 metres wide. This requirement was unpopular with landholders and it demonstrates the increasing importance of the role played by the CMA. It is not known how this rule effected the achievement of targets. This is not to suggest that the advent of the coordinators employed by the CMA has decreased the viability of the Landcare groups generally and in fact an evaluation study done by the research team in 2004 found that the coordinators have helped to arrest the decline of the groups.

The potential role of Landcare groups in capacity building is clear and a viable movement has been a cornerstone of NRM policy in this country. For the Glenelg Hopkins catchment, Landcare is of particular significance because of its historical link to the Potter Farms. At the present time there are about 120 Landcare groups in the catchment, however, a question mark exists of how many are active. One Landcare member spoken to in this study said that in her area there were previously five Landcare groups but now there are two.

The increased importance of the regional focus as indicated in the Framework Agreement for distribution of the NAP and NLP funds, and the definition of capacity building under the NAP, is consistent with the role adopted by the GHCMA. The concern is that in reaching catchment targets the emphasis towards on ground works may be hard to resist. There is the associated drive to establish benchmarks which ordinarily requires scientific input and may delay the point when the community can be meaningfully involved. This has been the approach in the GHCMA regarding its water quality projects. In a competitive funding environment the concern is expressed that it is hard to find a place in the system for an application for funding by a group (which might deal with capacity building) unless it had the prior support of the CMA staff or managers.
Given the central role of the CMA the question arises as to its own ability to deliver or facilitate capacity building to the community. The general view expressed on this point is that the CMA is improving but there is some way to go. More work is being done to collaborate with local authorities and the waterways program is connecting well with the community, including school groups.

The funding cycle with an extended application process, but a relatively short length of time to complete the project, remains a problem. This is a common complaint across many sectors and it does not easily fit with the need to take a long term view regarding environmental change.

It is somewhat difficult to establish how much capacity building (according to the definition for this study) is going on in the region. There are two main reasons for this: the inclusion of salaries and the dissemination of information in capacity building budgets. What is apparent is that there is little capacity building happening at the higher levels such as empowerment with the attendant skills of facilitation, leadership, negotiation and dispute resolution.

### 7.3.4. Role of local government

Most councils within the region employ an officer who has a responsibility to deal with environmental issues. From those spoken to in this study there is little contact between that officer and the public or groups although there may be contact with some local groups such as the field naturalists when assessing roadside vegetation.

The South Grampians Shire Council has a Vegetation Committee which has representatives from the CMA, DSE, Field Naturalists, Country Fire Authority, and the Victorian Farmers Federation. It does not engage in capacity building activities.

There appears to be little formal contact between the councils and the local Landcare groups and there is room for some collaborative work in this regard. One of the difficulties that Landcare groups have is the housing of agricultural equipment and a partnership with the local Shire in this regard would appear to be possible. The councils could work with Landcare groups to monitor roadside vegetation. More contact with the CMA would also assist.

### 7.3.5. Role of DPI and DSE

The DPI at Hamilton maintains a Sustainable Landscapes portfolio which has a budget of approximately $700 000 allocated for capacity building but most of that is allocated to salaries through service level agreements with the CMA. The DPI also has an extension officer in dairy and salinity who plays a role in building the capacity of landholders regarding water management.

The DPI now works on science platforms so that scientists of similar interest can exchange information and work collaboratively. This builds their capacity but the concern expressed here is that this arrangement dislocates them from other agencies and the community with whom they used to work with. It has the tendency to generate silos again. Much of the DPI work is with individual landholders.

### 7.3.6. Environment Management Systems

The region has an Environment Management Systems (EMS) national pilot program. Funded by the NHT and administered by the Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) the EMS is a methodical approach to the continuous improvement in planning, implementation and review of an organisation’s efforts to manage its impacts on the environment. The objective of the pilot program is to develop and assess the value of EMS as a management tool to improve natural resource management, from the enterprise level up to the catchment scale. It is designed to help farmers deal with market and production demands in a sustainable way.
While the term ‘capacity building’ is not mentioned specifically in the objectives of the EMS program, the activities of the participants qualify as capacity building by involving farmers working in groups and developing their skills in environmental management.

In the Glenelg Hopkins region the EMS project involves approximately 30 farmers or land managers and its prime objective is to assist in the delivery of catchment targets for the GHCMA under its RCS. Training is provided on the EMS system, farm plans are developed with the aim to move to an external audit of the environmental system in place for each farmer.

This project brings together farmers who are committed to environmental sustainability and the EMS project coordinator believes it provides an opportunity for farmer driven innovative research regarding sustainable practices that do not necessarily decrease production. In the opinion of the coordinator it is new research that excites the farmers. This research is not currently being funded.

**7.3.7. Greening Australia**

Greening Australia obtains funds via the GHCMA from the three main sources of NAP, NHT and NLP. Currently it has a project with the CMA to provide technical support and training to their other programs underway for vegetation management.

Another important source of funds is from corporations which allow Greening Australia to leverage more funding through the CMA. One important donor is Alcoa Aluminium which has provided $100 000 per year to the region since 1991. Roughly 40% of this funding goes towards capacity building activities of landholders. The type of activities run through this project include:

- Skilling up landholders to identify plant species through one on one training and field days.
- Giving advice on planting design.
- Seed collection and sourcing (this is done through training locals in this area, and they have since developed businesses in this area to provide an ongoing and sustainable service).
- Site preparation.

Greening Australia also has a corporate partnership with Pacific Hydro which involves $50 000 for a wetlands project to protect the orange bellied parrot. Here Greening Australia works with landholders to develop a changed grazing system that allows the seed bank to build up for the parrot to feed on. The landholders are involved in this on farm research trial and will be given a stewardship payment to change their grazing system.

Greening Australia has a strong relationship with the Glenelg Hopkins CMA. This has allowed it to provide services for capacity building in this catchment, whereas in other catchments, this has ceased to operate. There are still ways that the relationship between Greening Australia and the CMA can be improved, for example increasing the CMA’s understanding of the services offered by Greening Australia. For this to happen Greening Australia has to increase its own capacity.

Greening Australia believe that their current capacity building programs are missing a key audience – advisors and staff on large scale properties. The current focus on capacity building is aimed at landholders whereas a large percentage of land in this catchment is owned by large scale operators. To change land management practices on these properties, they believe that capacity building needs to be aimed at the staff and agents who are providing advice to these properties, such as agronomists and financial advisors. Many of these staff and advisors are not exposed to natural resource management capacity building activities under current programs.

A concern for Greening Australia is the way in which the Future Environment Fund (see below) may operate. It could result in numerous small organisations in different catchments approaching the
corporate bodies for funding. It is better to have a nationally based organisation with centralised access and national initiatives to attract and manage these funds.

The key to good institutional arrangements in this field is to have strong partnerships (both with public and private funders) and to have a strong local operation with local staff. Greening Australia believes strongly in the value of the model of attracting corporate sponsorship and using this to leverage or value add to CMA funds.

7.3.8. Future Environment Fund
This is a recent local association set up with the object of leveraging funds for the environment from the private sector. The Future Environment Fund Board has two representatives from the GHCMA and other members drawn from the community. The object is to develop investment opportunities for the region that help deliver improved natural resource outcomes as identified in the Glenelg Hopkins Regional Catchment Strategy. The Future Environment Fund will have the status of a Deductible Gift Recipient Association and will be available to channel funds for appropriate purposes from donors who do not have that status.

The Future Environment Fund plans include the maintenance of a research and demonstration farm to show best farm practice and also to establish a revolving fund where degraded land is bought and re-aligned so that it is balanced with a nature/production management system and resold. The Future Environment Fund is currently working with the Australian chapter of UNESCO.

7.3.9. South West Sustainable Partnership
The South West Sustainable Partnership (SWSP) was set up in 1998 with the aim to identify and implement processes for the sustainable development of the region. It is not directly involved in capacity building but is relevant to natural resource management for the area. There are 14 members ranging across local councils, CMAs, educational institutions and government and the idea is to provide a forum where members can report on activities and strategies. From there joint actions can be planned and better coordinated. The notion of the SWSP is to provide a forum free of bureaucratic structures.

In 2001 the SWSP developed a regional sustainability blueprint for South Western Victoria. This project was funded by the Department of Transport and Regional Services.

7.3.10. Western Coastal Board
Another body committed to sustainability of the region is the Western Coastal Board which is set up to champion for the balanced protection and development of South West Victoria’s coastal and marine areas. Whilst the role is primarily advisory to the Minister of Sustainability and Environment, the Board is responsible for the development of overall coastal planning frameworks for the western coastal region. It also performs strategic planning, education, advising and facilitation roles.

7.3.11. Funding opportunities
It is apparent from this study that there is a recognition of the importance of capacity building and there are considerable funds available for this process within the region. The issue appears to be more to look at how the funds may be better targeted. The following opportunities arise from this research:

1. To recognise that capacity building does not just apply to farmers and the community in general but also to agencies and professional staff.
There is much to be learned by these people about the true meaning of capacity building – in particular that it goes beyond the dissemination of information. There is a risk that if the provision of information is regarded as enough for capacity building then the target audience will be saturated and will become disinterested. This is already happening in the region, to CMA staff and community alike.

There is a need for funding for training for those who are going to deliver capacity building to gain a deeper appreciation of the steps and processes involved if a community is to be empowered.

2. Following on from the training mentioned above, funding could usefully be applied to agencies and organisations to develop a plan for capacity building within their organisation and also to develop capacity building within their constituent community. The object here would be to establish a process to move through capacity building from informing, consulting and involving to empowering. As noted above, much of what is happening now which is regarded as building capacity is only the provision of information.

3. To extend short term funding there are opportunities to fund follow up projects that have already been commenced and show some signs of success. This recognises that improvements in this field have to be gauged in the long term. This may mean funding project leaders that are successful. There are many opportunities through current agencies for an outside or private organisation to discover what projects deserve to be extended.

4. Private funding to organisations such as Greening Australia allows them the opportunity to leverage increased funds from the public system. Extended commitments, such as that by Alcoa, allows for longer term planning.

5. As identified by Greening Australia, there is a need to build the capacity of the managers of large scale properties with regard to NRM matters.

The establishment of the Future Environment Fund provides a further opportunity for private funding to contribute to capacity building.

6. There is a need for more farmer driven research in this field. As one respondent noted new research excites people and galvanises interest. The EMS project in the region for example, would benefit by innovative research looking at alternate ways of achieving sustainability. In the community capacity building area there are good examples of collaborative research being carried out involving the community, universities and other agencies (such as the Dairy Families Health project discussed below).

7. Another approach is to look at funding of a particular issue or hazard. One example here is weed management. While it is the subject of plans and strategies there appears to be a need for more collaboration between the various agencies.

8. There is an opportunity to fund capacity building in NRM that does not necessarily coincide with the Regional Catchment Strategy and which does not require the endorsement of the CMA. An example would be research into innovative pasture systems.

9. With the aging of the farming population and the lack of interest by the next generation in succeeding their parents as farmers, a real issue is who from that sector is going to have their capacities built. This relates to the increasing drop off of Landcare members and the fact that the average membership lasts eight years. In the first years of Landcare the exit of members was made up by new arrivals however clearly this situation is not viable in the long term. Perhaps this is a primary factor in the viability of Landcare. A study into this area would appear to be warranted. If farms are not to be taken over by the owners’ children then presumably they will be bought by companies and
this relates to the present need identified by Greening Australia to target the managers and advisors of those properties.

7.4. Capacity building for rural industry

7.4.1. Formal courses

The University of Melbourne through its Glenormiston campus offers a Diploma of Agriculture and the Advanced Diploma of Rural Business Management. The course is 2.5 years fulltime and students graduate with both qualifications. The speciality is sheep and beef production. Students undertake a series of work placement called ‘enterprise rounds and enterprise placement’ which is designed to apply the theory to practice. For years 1, 2 and 3 the rounds are 6 weeks, 12 weeks and 3 weeks respectively. Mostly the placements are on farm but at least one has to be with a non-farm agricultural enterprise.

Glenormiston also offers a range of short courses and workshops which are designed for both full and part time farmers. Examples of recent offerings include:

- Whole Farm Planning
- Remnant Vegetation Course
- Bed and Breakfast Rural Accommodation
- Southern Beef School
- Horse breaking

The South West TAFE offers Certificates II and III and Diploma in Horticulture and the Certificate IV in Wool Classing through its Warrnambool campus. At Hamilton it is possible to do the Certificate III in Rural Merchandising, Certificate III in Horticulture (also available at Portland) and Certificate IV Livestock Services. At all three campuses the Farm Chemical Users Course is offered.

7.4.2. Department of Primary Industries

There are DPI offices at Warrnambool and Hamilton however the move to transfer staff to the main centres such as Melbourne and Benalla is still being felt. The DPI accesses funds through industry partners such as MLA, AWI and Land and Water Australia for its projects. Capacity building is a large part of these projects and they follow the Best Prac model of a facilitator working with the producer groups and also to conduct research on farm. The pasture area of DPI obtains funding through Grains Research and Development Corporation. As noted earlier, the DPI also receives some funding from the CMA.

The primary barrier to delivering capacity building in regional areas is the lack of technically competent staff with an understanding of regional issues who can run the courses. For example, in DPI Hamilton there are no sheep, pasture or economists with the technical skills working in extension. A comment frequently made, in relation to extension and more generally, is that for staff to be effective, regardless of who they are employed by, they have to be in the region for a few years. They need this time to build the trust of the community. The view was expressed that the concentration by the DPI on funding applications and the requirement to deliver on specific outcomes for specific projects means that the organisation lacks the flexibility to respond to general needs in the region, including the needs of the CMA. A particular problem is the lack of ability to react to short term issues.

Currently the DPI is structured so that there are nodes of staff working around a common issue based together. This means that their capacity is not spread around the region, but located in one place. Staff at the local level try to work across disciplines and specialities, but they find the present structure inhibiting.
To build the capacity of DPI to work with the community there is a need to be able to bring on young graduates and trainees and PhD students into the regional offices of the department. When this was done in the past it meant that there were skilled people in the regions who understood the regional context. It also meant that new fresh ideas were being brought to the Department. The difficulty is that now this is not easy because the regional offices have been reduced in size.

7.4.3. Research

Southern Farming Systems (SFS)

SFS is a non-profit farmer owned and operated group exploring the best use of new technologies and techniques for more profitable agriculture. Their mission is to effectively and responsibly manage our farming environment and resources, to increase farm profitability and to enhance long-term farm and community viability.

SFS is funded from three sources:

- by its own subscriptions ($130 per annum);
- by sponsors, e.g. National Bank, VFF, agribusiness firms, National Landcare Program; and
- by funders such as GRDC, MLA and AWI.

The head office is in Geelong with a branch in Hamilton, comprising 76 members. The principal focus is on research which is driven by farmers in partnership with agribusiness and research institutions. SFS has been established for 10 years and is regarded as a very successful operation.

The work is done on a group basis. Participants are members of a branch and there are sub-groups. Each branch has its own program. The members tease out the research issues and are involved in the research projects. SFS works at the applied end of research and collaborates with people from other institutions such as government and universities. SFS does do some training –mainly in leadership. Being driven by farmers the SFS makes an evident contribution to capacity building for its members. This comes about from the knowledge and experience gained from their direct involvement in the research and the networks formed with other members and researchers from universities and government. There is also capacity built by the leadership training and mentoring that operates through the group.

The following are the key factors identified by the group’s coordinator in the success of SFS:

- Passion is regarded as more important than numbers of members.
- For research, the approach is to target individuals and not institutions. The group looks for people who can add value.
- Ensure that each branch has an enthusiastic and efficient local coordinator.
- Have a clear idea of what direction the research should take and then look for the funds. The view of the local manager is that it is better not to mould the research to fit the funds’ parameters.

(Colin Hackey pers.comm.2005).

In relation to institutional barriers, the study by Hassall (2005) notes that funding applications are ‘slow, cumbersome and complicated’. SFS also feel they could do more in the training area, such as leadership and succession. The Hassall study (p3) also suggested that:

*GRDC should invest in capacity building processes such as providing support to groups. This is justified to the extent that social outcomes can be expected. These facilitators can be internal group members, so that an alternative formulation might be to recognise the large amount of time (average of days per year) given to the projects by certain key individuals and*
pay for this time. The involvement of private and public agronomists should also be encouraged, as this can influence wider industry engagement with the findings. Again payment is likely to be appropriate. Note that this raises a wider issue than that applying to just farming systems R&D.

**Grain & Graze**

This is a recent program set up in 2004 and is scheduled to run until June 2008. It has three main objectives:

- Regional research;
- Information management and analysis; and
- Communication and capacity building.

Eight project areas have been established around Australia, including one for the Corangamite and Glenelg Hopkins CMA which has a local coordinator. The principal focus of this group is on research in five priority areas including stubble, pest management, natural grasses and water logging. It operates in a similar way to the SFS model however in this case there is no overlying structure. Instead, the focus is on accessing farmers from existing groups and networks such as Landcare, Prograze and Bestwool. At meetings of these groups the priority research areas are spoken about by the Grain & Graze (G&G) representative and those interested in one or other of them are identified. From there a meeting is held with the interested producers where problems are identified and solutions canvassed. At this point a course of action is determined and linkages made with like minded farmers. The group will set up a trial or some research where it is agreed what tasks G&G will attend to and what the farmers will carry out.

The farmers and G&G work together on the research and when the results come in the farmers interpret those results. The approach works well for the producers because what is being done is very relevant to them. Where necessary the group works with scientists and experts from government and the universities. The direct involvement of the farmers in the research builds their capacity, but in addition, G&G encourages farmers to become advocates of the research they have been involved in and to present it at an appropriate forum. Farmers are paid by G&G to do this, and this process also opens up an opportunity for mentoring.

The focus in the operation is to really do the research thoroughly and to bring in the right people. They are forming alliances with universities who have staff interested in some of these fields and for whom they can provide some facilities, a site and funding. They propose to use Masters and PhD students as well.

Research results are disseminated by means of workshops and field days. Again this is done through existing groups such as Landcare, Prograze and Bestwool. G&G plan to put on some accredited courses arising out of the research which will be run by a local training organisation. Another initiative is to develop farmers as advocates in the environmental field with the knowledge and expertise to be able to meet scientist and government officers on equal terms.

The structure of the organisation is a steering committee which is chaired by a farmer and has a number of farming representatives and members from the local CMAs. The idea is to have ‘flat’ organisation where the emphasis is on the passion and commitment of the participants. Around half the funding comes from G&G (GRDC, MLA, AWI) and half from the CMAs through NLP funds (approximately $2 million). They have themselves funded some research e.g. a grant of $10 000 for work on spiders.

While it is early days the approach taken in this initiative appears to be working well. Some of the crucial factors in the view of the local coordinator are:
• It was made clear from the start that the farmers did not want another group to join. There are enough groups so G&G have chosen to use the existing networks. This is both to garner the initial support for the research but also for the extension of the learning.
• The CMAs are interested because they can see that this is one way towards delivering on their catchment targets. In this context G&G have a triple bottom line requirement and there is an emphasis on the environmental outcomes.
• There is a clear capacity building drive in the program and the good results stimulate more enthusiasm.
• The diverse range of people who are brought into the operation is one of its strengths and should increase as the network grows.
• Some of the good ideas have come from the Southern Farming Systems organisation, both in the way of operating and in the actual solutions to identified problems.
• The research is quite focused on the five nominated areas. These areas were arrived at after considerable research and discussion.

WestVic Dairy
WestVic Dairy has a research station at Terang and works with the DPI, DSE and Dairy Australia to conduct research and development. It conducts training and has a small grants program. The current funding is $531,000 of which 75% (or $398,000) is spent on capacity building. The funding is partly provided by WestVic and partly by State and Federal monies.

Approximately $70,000 is spent on the small grants program where amounts of up to $5000 may be offered to groups for research and other activities. The participants are encouraged to undertake work that they would not otherwise do either on their property or as part of their dairy farm business. The projects are usually generated in one of the 18 discussion groups which operate in the region and ordinarily involve the DPI or universities to assist with the design. Farmer participants do the monitoring and are available to explain the research to visitors. One particular advantage of these small grants is that they can seed larger projects and assist with the leveraging of other funds. In one case a grant of $5000 led to a second phase where the budget was over $100,000 and included private and public funds.

A number of training and other activities are conducted covering topics such as the capacity of farmers to sit on boards, upgrading skills of accountants and other professionals to work with dairy farmers, growing the next generation, hands on dairy awareness for politicians, NRM focus farms, Brucknal Creek community working together, training for young farmers to be something else other than farmers and facilitators for discussion groups. The farmers can make a request for the training they feel they need. One important outcome from this work has been the desire to see NRM as more than just compliance. Compliance is no longer seen as good enough.

Some of the barriers to capacity building are the lack of time for male farmers. This has meant a drive to target women. More women attended one workshop held recently than all the men who came to the other workshops held that year. Other barriers are the difficulty in securing the assistance of professionals such as accountants and financial advisers. This has led to the establishment of two scholarships ($16,500 each) to fund two business honours students from Deakin University to work in the Western District on projects of interest to the dairy industry.

Sustainable Dairy Farmer Families project
This is an innovative project managed by the Western District Health Service at Hamilton and includes partners from the Gardiner Foundation, Victorian Farmers Federation, WestVic Dairy, RMIT, Colac Area Health, Farm 500, Australian Women In Agriculture, and MLA. The aim of the project is to tackle the health of dairy farmers and link that to workplace safety. It commenced in 2003 and is scheduled to finish in 2006.
Central to the project is the design of a social research component which is tracking the health of the participants over time and investigates whether there is any link between the health of the participants and their financial performance. This research component of the project involved the assistance of RMIT and was considered to be vital to obtaining funds and to the overall success of the project. The participants in the project include some 200 dairy farmers in Victoria, of whom 120 have participated in the first phase of the study. The activities included the delivery of information in workshops on health and safety by professionals and then the participants designing their own health and work safety plans making up the capacity building part of the project.

In the second year of the study the participants will self evaluate their health on a scale of 1-6. Of the participants, 96% have completed the health plan in the first year and 90% have indicated their interest in continuing in the project. This project is unusual in that it has a budget of over $300 000, which is high for capacity building. This stretched some of the funders who were used to funding scientific research to this magnitude but not capacity building.

The project now has 16 parties which does make it unwieldy in some respects. In common with many funded projects, success raises the level of interest and new organisations now want to be involved. An example is the Victorian Department of Human Services. FarmBis were not prepared to subsidise the training.

The features of the project that have contributed to its success are:

- The strong social research base which was provided by RMIT through its local campus at Hamilton.
- Linking the research to financial performance.
- The involvement of a wide range of partners, both government and private, research institutions and bodies such as the Victorian Farmers Federation.
- An experienced steering committee.
- Appropriate tutors on content (especially the health component).
- An imaginative proposal driven by the passion of the principal coordinator, Sue Brumby.
- A generic set of materials that can be used elsewhere.

Now the sugar and cotton industries are interested in a similar project. Other groups such as Bestwool are interested but they do not have the funds at present. This project shows that with imagination and commitment it is possible to obtain funding for capacity building projects on a large scale. Project funding at this level also builds the capacity of organisations managing the project.

7.4.4. Other activities

Group work
Throughout the region there are a number of groups (such as Bestwool) which have been in existence for some years. Generally they are run by a local private consultant who takes the members through an exercise such as benchmarking. The group meets regularly and generally a facilitator is present. Information is collated by the consultant and presented back to the group. There is some capacity building as the group decides on the themes and issues and over time becomes more independent as its members grow in confidence, learn more about the subject and from each other. They get the opportunity to see how other people are operating and that may apply to their own business. A network also develops between the participants. For some groups the members decide on speakers and arrange their attendance with the help of the consultant. Some of the funding comes from FarmBis. For others funds are provided by research organisations such as AWI.

According to one consultant spoken to there are quite a few of these groups in operation and there is considerable competition for members. This can make it difficult for privately funded discussion groups to attract members.
When speaking of the impact of funding on capacity building, the role of earlier initiatives needs to be recognised. One example is Sustainable Grazing Systems which began in 1996 and finished in 2002. It had a national site at Hamilton and the value of the participation was referred to by a number of participants in this research. The experience was particularly formative for the project leader of the Western Health Dairy project.

**FarmBis**

One to one consulting and other courses and workshops continue to be funded through *FarmBis*. The extent of the capacity building component of these courses does vary but it is likely to be a strong element where the subject matter is financial planning, risk management and the like, particularly if it is a one to one course. A search of the *FarmBis* website for the South-West region of Victoria showed 47 leadership courses available and for ‘risk management’ there were 656 entries. These two examples were chosen because they are likely to have a capacity building element. The numbers should be read with some caution because it appears that some of the entries on the website do not appear to deal directly with the subject matter in question. Nevertheless it is clear that there are a wide range of capacity building opportunities through *FarmBis*.

7.4.5. Discussion

It is apparent that there are a range of groups, courses and workshops available to the farmers of the region which deal either directly or indirectly with capacity building in agricultural extension. In this study the point was often made that there are too many courses and any new additions need to be well targeted. There is considerable research being done by WestVic, Southern Farming Systems and *Grain & Graze* as well as the DPI and universities which build capacity. A number of respondents referred to the age old problem that those farmers who are part of capacity building programs are likely to be the more innovative producers anyway and it is really those that do not belong to groups or attend courses that need to be reached. This is not something that this research was designed to investigate.

The barriers to capacity building that have been identified are generally of a structural nature such as the reduction in the size of government offices, the privatisation of government activities through the requirement to access external funding and the short term funding cycle. The complexity of the funding application process (which can particularly impact on community groups) does not appear to present a problem here, often because it is professionals who make the application. The amount of funding also was not raised as a major issue.

The following opportunities have been identified:

1. There is a clear need to increase the level of education of professional advisers, especially those who are already living in the region. Some options are:
   - Fund scholarships for students in either their Honours year, Masters or PhD to get them to carry out research in the region. The initiative of WestVic Dairy of funding scholarships for accountants and economists is a response to this need and could be extended to other fields.
   - Target those already working in the region to engage in higher studies. One approach was Masters by project courses offered by RMIT with the projects applying to the student’s workplace. Initially the cost of the courses was at the HECS level however it now appears that the course will have to be full fee paying and its future is in doubt. This is unfortunate because of the first intake of students four or five plan to enrol in a doctorate. The RMIT Masters was in education but a similar approach could be taken for other fields. The value of the RMIT program was that the course was offered by the Hamilton campus and ideally this type of program should be available through a regional university.

Funders could offer scholarships to local students in this category and where the course was not available through a regional university, travel costs could be defrayed by the grantee.
2. The research currently being conducted through SFS, Grain & Graze and WestVic Dairy appears to offer value for money. Apart from its leveraging ability there is ample opportunity to fund collaborative projects with universities and government. In each of these three cases there is a funding system in place for a provider to augment. In particular grants could be made to fund the second and third phases of projects that have promise. Funders could also encourage research in non-technical fields such as sustainability in its wider meaning. The Sustainable Dairy Farmers project is a case in point. Meaningful triple bottom line projects where the social aspect receives full attention could be targeted.

3. While capacity building initiatives usually target the farmers, the approach taken by WestVic Dairy in focusing on the role of the external adviser such as accountants and increasing their capacity is a novel way of looking at the needs of the target group. In a similar vein programs could be offered to assist farmers on how they can better use consultants and vice versa.

4. As with the NRM capacity building, the organisations involved in agricultural extension do not appear to have a clear course of action for their capacity building programs. In particular there does not appear to be a clear progression from the lower forms of capacity building to the higher. The related matter is the extent to which the capacity of the organisation itself has to be built.

5. While there is funding for some leadership courses, there appears to be little funding of the higher capacity building programs. In this context the ‘advocate’ role of farmers by the Grain & Graze group is to be welcomed. Even for leadership courses there is evidence from this research that where such courses have to have matching funds there is a drop off in interest. The reduction of the FarmBis subsidy to 50% has thrown some doubt over this type of course which is not considered central to a farming operation. Leadership, advocacy, negotiation and mentoring courses, given their public good element, could be funded in their entirety.

6. In a general sense there is an opportunity to provide assistance to groups, especially those that have been in existence for some time. This could come in the form of paying internal facilitators (as recommended by the study by Hassall 2005), travel grants to those to deliver the results of research and secretarial assistance. This need not be ongoing but can be targeted.

**7.5. Community Capacity Building and Development**

To gain an insight into the scope of community capacity building, a number of programs and projects operating in the case study area have been examined. The emphasis has been on innovative initiatives and what follows is not intended as an exhaustive summary of the field.

In response to the widespread concern about the decline of rural and regional communities over the last 10 years, a broad range of programs have been designed to build capacity in the regions. The initiatives have come from the three levels of government, corporate donors and the philanthropic sector. In particular, there have been a number of diverse State government programs which have funded community groups to build capacity (as it has been defined in this study) and also to build infrastructure. As well there are a number of more general support programs for community capacity building such as the provision of information to community groups and training.

**7.5.1. Victorian State Government Programs**

The main examples relevant to this case study are:

- Community Capacity Building Initiative
- Community Building Demonstration Projects
- Victorian Community Support Grants Program
Community Capacity Building Initiative
This program ran from 2000-2004 and was aimed at “strengthening small rural communities to take care of their own future”. For each district selected there was a local steering committee, a community based facilitator and designated staff from relevant government departments. Under this program, a project within the case study area involving the districts of Balmoral and Harrow was successful in obtaining a grant. The objectives of the project were:

[T]o take on the challenges of the future, building capacity and planning and reviewing their goals. In their Action Plan they identified projects including Mining/Community Liaison Project, Riverscape Development and an Accommodation Project. Their Learning Program delivered skills in areas such as team building, having a say at meetings and public speaking.

While the program was funded by the State Government, the sub-project had to access funds from other sources. This was part of their capacity building activities. The projects were regarded as successful and toward the end of the first phase the Helen McPherson Smith Trust made an offer of $500 000 which was matched dollar for dollar by the State Government. The additional funds have allowed the initiative to continue into a second phase. It is an interesting example of how philanthropic funds can leverage government monies. Recently the State Government has pledged to continue with the program.

Community Building Demonstration Projects
One project in the case study locality was Warrnambool Action Vision for Everyone (WAVE). Here four disadvantaged areas in Warrnambool were targeted and the project began by project workers forging links with resident groups and associations. The focus was on forming a networking forum and gradually more and more members of associations attended and took control of the terms of reference looking at developing shared resources, skill development opportunities and networking. The underlying objective was to strengthen the often weak links between volunteer community groups by associations supporting each other but also providing a single voice on issues common to them all. The forum currently meets bi-annually with each member association taking it in turns to prepare and host the meetings. Actions decided are taken on by member associations.

The significance of this project is that it is building the capacity of a number of associations rather than a single community group and has the potential to make a wide impact. It shows the value of involving professional workers initially with the objective that they withdraw from the process at an appropriate point.

Community Support Grants
Funded by revenue from electronic gaming machines, the Community Support Fund is administered by the Department of Victorian Communities and has been in operation since 1991.

One example of a project in the region is the South west Community Capacity Consortium (SWCCC). This is a coalition of local government and non-government agencies which is working to develop other initiatives in community building. It uses a reference group and extends ideas or promotes projects which are seen as necessary by the community.

One project initiated by the SWCCC was the South West Local and Regional Volunteer Service Project and was supported by the Gardiner Foundation. The project focuses on assisting and growing the volunteer sector and one aspect of the Project currently underway is to research possible models for the establishment of a Volunteers’ Resource Service for the SW region. This is not envisaged as a stand-alone centre, but would aim to provide support, training, co-ordination and development opportunities for volunteers. A sub-set of this project has been an initiative which encourages volunteering by young people to boost their confidence and develop social capital skills, including communication, leadership, decision making and networking.
The approach taken in the SWCCC has been to use an umbrella group of experienced community leaders (the Consortium) to promote other projects, using their knowledge to access funds and provide mentoring and support. The Consortium only sees that it has a life while ever it can be of use and it has deliberatively not sought funding for its own operations apart from the initial seeding grant.

Another innovative use of the Community Support Fund in the case study region has been the **Ararat Area Community Building Project**. It is a three year project under the auspices of the Ararat Rural Council involving capacity building in seven small towns in the region. It builds on a previous project funded by Victoria Health and has been supported by the local council for about five years. The approach is for the project coordinator (who is employed by the Council) to assist each town to develop an action plan, which may have infrastructure and human capacity building components. The action plan is ordinarily a simple document setting out what the community wants to achieve in the next three years. Having developed the plan (which is designed by the community), the coordinator assists with funding applications to implement the plan. Here various sources of funds are used such as:

- Victoria Health
- Regional Development of Victoria Small Town Fund
- Federal government small grants mainly for equipment for volunteers
- Feasibility study for Moyston from the Sport and Recreational Fund from Department of Victorian Communities (DVC).

One part of the initiative is to encourage the development of new leaders in the region to relieve the pressure on those who currently take on this role. The objective is to train two new leaders for each town. To assist here the project has been able to gain access in leadership training which is provided by Victoria University and funded by DVC.

The reports are that this project has been successful in building the capacity of at least some of the small towns in question. The process of developing the action plan, applying for funds and the leadership program all build the capacity of the community. The model of having an overarching project, action plans and then sub-projects with the aid of the coordinator has been well received. The project has influenced the way in which the Ararat Council now views the distribution of its community grants program with better alignment of infrastructure with community planning, especially in areas such as health services. Apart from influencing the approach of the Ararat City Council in its planning, these action plans are now regarded as a useful way for a community as a whole to achieve some overall progression and provide guidance to other service providers on what is required in the local areas.

**Regional Development Victoria: Leadership and events program**

Generally Regional Development Victoria (RDV) works more on the infrastructure or business aspect of community development but they have initiated several programs related to human capacity building. In one of these programs community groups, through their shire council, could apply for funding and gain experience in project planning. The two types of projects funded were “events” or leadership. The funding was matched dollar for dollar by the State government and this meant that the council or community group had to raise the remaining funds. It was found that of the two types of projects the events type were generally preferred because they could raise funds from the event itself. In the program about 90% of projects were for events and 10% for leadership which reflects the difficulty of human capacity building initiatives where a matching dollar for dollar requirement exists.

**Grampians/Pyrenees Wine Industry Seasonal Resource Solutions**

This was a project funded by DVC under its Community Regional Industry Skills Program (CRISP). The program provided targeted funding to address skill shortages and create sustainable industries and jobs in country Victoria. One project in the South West region focussed on the shortages of seasonal workers in the wine and wool industries. The project provided training and job placement to participants.
While the targets for those trained and placed in employment were not achieved, the project was generally regarded as providing an innovative solution to seasonal work deficiencies in Victoria. The aim was to train the participants in at least two industries (wine and wool) so that added together the workers would have employment that spanned most of the year. This would encourage seasonal workers to stay in the area and would provide a pool of skilled labour for the two sectors. There was significant cooperation amongst stakeholders in this project (three councils, job placement agencies, development associations) which has provided optimism for this type of initiative in the future. However one of the conditions of the original funding was that the same project could not be repeated and it is unclear if this initiative will be replicated.

The Grampians/Pyrenees Wine project has also revealed the impact on this type of program of the lack of transport. Many of the participants with a history of unemployment had unreliable vehicles and could not travel the distances to attend training or their job placement and had to drop out of the course. The program shows that while capacity building programs can be made available, they may flounder because of infrastructure deficiencies.

7.5.2. Commonwealth government programs

There are a range of Commonwealth programs which impact upon capacity building in regional Australia (see Inventory). In the main they are of a more general nature than the State based ones, providing services which assist communities, but not so much targeted to the funding of local projects. Set out below is a brief review of some of the more important programs.

Family and Community Services

The Department of Family and Community Services (FACS) hosts the Stronger Families and Communities Strategy which in turn provides funds for local projects through its Local Answers Program, for which $60m has been set aside for the period 2004-2008. This Program helps strengthen disadvantaged communities by funding local, small-scale, time limited projects that help communities build skills and capacity to identify opportunities and take action for the benefit of their members. This approach is in recognition that government alone cannot solve community issues and that communities themselves know what their local issues are, how these issues can best be addressed and who they need to work with to implement solutions. (FACS website at www.facs.gov.au/). The focus is on the family and young people and preference is given to projects in areas of “disadvantage” of which there are a number in the case study region, including parts of Warrnambool, Ararat and Portland. From the recent round of projects funded under this Program none appear to be related to the case study area.

FACS also provides capacity building funds through the Family Community Network Initiative (FCNI). At the present time the focus of this program is on supporting Indigenous communities. The latest round of grants did not apply to projects in the case study region.

Other FACS programs

The National Skills Development for Volunteers initiative provides specialist training and skills development to volunteers to assist them to improve the standard of service to the communities that they support. There have also been a number of pilot projects including an ongoing Creative Volunteering Project managed by Regional Arts Australia to assist volunteers in the cultural and museum sector. The program is managed through a National Skills Centre which develops training materials and a national peer network.

Other programs include the Volunteer Management program which funds 27 Volunteer Resource Centres to provide volunteer matching and referral services throughout Australia. Also there is the Voluntary Work Initiative which allows the unemployed to meet their activity test requirements through voluntary work. To encourage volunteers, FACS provides Small Equipment Grants for Volunteers of up to $3000. A number of these grants were received in the case study area.
As with the Victorian State Government, the Commonwealth provides information through a website for community groups on matters such as the source of funds and fund arising techniques.

7.5.3. Victorian Government Support Services

To support capacity building, the government provides a number of services. The main ones are:

- **Rural Community Development Officers (RCDOs) and Interface Councils Liaison Officers.** The government has appointed 10 RCDOs and one Councils Liaison Officer. RCDOs are situated at Ararat and Warrnambool and are available to help local communities with their capacity building.
- **Community Building Resource Service (CBRS) which supports people and organisations involved in projects aimed at strengthening communities.** It is coordinated by Victoria University.
- **As part of the CBRS, skills development and training is offered.** Here an organisation can contact Victoria University, who identifies training needs and provides a trainer to run a session in the local community. As well, there are a series of standard workshops covering matters such as fundraising, conducting meetings, public speaking and developing community action plans.
- **Victoria University recently completed a trial of three models of leadership and mentoring in a community development environment with the objective of publishing the outcomes as a resource for other organisations.**
- **On-line library material relevant to community strengthening is maintained by RMIT and provides a single point of reference and advice for community strengthening and other community development activities.** Featuring an accessible database, it has been designed to help both government and community building practitioners. The e-library provides information on policy and research as well as practical online resources.
- **Local Data Support which is a service identifying what local data projects need, and how best to obtain this information.**
- **Learning towns which is a network which fosters and supports lifelong learning, and contributes to the development of a learning culture.** The nearest Learning Town to the case study area is at Horsham.
- **Adult and Community Education centres and Local Learning and Employment Networks play important roles in community strengthening initiatives.**

7.5.4. Regional Initiatives

**Regional Management Forums**

One frequent criticism of the role of government in the area of service delivery, and this includes capacity building programs, is the lack of cohesion and coordination. To attempt to meet this need the Victorian State Government in May 2005 has established eight Regional Management Forums (RMFs) across the State. The membership comprises the senior officer of each state Department with a presence in the region and the CEOs of local councils. The function of the RMFs is broadly to engage with the communities to gain an understanding of the important issues which would benefit from a joint response involving governments and community agencies working together. From there, the plan is to develop proposals for addressing those issues. Each region will have a ‘champion’ who will oversee the operations of the RMFs and community project teams will implement the proposals to address identified issues.

**Greater Green Triangle**

The Greater Green Triangle (GGT) is an Area Consultative Committee, an initiative of the Commonwealth Government to provide a regional approach to community development. The GGT office is located at Ararat and provides a variety of services to the community and business, including sourcing funds, funding applications and forming partnerships. The Area Consultative Committees...
have considerable control over their own direction formulated via a strategic plan. They are run by a local Board of Directors.

When it was first formed the GGT was involved in a wide range of community development projects which included human capacity building. However of late it has moved away from the social and human capital work towards a more business and employment focus. This has been brought about to a considerable extent by the increasing involvement of the State Government in the human capacity building field. The GGT sees its role as responding to the needs of the region at the time, taking into account their regional plan and the current initiatives of the Commonwealth and State Governments.

The GGT is not a funder of last resort but more a conduit for funding applications, to help applicants with the application process. They act as a referral point and in that role they work in conjunction with State and local government and have strong links with Community Development Officers employed by councils.

**Great South Coast Foundation**

Recently formed, the Great South Coast Foundation includes the local councils areas of Moyne, Pyrenees, Southern Grampians, Glenelg, Warrnambool and Corangamite. The objective is to provide an opportunity for smaller organisations to access funds for community building, especially those that do not always fit current guidelines. The Foundation will provide a degree of flexibility at the local level compared with other funds, especially those from government. It is intended to combine the public and private funding sources and recognises that to access public funds it may be necessary to match that contribution dollar for dollar. Another impetus for the initiative is to have a regional focus and to provide some cohesion in the community strengthening field. One disappointing aspect of the initiative has been the general lack of support from local government.

**Regional universities**

An important potential contributor to regional capacity building are universities, especially in capacity building research. The role of Deakin University has been referred to in relation to the NRM field and RMIT is playing a crucial role in the Sustainable Dairy Framer Families project. Being situated and known in the community is mentioned a number of times in this study as being vital to well supported, targeted and collaborative research. In addition to the dairy farmer project, RMIT has been involved in other research projects related to capacity building. An example is the work being done on the effect of the Balmoral mineral sands enterprise on the triple bottom line on the community. As noted above, the long term future of RMIT is unclear.

**7.5.5. Philanthropic funds**

As the Inventory shows, there are many philanthropic organisations contributing to capacity building throughout Australia. Within the case study region the work of the Gardiner Foundation and the Helen McPherson Smith Trust has already been noted. Another important provider of private funds to this field is the *Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal* (FRRR)

Since FRRR was set up in 2000 it has provided $6.2 million to communities across Australia and has leveraged more in supporting grants. It has a small grants program that places approximately $500 000 a year to assist small rural communities. The program is supported by The RE Ross Trust, The Myer Foundation, The Pratt Foundation, The William Buckland Foundation, Perpetual Trustees, The Sylvia & Charles Viertel Charitable Foundation, Department of Transport & Regional Services, Community Enterprise Foundation and FRRR itself.

Applications in the small grants program that relate to the following areas are currently given preference if they relate to:
• Community hardship in drought affected areas
• Retention of young people in Rural and Regional Australia.
• Resettlement of immigrants in rural Australia
• Community Infrastructure

Apart from the small grants program, FRRR is involved in other initiatives such as FRRR/ Wicking Trust Caring for Aging in Rural Australia and the Working in dairy program, which, amongst other things, supports the development of leadership in dairy communities and ANZ Seeds of Renewal.

FRRR has two features which are of particular relevance to this study. In the first place it provides an important service to other philanthropic donors by acting as the vehicle through which other funds can be channelled thereby increasing the efficiency in the distribution of funds. As part of this role, FRRR is a charitable organisation and can act on behalf of organisations which do not have that status through the provision of donation accounts providing tax deductibility to approved projects and organisations. FRRR also has a strategy to encourage local community philanthropy through the formation of community foundations in rural and regional areas and has assisted around 15 throughout Australia.

Secondly, it operates through a simple grants process with the ability to make decisions on grant applications quickly. It has a degree of flexibility not enjoyed by more bureaucratic institutions.

7.5.6. Discussion

An investigation of community capacity building or community strengthening within the case study area indicates that there is a wide range of available programs and projects. The greater proportion are the result of State Government initiatives and the view expressed in this research was that the government at this level is really striving to make a contribution. It is particularly interested in new initiatives and innovative suggestions. One example of this is the Demonstration Projects discussed in section 7.6.1 above. Apart from grants there is an array of resources to assist communities involved in this area. In collecting the data for this case study there were few complaints that there was a lack of funds available in community strengthening. It was apparent however that it is easier to attract funding for small infrastructure projects than human capacity building and from time to time worthwhile projects are not funded.

The role of local government in capacity building has historically been small however it is increasing. Much depends upon the council. Increasingly councils are providing their own funds for small grants to community groups and most councils have community development officers who are well versed in sourcing monies and in making grant applications. While councils are getting involved in capacity building there is still more emphasis on infrastructure over social and human capacity building which is seen as harder to see and harder to measure. The advent of action plans for small towns provides the councils with a plan to follow when funding decisions are being made.

Term of Reference 5 for this study states:

Explore the constraints and opportunities created by the funding patterns for capacity building in terms of current and potential institutional arrangements. The role that capacity building activities can play as a policy instrument in conjunction with regulation and economic instruments should be considered

In relation to Term of Reference 5, the area of community capacity building matters which impact most strongly are the lack of resources to apply for and administer grants and hence there is a need for more skills in this field. A number of issues arise here:

1. While it is clear that it is desirable for the local community to be involved in the granting process to build their own capacity they will often need some assistance. The point at which the external
assistance withdraws is always going to require careful balancing. Having paid staff working in community development can also cause a drop off in interest and involvement at the local level, especially if the paid staff are answerable to an outside body such as a government department.

2. Reaching small and often disadvantaged communities requires a simple grant application process. Here private funders are often more attractive because they are less bureaucratic and can be more flexible. Decision makers from private funders are often seen as more ready to engage in a dialogue with the applicants and more willing to visit the region to discuss the project. While on the grant process, another issue raised has been the effect of the competitive process which leads to less sharing and co-operation between community groups who anticipate competing for the same funds.

3. Flexibility is regarded as crucial when dealing with community capacity building. There is no “one size fits all” for this area, and while there are considerable funds available, one of the main reasons for the institution of the Greater South Coast Foundation was to provide more flexible options for community groups.

4. Another common theme is the lack of cohesion. There is said to be a lack of cohesion between government agencies at the different levels although this was not obvious in this research, in fact there seemed to be considerable cooperation between agencies. It was noticeable that at the local level staff involved from different departments and levels of government appeared to be making a concerted effort to accomplish satisfactory outcomes.

The other aspect of the lack of cohesion spoken about was the need to ensure that the different initiatives build some form of regional approach. At the very local level the advent of community action plans for small communities is a welcome development. However difficulties arise in achieving a concerted approach across wider areas and over different local government areas. The Regional Management Forums and the Greater South Coast Foundation are designed to assist here and their progress in that area will be closely watched.

Those spoken to recognise that a drive towards a more regional approach does carry the risk evident in all this work that by achieving a wider objective contact can be lost with the local communities, especially if a new bureaucracy is formed. In the first place it is necessary to agree on what the region is. Some local councils have a narrow view on this.

In a general sense one experienced worker in this field says there is a real need for better collaboration at the local level. There are many attempts at partnerships but it is necessary to go beyond partnerships to real collaboration. This is challenging for some because it commonly requires compromise and perhaps giving up service delivery or other functions to another organisation which is better placed, thereby jeopardising funding.

7.5.7. Opportunities

Community capacity building (in the sense intended in this study) is often the hardest to accomplish and, of its nature, is more ephemeral than other forms of community development. The theme emerging from this research in response to Term of Reference 5, is that, for communities at least, capacity building has to be nurtured and should be subject to as few barriers as possible.

Some suggested guidelines and opportunities are:

1. Human capacity building funds should not be granted on a dollar for dollar basis –even where those funds come from a body such as a local council. This is in recognition of the public good that is derived from this form of activity.

2. The competitive grants may not be appropriate for this activity, especially when the community organisation is inexperienced or newly formed. Instances were cited in this study
of the competitive grant process causing an erosion of trust and cooperation between local organisations.

3. Funding guidelines need to be very flexible and the provision of private funds will often best serve the needs of projects.

4. More repeat funding for longer term projects and second tier funding such as private funds is often called for particularly where the initiative in question requires a long term commitment and development. Private funders can leverage additional government funds as discussed in relation to the Community Capacity Building Initiative. Funders of the second stage can look for opportunities to fund projects which are innovative but of their nature are hard to accomplish over a short time frame. The Grampians/Pyrenees project is an example of this.

5. The model where the government develops the program and encourages and supports proposals by providing an overarching structure and officers on the ground who assist with grant applications help find funds initially has been well received. The success of the projects will often attract private funders who may have been reluctant to become involved at the outset. The idea of having a program funded by government with community sub-projects who themselves apply for funds also has worked well in the Ararat Community Building Project. The idea of providing some overall structure and support is also at the heart of the Capacity Building Consortium.

6. The range of resources available through both the State and Commonwealth websites on capacity building offer some assistance. Of particular note is the ability to access training by Victoria University without the need for an extended application process.

7. In the regions some capacity building initiatives flounder because of infrastructure problems and one such was the Grampians/Pyrenees Wine project. A particular problem is transport and funders could look at the impact of these types of issues on capacity building and provide assistance here.

8. As with all forms of capacity building, there are opportunities to fund specific projects related to a particular issue, such as for a disadvantaged sector or group. The work of FRDR in its support for the aging in rural Australia is a case in point.

9. Through organisations such as FRDR there is a vehicle through which donors can channel funds in an efficient and effective way either through its small grants fund or by collaboration on major projects.

7.6. Overall summary and conclusion

There are some common themes that emerge from the examination of capacity building in the NRM, agriculture extension and community development fields and the institutional arrangements that affect this endeavour. At the detailed level there are, however, many differences. As one respondent in this case study said “there is no one size fits all with capacity building.” The differences are particularly marked between community capacity building and the other two forms discussed here.

Turning firstly to the similarities. All three forms receive government funding via grants delivered on a competitive, short term, one off basis. Frequently the funds have to be matched from the applicant or another source. This raises a number of institutional issues and barriers. The application process can be difficult, time consuming and frustrating for groups or individuals who apply for funds. The guidelines will invariably reflect government priorities and policies. Short term funding means it can be difficult to plan for the longer term which is required in many cases to bring about change. Sometimes the continued employment of staff is dependent on successful applications for funding. However some of these issues and barriers do have their positive side. The competitive process can prompt the emergence of innovative ideas and collaborations. The need to match funding can in the end result in considerable leveraging allowing projects to continue into a second phase. The question is whether they are appropriate in all instances, such as in the case of community development or strengthening.
In relation to the quantum of funds available for capacity building, there was not a strong voice detected in this study suggesting that it is inadequate. In all three areas governments, research corporations and other funders appear to be genuinely concerned to increase the levels of capacity building. Having said that, there is a culture against devoting large amounts of funds to human capacity building compared to say scientific research or in the community development context, infrastructure.

Another common theme across all three fields considered here is the need for a regional approach to capacity building. Here developments in this area are patchy. It is occurring already in relation to NRM with the CMAs although possibly at the cost of community involvement through the Landcare movement. In agriculture extension it is happening through branches of groups such as Southern Farming Systems and Grain & Graze but the State Government policy is working in reverse with the dismantling of the old de-centralised system of the DPI. In the community sphere, there is a recent recognition of the need for a regional perspective and some early moves in that direction are being made. The challenge here is to ensure that the adoption of the regional approach does not occur at the expense of grass roots contact with the local community.

While most organisations work to a strategic plan there is little evidence of a similar document applying to capacity building whether within or outside of an organisation. There is no recognition, for example, of the need to take the receivers of capacity building from the lower forms to the higher or even to ensure that all forms are considered or made available. These matters are discussed in the models of capacity building elsewhere in this report.

The brightest star on the horizon is the use of private and philanthropic funds. This tends to be more evident in the community strengthening field and could usefully be applied to NRM and extension. These funds can be used to overcome some of the institutional barriers associated with the public funding. Private monies can fund second and subsequent stages of research, the guidelines can be more flexible and the application process less tortuous. Instances were encountered in this study where private funds were sufficient to leverage government contributions which is the reverse of what commonly applies.

One marked difference between capacity building in the three fields is the volume of monies expended on NRM and extension compared to community strengthening. This may reflect the longer history of capacity building (especially in extension) and political realities in these fields. With the level of funds (especially in NRM) it is perhaps inevitable that strong guidelines will be applied to the use of these funds.
8. Criteria for funding capacity building

What is striking in this project is the lack of overall planning or structure in the way capacity building is funded. This has an effect on the institutional arrangements and on the criteria that are used by organisations to approve or allocate funding for capacity building. For example, there is little or no attention paid to the progression in building capacity from lower to higher skills and no differentiation between public or private benefits. There is also little regard paid to whether capacity building should be both for the recipients or the providers. These matters are further explored below.

8.1. Lower order to higher order capacity building

What has been made clear from the results of this study is the need to see the building of capacity as a progression rather than as the product of a model, process or activity. The brief for this research project was to focus on those activities that can be regarded as building capacity and because of this we concentrated on the products of three extension models: Group facilitation/empowerment, Technology Development, and Mentoring. While activities using these models certainly build capacity, looking at them in isolation does not describe how it develops. In many situations there is a discernible progression from the development of basic level skills such as being able to perform a task because one is told how to do it, to higher order skills such as being able to critically evaluate for oneself the value of that task.

The concept of higher order skills and what these might be is the subject of a parallel study by Coutts and Roberts (2006 in press). In that study we looked at a variety of skills that could be regarded as higher order. In the present case to show the progression from lower to higher order we focus on only one of those skills (the acquisition of knowledge). This skill and its continuum comes out of the work of Lorsch and Ronkowski (1982) from the discipline of education. In the following two subsections we look at how this order is applied to individuals who need to learn about something concrete such as carrying out on farm trials and to individuals who need to learn about something conceptual such as how to build capacity. The first group is called ‘clients of capacity building’ and the second group ‘providers of capacity building’. We also make an attempt to link extension models to this progression to show that capacity building is not dependent on one or two models.

8.1.1. Clients of capacity building

If we take a Southern Farming systems project as an example, at the base level of building the capacity, a farmer is told about how to carry out acceptable research before becoming involved in planning and conducting on farm trials. S/he then progresses on to measure the results of the trial, to then describe the trial to an outsider, and onto interpreting the results and presenting them at an appropriate forum. The entry level of building capacity here is telling farmers how to carry out research so they can do it themselves. This is very much the Information Access and Programmed Learning (Training) models. At the higher end the Mentoring model might be more applicable to coach farmers to present at science conferences and during the on farm trial, the Technology Development model is useful to work through the trial activities.

This scenario could equally apply to any individual who needs to learn how to carry out a task. For example, waterway staff from CMAs need to know how the rivers and creeks in their catchment function in order to restore or rehabilitate them and then explain to others how to go about that task. For this they need help and they commission research projects for just that purpose.

The table below sets out what the transition from lower to higher order capacity building looks like using the Southern Farming Systems project as an example and linking the order to extension models.
Table 8.1 Capacity building skills compared to models of extension - on farm trails.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of capacity building</th>
<th>Extension model</th>
<th>Research example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring new information</td>
<td>Information Access, Programmed Learning</td>
<td>Knowledge about research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic planning</td>
<td>Information Access, Programmed Learning</td>
<td>Planning the trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New skills</td>
<td>Technology Development</td>
<td>Measuring and observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation of information and describing it to others</td>
<td>Technology development</td>
<td>Describing the experiment to visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate level of skill</td>
<td>Technology Development, Mentoring, Facilitation</td>
<td>Interpreting results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of information and presenting it to others</td>
<td>Mentoring, Facilitation</td>
<td>Presenting results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Mentoring, Facilitation</td>
<td>Evaluation and planning for next cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be apparent that not everyone involved in on-farm trials will want to move through all of these stages, but we use this as an example of how capacity building could progress and how it could be planned for. Much will depend on the activities involved and their intended outcomes but we suggest that this is a matter to be considered. Funders could ask applicants how they propose to deal with and plan for this progression. This will provide some structure to the institutional arrangements that are lacking at the present.

8.1.2. Providers of capacity building

What we found from this research was evidence that the intention to build capacity by those in a position to do so was more important than the model or activity they used. A frequent theme was the need for members of organisations to build their own competence regarding capacity building and that there was some discontinuity between organisational goals and values of capacity building and the competence of their staff to deliver. For example, there was evidence that some staff of organisations such as government departments of agriculture, whose core business it is to build capacity, do not distinguish readily between actions that lead to clients becoming independent, from those actions where their clients continue to be reliant. In other words, they do not distinguish between actions that are client focussed and build capacity (that help the client operate independently) and those that are expert focussed and build dependence (where experts continue to retain the status of expert when it is no longer appropriate to do so).

There are other organisations such as the Catchment Management Authorities, or Regional Bodies whose staff inherited a community engagement role. In the main, the staff of these organisations regard all community engagement activities as capacity building – activities that range from awareness to empowerment. In this they are probably right, however, we argue that an assessment of where these activities sit on the continuum of lower to higher order is also necessary.

If one looks at the table below, lower order skills are where providers are introduced to the notion of capacity building and told how to carry it out. They are not told about tools and techniques of extension (community engagement) but about the outcomes that lead clients to being more
independent. They will be told about how to motivate clients, how to build client confidence, and how to engage with them. As providers go up through the levels, they will build their own skills to the level where they can explain the concept to others and be able to critically evaluate their own activities for value in building capacity.

Table 8.2 Capacity building skills compared to models of extension - capacity building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of capacity building</th>
<th>Extension model</th>
<th>Research example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring new information</td>
<td>Information Access, Programmed Learning</td>
<td>Knowledge about capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic planning</td>
<td>Information Access, Programmed Learning</td>
<td>Planning capacity building activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New skills</td>
<td>Technology Development</td>
<td>Measuring and observation capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation of information and describing it to others</td>
<td>Technology development</td>
<td>Describing capacity building to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate level of skill</td>
<td>Technology Development, Mentoring, Facilitation</td>
<td>Interpreting the results of capacity building activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of information and presenting it to others</td>
<td>Mentoring, Facilitation</td>
<td>Presenting results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Mentoring, Facilitation</td>
<td>Evaluation and planning for next cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, for organisations and individuals charged with building capacity there are two dimensions: the capacity of the provider to deliver and the activities. We argue that it is the capacity of the provider to deliver that has greater potential to build capacity, rather than the type of activity. For example, if a provider only has one tool at their disposal and that is training and their capacity building skills are high, they would mould that tool to build capacity. They would do this by first asking what clients needed, then making the training interactive so that everyone actively took part in the learning and finally, they would defer to participants with greater knowledge so that by the end of the day, the whole group was in possession of the highest level of the collective knowledge.

Conversely, if a provider only had a Group Empowerment/Facilitation model of extension at her/his disposal, a model designed to build capacity, s/he could manipulate the facilitation so that the group remains reliant on the facilitator. The acceptance of jokes about facilitation versus ‘facipulation’ are an example of this.

8.1.3. Summary

When funding capacity building, consideration should be given to:

- The needs of the client (where client is defined as the individual requesting capacity building) rather than the model used to build capacity;
- The level of competence of providers to deliver;
- The training of staff to deliver; and
- A planned progression from some basic form of capacity building to higher order capacity building.

We would suggest that funders need to be more aware of these dimensions so that they can be more certain that the funds are properly targeted and adjust their guidelines accordingly.
8.2. Private v public good

Another way to look at capacity building is to have regard for the outcome for the person or organisation involved. Is the increase in knowledge, skills or attitudes for the private or public good? At the private end a farmer might develop their capacity with regard to making financial decisions for their farm and then may progress to the public end by taking a course to increase their skills so that they can negotiate directly with government as an industry leader. An organisation might be entirely devoted to working for the public good (such as a philanthropic body, government or a CMA) or in another there may be a mixture of private and public good outcomes (such as agribusiness and private corporations).

What are the implications for funding capacity building? What is suggested here is that the level of contribution required of a participant should be highest at the private end of the continuum and reduce to nothing at the public end. This is currently not the case. Taking the FarmBis subsidy for example, it does not discriminate between the private and public good. The same contribution is required for a financial planning course as for a workshop on leadership. Requiring matching contributions for capacity building is an important institutional barrier and yet little differentiation between the outcomes of the capacity building in the sense dealt with here appears to be considered.

Besides the requirements of financial contributions, it could be open for funders to assist public good capacity building in other ways. Small community organisations might be relieved of applying for grants on a competitive basis or funders could provide help to these organisations to formulate relevant applications by visiting them on site.

The figure below sets out what we think are the major groupings of recipients of funds. We argue that the greater the public good component the easier funds should be to attain. For example, we suggest that there should be 100% subsidy by FarmBis and others for individuals taking courses that help build the capacity of others. For organisations or projects that have an externally validated, proven record of building capacity for public good, their funding should be rolled over for at least three terms, pending external evaluation reports and a capacity building plan. For others it should still be by:

- Competitive grant;
- Matching funds; or
- Fully funded privately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Organisation Public: Individuals who work in organisations and build their capacity to work for the public good.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Public: Private</td>
<td>Unpaid community facilitators, community leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Private: Private</td>
<td>Business enterprises or corporations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Private: Private</td>
<td>Individuals who build capacity for their own good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Private: Private</td>
<td>Individuals who take on a course to improve production or profitability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.4. Public private good continuum**
9. Better institutional arrangements

In outlining proposals for better institutional arrangements for the funding of capacity building two options present themselves. On the one hand, recommendations could be made for changes to the existing arrangements to remove barriers that inhibit funding. On the other hand, propositions or suggestions could be offered regarding new possibilities for institutional arrangements. In this section the emphasis is on the latter. The reason for this is that many of the barriers identified in this research are well known and likely to remain. These commonly arise because of the strong hand that governments play in capacity building and result from political imperatives or policies such as short term, competitive grants, the requirement for matching funds and the application for prescriptive government guidelines for applicants. Rather than changing these factors it might be more fruitful to investigate how funders can work better within these parameters. First we make some points about culture, attitude and practice that help or hinder capacity building; then we suggest what works well such as partnerships, longer term funding and a regional approach.

9.1. Matters of culture, attitude and practice

There are a range of issues that have arisen out of this work that can operate to reduce the reach and impact of capacity building programs. In summary they are:

- The dichotomy between economic/material and social outcomes mentioned above (section 5.4.1). In agriculture it is the production focus v social outcomes, in NRM it is between on ground works and capacity building, in community development it is between financial and human capital.
- The apparent misconception that capacity building (especially in extension) is a tool to produce prescribed, external outcomes, such as an increase in production. Capacity building is not necessarily about a process to meet industry targets. It is to produce better farmers who can better manage change.
- The change agents. People who have largely been targeted in agricultural industry and NRM are the single operators, (usually male). However, increasingly there is a recognition that the change agents are women.
- The target audience now includes the managers and staff on corporate farms as they take over from existing farmers. At the other end of the scale some providers of capacity building are concentrating on hobby farmers.
- The laborious application process. While it is clear that the application process does of itself build capacity there is always the risk that inexperienced applicants will be turned off, especially if they are not successful. This can mean that those more adept obtain the funds and increase their ability in the process.

But there are also many opportunities arising out of the current culture and practice of institutions. For example:

- Of particular note is the ability for community groups to access training provided by without the need for an extended application process.
- As with all forms of capacity building, there are opportunities to fund specific projects related to a particular issue, such as for a disadvantaged sector or group. The work of Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal in its support for the aging in rural Australia is a case in point.

9.2. Partnerships

Already there are many partnerships existing in relation to capacity building. They exist between government agencies, CMAs, research organisations and private funders. These partnerships play an important role not least because in this area the quantum of funds available compared to other areas is often
relatively small. Partnerships leverage other monies as well as providing a range of expertise for projects and working in partnership builds capacity itself.

From this study some of the areas where partnerships could be further developed are:

1. Working at the local level such as between a university and a local organisation or group. Projects could have been linked with a provider or a number of providers to understand at some depth what is involved with the funding of their capacity building activities. Of particular importance here is the presence in the team of a practitioner in the field with strong links to the local community. The Sustainable Dairy Farming Families project, which is referred to in the section on the regional case study in this report, is a case in point.

2. Channelling monies to applicants. A funder might find it more efficient to use an existing foundation to dispense the funds. The Gardiner Foundation uses the Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal in this way. It may be that the body dispensing the funds has a better understanding of the capacity building needs of a particular community or group and established systems for monitoring grants.

Another reason why this approach can be attractive is that the organisation who disperses the funds might be a charity and can act on behalf of organisations which do not have that status through the provision of donation accounts providing tax deductibility to approved projects and organisations. Some foundations are set up in regional centres and can be used as a conduit through which funds can be spent in a particular region.

3. Partnerships can be formed between universities and funders operating in regional areas. Research can be sponsored as occurs now but more effort could be made to fund Masters and PhD students to conduct research in a region or on a particular topic. As discussed below this could be part of a move to attract more qualified people to live in regional Australia. The funding of students need not be long term and could be project based. The initiative of WestVic Dairy in funding scholarships for Honours students in finance and business to work with producers is an example of this type of collaboration.

4. The role of local government in capacity building, could be enlarged by the use of collaborative arrangements. In the NRM field particularly, more contact and work could be done between local councils, Landcare groups and CMAs. This could be expanded to include other community strengthening programs.

5. In the community development area particularly, the model where the government develops the program and encourages and supports proposals by providing an overarching structure with sub-projects who apply for funds has been well received. The success of the projects will often attract private funders for the second and subsequent phases of the program. The Victorian Community Capacity Building Initiative is a case in point.

9.3. Long term funding

The effects of short term funding has already been discussed elsewhere in this report and points to the strong need for a longer perspective in this field. This has been an important message to come through in this research.

A number of opportunities arise here:

1. In drawing up their guidelines, funders of all types could consider whether the outcomes for particular projects are going to be achieved during the period of the grant. If not, then a more extended period might be called for. Building the capacity of people and organisations is itself a long term endeavour. The need for more extended funding cycles also relates to some of the issues raised in the section of this report dealing with the criteria for funding such as the progression from lower to higher capacity building, the plan for capacity building and the question of public-private benefits.
If funding organisations fear that they will lose control of a project over an extended period it can deal with this through monitoring and evaluation. Such monitoring and evaluation would be an appropriate mechanism to ensure that real empowerment is occurring.

2. Longer term funding can be provided by partnerships. It may be, for example, that short term or seed funding comes from the government and the second and subsequent phases are provided by private organisations. It may be that the partnership develops the other way around. Instances already exist where projects attracted private funds to begin with and then government agencies, on seeing the success of the project, wanted to become involved. Another opportunity arises where projects are funded by government and for reasons of policy are not eligible for a repeat grant even though the project has merit. Examples of these situations are provided in the regional case study.

The difficulty with second phase funding is that it will not alleviate all the problems of short term funding if its availability only becomes known at the end of the first phase. In this situation the uncertainties prevalent in short term funding remain.

3. Longer term or rolling funds should be provided for individuals and organisations who have an externally validated, proven record of building capacity. Funding can be based on an approved plan, milestone reports and external evaluation.

9.4. Regional approach

A common theme to emerge from this project was the need to look at capacity building on a regional basis. This is already happening to some degree with natural resource management but more could be done especially in extension and community development. Even where there is an existing catchment focus on environmental matters, a deeper working relationship between those conducting research and the practitioners has been called for as well as better partnerships between local and state governments and CMAs.

In relation to extension, the strong message coming out of the regional case study was the serious impact of the reduction in the size of government regional offices. This has meant in Victoria, for example, that typically regional offices cannot offer the range of services needed for capacity building. The collecting of specialists together in various city and regional offices with the idea that they could be called upon across the State meant that they did not have the local knowledge and local contacts that are required to build the necessary relationships.

What has worked well has been the establishment of regional programs, such as Grain & Graze, which are delivered by local organisations (such as the CMAs) who have a clear understanding of local problems and priorities and work with the producers to deal with them. EMS projects have the same local focus and would be a good vehicle to fund innovative research into sustainable farming practices.

9.5. Summary

Better institutional arrangements can be created by working within the current parameters and by attending to features such as:

- Developing an understanding that building capacity is about empowering individuals to take control and manage their own futures. This is not always translated into an increase in productivity but it does translate into a rural community that has a better chance of managing change and being sustainable;
- Making the application process commensurate with the amount of funding applied for;
- Developing partnerships at a local level to build capacity so that expertise and resources are shared, combined and properly channelled; and
- Proving longer term funding where there has been proven gains made in building capacity.
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## Appendix 1: The inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMONWEALTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian National Training Authority</td>
<td>Adult Learning Australia  <a href="http://www.anta.gov.au/">http://www.anta.gov.au/</a></td>
<td>$270,000 (rural Australian projects)</td>
<td>To advance a learning society.</td>
<td>Advocates for adult learning, promotes innovative learning techniques and unites adult teachers from various sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Generals Department</td>
<td>National Community Crime Prevention Programme - Community Partnership Stream <a href="http://www.ag.gov.au/agd/WWW/ncphome.nsf/Page/National_Community_Crime_Prevention_Programme">http://www.ag.gov.au/agd/WWW/ncphome.nsf/Page/National_Community_Crime_Prevention_Programme</a></td>
<td>Community partnership stream and community safety and Indigenous community safety programme are allocated $30m over four years in total.</td>
<td>To provide a variety of opportunities for young people.</td>
<td>Allocating grants of up to $150,000 for community activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation <a href="http://www.csiro.gov.au/">http://www.csiro.gov.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>To help regional communities and industries manage and adapt to economic, environmental and social changes, sustain livelihoods and maintain or enhance ecosystems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Government and nine rural research and development corporations (RDCs).</td>
<td>Science and Innovation Awards for Young People in Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry <a href="http://www.affa.gov.au/content/output.cfm?ObjectID=04D6455A-F783-4ACE-B346C2D6783CA6E">http://www.affa.gov.au/content/output.cfm?ObjectID=04D6455A-F783-4ACE-B346C2D6783CA6E</a></td>
<td>17 awards of up to $10,000</td>
<td>To undertake projects of long-term benefit to Australia's agriculture, fisheries, forestry, food or natural resource management industries.</td>
<td>There are 17 awards available - one from each State and Territory, and nine industry-based. Each award is worth up to $10,000, and is open to farmers, fishers, foresters, processors, students, and anybody else aged between 18 and 35 who is working in, or supporting, our agriculture, fishing and forestry industries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Youth teaching youth  
• Developing links to the local area in a creative way for Primary school children  
• Investing in broader capacity initiatives (Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building, Australian Research Council Linkage Grant) |
• Giving farmers access to an effective welfare safety net  
• Providing incentives for ongoing farm adjustment  
• Encouraging social and economic development in rural areas.                                                                 | Training and learning activities, Farm Growth Through Export Growth, Farm Innovation Program, Farm Help: Supporting Families Through Change, Rural partnership program and other programs |
|                                                                      | Agriculture Advancing Australia - Supporting Families Through Change [http://www.affa.gov.au/content/](http://www.affa.gov.au/content/) | $33.8m per annum for four years, starting July 2004. | To encourage farmers to work towards either:  
• improving the financial position of their farm enterprise  
• obtaining off-farm income or  
• re-establishing themselves off the farm.                                                                                     | Income support, a professional advice and training grant and re-establishment assistance.              |
|                                                                      | Agriculture Advancing Australia - FarmBiS [http://www.affa.gov.au/content/](http://www.affa.gov.au/content/) | $1 billion for entire AAA program since 1997 | • To increase the capacity of primary producers and rural land managers to identify, plan and access quality learning activities  
• To enhance the capability of primary producers to effectively manage change and risk and benefit from the adoption of innovation and best practice management techniques  
• To increase the adoption of management practices that lead to greater resource sustainability, profitability and competitiveness. | Financial management; general business management; marketing; people management; production management; natural resource management |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | Environmental Management Systems | $39.7m        | To help industry, farmers and government to achieve:  
- The adoption of profitable and sustainable farming practices  
- Improved natural resource management and environmental outcomes  
- An ability to demonstrate environmental stewardship to domestic and international markets. | The EMS Incentives Program - encourages the adoption of sustainable management practices through a cash reimbursement for activities associated with the development and implementation of an EMS. Pathways to Industry EMS Program - assists industries to implement an EMS or environmental assurance “pathway” that positions their members for the future. The pathways build upon existing industry programs and enable industries to take the next step – allowing farmers to demonstrate their positive management practices and to translate those practices into natural resource management outcomes on the ground. |
|        | New Industries Development Program (NIDP) and Agribiz [http://www.affa.gov.au/content/] | $34 m until 2011 | To assist people to turn business ideas into competitive, profitable and sustainable commercial ventures through competitive based grants, scholarships and learning tools. |
|        | Building the future Sharing the work [http://www.affa.gov.au/content/] | Maximum of five $12,500 grants in 2005 ($62,500 PA) 100% capacity building | To assist non-government organisations to develop strategic alliances with industry in projects of mutual interest  
- Provide leadership in supporting the management of change in the rural sector  
- Enhance their operations through improved communications, information dissemination and strengthening of community networks  
- To focus on their future needs and plan for ways to become self sufficient. |
|        | Sugar Industry Reform Program [http://www.affa.gov.au/content/] | $75 m | To promote cross-sectoral partnerships and adoption of whole-of-system solutions and may include:  
- opportunities for diversification, value adding and alternative products  
- facilitate adoption of best growing, harvesting and milling practices  
- pursuit of improved environmental management practices  
- pursuit of alternative business structures  
- Initiatives that strengthen the community through economic diversification and social infrastructure development. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Landcare Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.landcare.gov.au">http://www.landcare.gov.au</a></td>
<td>$24m 2002-2003</td>
<td>Catalytic investment in capacity building and on-ground works through Landcare group networks will: • raise awareness and understanding by the community and land managers of NRM issues • build a stronger stewardship ethic and a shift in attitudes • enhance knowledge and skills leading to adaptive management • increase information sharing, and provide new and interactive training opportunities • stimulate and mobilise investments by landholders and others in natural resource management • give landholders skills and confidence to engage in on-farm and collective local planning • stimulate the adoption of improved and sustainable farming practices and changed behaviours • lead to action beyond the property that will support and contribute to catchment and regional NRM outcomes.</td>
<td>Activities are undertaken through various bodies, including: • Landcare Australia Limited, a not-for-profit company, to raise corporate sponsorship and promote the Landcare ethic to the broader Australian community • the National Landcare Facilitator who supports the network of Landcare facilitators, coordinators and groups around Australia, and communicates between government and its community partners • national priority projects with a national focus or application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry/ Commonwealth Scientific Industrial Research Organisation/ University of Queensland</td>
<td>Leadership in Extension: Nurturing Young Leaders workshops <a href="http://www.ruraldevelopmentsservices.com/apen_youth.htm">http://www.ruraldevelopmentsservices.com/apen_youth.htm</a></td>
<td>$85,000 (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>• To engage extension professionals (under 35) in agriculture and natural resource management and seek out issues of concern and include these in the National Extension Policy Framework; • To provide leadership training for young extension professionals; and • To provide increased support for young extension professionals through the Australasia Pacific Extension Network.</td>
<td>A series of five three day workshops around Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry/ Department of Environment and Heritage</td>
<td>National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (overview) <a href="http://www.napswq.gov.au">www.napswq.gov.au</a></td>
<td>$144m 2003-2004 (22% capacity building)</td>
<td>To develop community capacity.</td>
<td>Reorienting the facilitator and coordinator support network, to support integrated catchment/region management planning and implementation; developing management and technical skills of land managers and other stakeholders to ensure wider adoption of sustainable land and water use and to enhance the capacity of communities to prepare, evaluate and monitor the progress of integrated catchment/region management plans, extending information to communities, including National Land and Water Resources Audit data, so that they can effectively develop and implement their plans; and developing (where they do not exist) appropriate catchment/regional delivery bodies/arrangements to implement the plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening Australia - National Vegetation Knowledge Exchange Service <a href="http://www.nrm.gov.au/publications/network-news/index.html">http://www.nrm.gov.au/publications/network-news/index.html</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000 per annum</td>
<td>To link, network and create two-way communication between people who are looking for information on vegetation management and people with the information or answers. To identify the information gaps.</td>
<td>Cross regional events focusing on relevant natural resource management issues, for example vegetation management, riparian zone management and partnership building. National workshops to explore regionally relevant issues best addressed through a national approach, for example seed provenance and knowledge management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry/ Department of Environment and Heritage/ States and Territories</td>
<td>Natural Heritage Trust (overview) <a href="http://www.nht.gov.au">www.nht.gov.au</a></td>
<td>$76.8m 2003-2004 (35% capacity building)</td>
<td>To provide land-holders, community groups and other natural resource managers with understanding and skills to contribute to biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management; and Establishing institutional and organisational frameworks that promote conservation and ecologically sustainable use and management of natural resources.</td>
<td>• Biodiversity Conservation; • Sustainable Use of Natural Resources; • Community Capacity Building and Institutional Change - support for individuals, landholders, industry and communities with skills, knowledge, information and institutional frameworks to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource use and management. • A National Natural Resource Management Capacity Building Framework designed to provide a consistent approach to capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Trust - Regional Investments <a href="http://www.nht.gov.au">www.nht.gov.au</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11.5m 2003-2004 (37% capacity building)</td>
<td>A range of activities by which individuals, groups and organisations improve their capacity to achieve sustainable natural resource management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Trust - State-wide/multi-regional projects <a href="http://www.nht.gov.au">www.nht.gov.au</a></td>
<td>$3m 2003-2004 (22% capacity building)</td>
<td>To work with stakeholders on capacity building around issues that are effectively addressed on a state-wide or multi-regional basis.</td>
<td>The development and implementation of common planning frameworks, communication strategies and approaches to cross border issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envirofund <a href="http://www.nht.gov.au/envirofund/">www.nht.gov.au/envirofund/</a></td>
<td>$20m per annum</td>
<td>To help local community groups take practical action to protect land, waterways, coasts, vegetation and/or threatened species.</td>
<td>Community groups and individuals can apply for grants of up to $30,000 (GST inclusive) to carry out on-ground and other actions to target local problems. Grants of up to $50,000 (GST inclusive) will be considered where the magnitude, complexity or public benefit of the project is such that additional funding would be beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry/ Department of Environment and Heritage/ States and Territories</td>
<td>National Weeds Strategy</td>
<td>To develop integrated strategic approaches to reduce the impact of weeds of national significance; Prevent the introduction of new pest plants through revised quarantine assessment procedures; and Assess the potential of existing pest plants to become weeds of national significance.</td>
<td>The Weeds Australia web site (<a href="http://www.weeds.org.au/index.html">http://www.weeds.org.au/index.html</a>) provides a range of information about weed management issues in Australia. This includes information about the National Weeds Strategy, Weeds of National Significance, weed identification resources and training material such as the national training competencies for weed management. The National Weeds Awareness Program aims to increase public awareness through coordinated national promotional activities such as Weedbuster Week and ongoing public awareness and education activities. A facilitator for the national strategies was funded during the year and contributed to generating involvement in weed control throughout Australia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Advancing Australia - Rural Financial Counselling Service <a href="http://www.affa.gov.au/content/output.cfm?ObjectID=709C20F7-EC3A-4300-8B99630F2E7D778&amp;conType=output">http://www.affa.gov.au/content/output.cfm?ObjectID=709C20F7-EC3A-4300-8B99630F2E7D778&amp;conType=output</a></td>
<td>$5.8m per annum, starting May 2004</td>
<td>To assist primary producers, fishing enterprises and small rural businesses in rural areas who are experiencing financial hardship and have no other sources of financial assistance or information.</td>
<td>Gives not-for-profit, representative groups with strong community or regional involvement (as long as they are incorporated, or sponsored by an incorporated body) the opportunity to apply for funds. Funding provided for community planning activities is generally up to a maximum of $3,000. Funding for other program components is generally up to a maximum of $50,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment and Heritage</td>
<td>Waterwatch</td>
<td>To achieve successful and effective community</td>
<td>To achieve successful and effective community involvement through raising the knowledge and skill base of the community and through the creation of effective partnerships between community members, all spheres of government and the private sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>involvement through raising the knowledge and skill base of the community and through the creation of effective partnerships between community members, all spheres of government and the private sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program of Grants to Voluntary Environment</td>
<td>To assist organisations to deliver services and/or</td>
<td>To assist organisations to deliver services and/or projects contributing to: • the protection, conservation and/or rehabilitation of the natural environment or • the protection and/or conservation of Australia's historic heritage</td>
<td>Assistance with the costs of running craft groups, skills courses, self esteem and enhancement programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Heritage</td>
<td>projects contributing to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the protection, conservation and/or rehabilitation of the natural environment or • the protection and/or conservation of Australia's historic heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defence/ Defence</td>
<td>Family Support Funding Program</td>
<td>$3.3 m (8.6% capacity building in 2003/4)</td>
<td>• Provide grants to groups of Australian Defence Force families • Support self-help projects initiated by Australian Defence Force families • Assist not for profit community groups with a project or service that specifically targets Australian Defence Force families.</td>
<td>Assistance with the costs of running craft groups, skills courses, self esteem and enhancement programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Community Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education Science and Training</td>
<td>Workplace English Language and Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide workers with English language, literacy and numeracy skills, integrated with vocational training to enable workers to meet their current and future employment and training needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education Science and Training</td>
<td>The Australian Technical Colleges Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish and operate 24 Australian Technical Colleges providing high quality tuition in both academic and vocational education for students in Years 11 and 12. The Technical Colleges will be located in regions suffering skills shortages, with high rates of youth unemployment; and supported by a significant industry base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Industry Skills Initiative</td>
<td>National Industry Skills Initiative <a href="http://www.skillsinitiative.gov.au/">http://www.skillsinitiative.gov.au/</a></td>
<td>$2.2m per annum</td>
<td>Improving the image of industry and their recruitment practices, engaging employers in training, and developing careers education materials are some of the strategies developed under NISI to address difficulties in attracting and retaining people to industries experiencing skills shortages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Immigration Multiculturalism and Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td>The Migrant Resource Centre/ Migrant Service Agency network/ Community Settlement Services Scheme <a href="http://www.mrcnltn.org.au/">http://www.mrcnltn.org.au/</a></td>
<td>$27.6 m per annum</td>
<td>To meet the settlement needs of recently arrived humanitarian entrants and family stream migrants with low levels of English proficiency.</td>
<td>Assists people on an individual basis, Provides confidential counselling, advocacy and support to individuals, Provides assistance with settlement for new arrivals, Provides an information and referral service, Provides input into policy development in relation to people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, Seeks to improve understanding of migrant/refugee issues by mainstream services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport and Regional Services</td>
<td>Sustainable Regions Programme <a href="http://www.sustainableregions.gov.au/index.aspx">http://www.sustainableregions.gov.au/index.aspx</a></td>
<td>$131m</td>
<td>The Sustainable Regions Programme assists regional communities to address priority issues they have themselves identified. The Programme offers a planned, integrated approach to regions facing economic, social and environmental change. Assistance under the programme will initially be provided to eight 'prototype' regions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Regional Partnerships | | $1.6m per annum | To work in partnership with communities, government and the private sector to foster the development of self-reliant communities and regions. This approach is consistent with the Commonwealth’s framework for developing Australia’s regions: Stronger Regions, A Stronger Australia. | Projects that focus on:  
• strengthening growth and opportunities by investing in projects that strengthen and provide greater opportunities for economic and social participation in the community  
• improving access to services by investing in projects that, in a cost effective and sustainable way, support communities to access services. It will give priority to communities in regional Australia with a population of less than 5000  
• supporting planning by investing in projects that assist communities to identify and explore opportunities and to develop strategies for action  
• assisting in structural adjustment by investing in projects that assist specifically identified communities and regions adjust to major economic, social or environmental change. |
| EMA Research and Innovation Program | ‘Scoping’ (a small grant to test an idea/concept up to $10,000) and ‘Major Projects’ (up to approximately $100,000) | Focuses on nationally determined priorities for research and innovation in emergency management. | The Program is open to Emergency Management Organisations or Groups who have developed innovation approaches and are interested in sharing their work with the rest of the EM Sector. Organisations with a capacity to work with stakeholders to define research questions, complete significant projects and participate actively in the transfer of project outputs into enhanced practice. |
| Family and Community Network Initiative | $1.6m per annum | The FCNI is a four year pilot project which aims to:  
• improve access to family-related information and services for families and community organisations.  
• enhance the capacity of communities and services to work together more effectively to address the needs of families and communities. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Department of Family and Community Services | Stronger Families and Communities Strategy [http://www.facs.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/aboutfacs/programs/sfsc-sfcs.htm](http://www.facs.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/aboutfacs/programs/sfsc-sfcs.htm) | $56.5m per annum | More than 660 local projects have been funded under the Strategy including:  
• 142 Early Childhood Programs  
• 99 Parenting Skills Programs  
• 51 Relationship Skills Programs  
• 188 Mentoring and Leadership Programs  
• 97 Community Building Programs  
• 63 Volunteering Programs | Funding under Local Answers supports projects that: build effective parenting and relationship skills; build opportunities and skills for economic self-reliance in families and communities; deliver better services and addressing unmet needs through the building of partnerships between local services; assist young parents to further their education or access to training to make the transition to employment; encouraging local volunteering or mentoring of young people or training to build community leadership and initiative. |
| Department of Primary Industries | Local Answers [http://www.facs.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/aboutfacs/programs/sfsc-local_answers.htm](http://www.facs.gov.au/internet/facsinternet.nsf/aboutfacs/programs/sfsc-local_answers.htm) | $15m per annum | To give communities the chance to develop their own solutions to local issues, focusing on funding local, small-scale projects that help disadvantaged communities to build skills and capacity to identify opportunities and take action for the benefit of their members. | |

**STATE GOVERNMENT QUEENSLAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Primary Industries / National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality</td>
<td>AG16 Scoping and capacity building of natural resource management issues with the horticulture industry of dry tropics <a href="http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/AgSIP/15921.html">http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/AgSIP/15921.html</a></td>
<td>$99,300 per annum</td>
<td>To work with horticulture land managers to develop and implement best practice systems for the dry tropics catchments which contribute to catchment Natural Resource Management targets. To build engagement between stakeholders, e.g. with green groups, regional bodies etc.</td>
<td>Facilitates groups in issue and risk analysis and to develop cost effective solutions. Facilitates groups to trial new processes and monitor outcomes. Builds skills of producers to conduct on farm monitoring. Develops case study properties, trial different monitoring techniques on these. The program has also taken 15 producers interstate to view other farming systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Primary Industries</td>
<td>Building Rural Leaders <a href="http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/community/1_1968.html">http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/community/1_1968.html</a></td>
<td>Majority of the cost is covered by participants</td>
<td>To empower individuals so that they can have an influence on their family, industry and community.</td>
<td>Six modules of experiential workshops that follow adult learning principles and allow for different learning styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agforce and State Natural Resource Management</strong></td>
<td>Various programs including Natural Resource Management, Workplace Health and Safety, Climate Education, Self Development Covey 7 habits courses, Financial Counselling Services, Farm Succession Planning. <a href="http://www.agforceqld.org.au/">http://www.agforceqld.org.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>To address members' needs in on-going learning and skills development so members have viable, sustainable businesses.</td>
<td>AgForce offers access to a range of training programs such as rural leadership, managing farm safety, first aid, property-level planning, climate education and computer and office skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of State Development</strong></td>
<td>The Indigenous Business Capacity Building Program <a href="http://www.sdi.qld.gov.au/dso/web/v3/guis/templates/content/gui_cue_doc.cfm?id=4008">http://www.sdi.qld.gov.au/dso/web/v3/guis/templates/content/gui_cue_doc.cfm?id=4008</a></td>
<td>Approx. $900,000 per annum</td>
<td>To assist Indigenous people to gain the expertise and skills to develop a business operation. Make it easier for Indigenous people to learn about business planning; help Indigenous people learn how to run a successful business; encourage more Indigenous people to get into business; increase the number of Indigenous people with good business skills; increase the number of Indigenous people already involved in business networks; increase the numbers and types of Indigenous business activities.</td>
<td>The program funds Indigenous Business Hubs, centres which support Indigenous people develop business plans and link to opportunities. Employs a business manager. Two hubs have already been established: one in Cape York and another in South East Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Group Collective (Alliance of Regional bodies in Qld) / National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>CB06 Leadership for high performance in NAP regions <a href="http://www.nrm.qld.gov.au/">http://www.nrm.qld.gov.au/</a></td>
<td>Funding delivered over three years</td>
<td>To enable regional groups to identify their training requirements and access appropriate services to meet these needs, including linking with investments in national programs. To deliver early training and support for team building and develop resources for skill development for common needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESTERN AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td>Regional Investment Fund <a href="http://www.dlgrd.wa.gov.au/regionDev/financialAssist/RIF.asp">http://www.dlgrd.wa.gov.au/regionDev/financialAssist/RIF.asp</a></td>
<td>$20m per annum</td>
<td>To assist with the economic and social development of regional Western Australia and improve the access by regional communities to services.</td>
<td>Funding is available through five assistance schemes: Regional Infrastructure Funding Program (RIFP); Regional Headworks Program (RHP); Indigenous Regional Development Program (IRDP); Western Australian Regional Initiatives Scheme (WARIS); Regional Development Scheme (RDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leadership</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dlgrd.wa.gov.au/regionDev/communityLead.asp">http://www.dlgrd.wa.gov.au/regionDev/communityLead.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>To create viable communities through building leadership.</td>
<td>The WA Community Leadership initiative is delivering against the following initiatives: WA Community Leadership Plan; Making Connections; Network of Support / Alumni; WA Community Leadership Program; Leaders In Sport Program; Building and Empowering Sustainable Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **NSW Environmental Trust Grant Program** | Environmental Education Section [http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/grants/envtrust.htm](http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/grants/envtrust.htm) | $17m per annum | The Environmental Trust’s four objectives are:  
- To encourage and support restoration and rehabilitation projects  
- To promote research into environmental problems of any kind  
- To promote environmental education in both the public and private sectors  
- To fund the acquisition of land for the National Parks Estate.  
The Trust does not have a specific capacity building aim, but the provision of funds to community groups/organisations for environmental projects also serves as an opportunity for these target groups to build on the skills they already have to better manage their surrounding environment while at the same time improve their project/financial management skills. | Workshops, community consultation, develop promotional material. Provision of environmental grants. Other capacity building activities include targeted education programs that specifically focus on capacity building around particular environmental issues for particular sections of the community. |
<p>| <strong>Department of Primary Industries</strong> | Various <a href="http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/reader/dpi">http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/reader/dpi</a> | DPI projects spend 5 - 10% on capacity building | There is no program or specific goals for capacity building. Capacity building is incorporated as an element into all programs. |  |
| <strong>Department of Primary Industries</strong> | Envirowise in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area <a href="http://www.mirrigation.com.au/">http://www.mirrigation.com.au/</a> | $19.5m | To improve irrigation efficiency practiced by landholders to meet the NRM targets. | Runs a six day course as well as different workshops on NRM issues. Has a focus on whole farm planning. Envirowise regularly identify future training needs, and design the course program around their issues that get raised. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW Community Builders Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au/">http://www.communitybuilders.nsw.gov.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>The NSW Government's community builders website aims to help local communities across the State share ideas on how to enhance and strengthen their community.</td>
<td>The emphasis is on practical resources and how to do things including checklists on what is community building; how to use and interpret statistics; group work techniques; managing conflict; how to consult young people; funding sources; sustainable urban design; and partnerships with community and business. Most of the resources are Australian but some overseas material is also included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AUSTRALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Industries and Resources SA</td>
<td>Leadership Program</td>
<td>$70,000 per annum</td>
<td>To enhance the leadership skills of participants and develop their networks with other community leaders.</td>
<td>Business and family planning programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>To improve the strength, self-reliance and viability of rural communities through improved access to services and information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASMANIA</td>
<td>Recreational Fishery Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide funding for projects of benefit to the recreational sea fishery in the areas of administration, management and education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment</td>
<td>Women in Rural Industries</td>
<td>$70,000 per annum</td>
<td>To raise the profile of women in agriculture and seafood. To provide opportunities and learning for them to reach their full potential and to support women who wish to be part of the decision-making areas of agriculture and aquaculture. The program also provides a forum for women to gain knowledge and understanding about what is happening in their industry and also provides an important framework for women in rural industries to network amongst each other.</td>
<td>• Business skilling programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tours to agricultural/aquaculture areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational opportunities including speakers who can provide practical hints and experiences about their journey in their enterprise so that this may assist others with their business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Informative newsletters are also produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPIWE Dairy Program <a href="http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/ThemeNodes/EGIL-52Y97G?open">http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/ThemeNodes/EGIL-52Y97G?open</a></td>
<td>$755,000 per annum</td>
<td>To support the Government’s State of Growth objective to increase the contribution of primary industries to the Tasmanian economy and community through the delivery of skills training, best practice demonstrations and extension activities for farmers and service providers to enable dairy businesses to expand in a profitable and sustainable manner.</td>
<td>Farmlet demonstration, companion farm, skills audit, benchmarking, young farmer program, discussion groups, seminars, workshops, courses, field days, road shows, farm walks, industry newsletter and publication of articles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management Conservation</td>
<td>$500,000 per annum (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To facilitate broad community stakeholder engagement in the sustainable management and conservation of natural resources in Tasmania. To develop and manage engagement programs that enable and support community participation in managing natural resources in cooperation with the Agency. To provide a link for the passage of information and understanding between the community and government, thereby strengthening the capacity of the community and government to work together.</td>
<td>Works with Wildcare to provide courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NORTHERN TERRITORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Of Community Development, Sport and Cultural Affairs <a href="http://www.dcdsca.nt.gov.au/dcdsca/intranet.ntf/pages/RD_Grants">http://www.dcdsca.nt.gov.au/dcdsca/intranet.ntf/pages/RD_Grants</a></td>
<td>Just over $1m capacity building combined grant program (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To develop the capacity of regions and communities to improve regional outcomes.</td>
<td>Develops local leadership capacity through fostering and facilitating opportunities for the emergence of local leadership and ensuring that appropriate consultative and planning processes are undertaken. Regional development officers and community development officers work to support and facilitate local efforts and to coordinate and network and communicate with central government in a broad based relationship role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefit Secretariat Racing, Gaming and Licensing Division Northern Territory Treasury <a href="http://www.nt.gov.au/ntt/licensing/gaming/cbf.htm">http://www.nt.gov.au/ntt/licensing/gaming/cbf.htm</a></td>
<td>$1.6m per annum (87.5% capacity building)</td>
<td>To support community initiatives and community groups.</td>
<td>Small grants. Any non-profit community organisation can apply but religious and political groups are not eligible. Grants can be used for a wide range of purposes such as construction, playgroups, sporting, wildlife career courses, and equipment. Hold two funding rounds per year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VICTORIA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>Arts for all Victorians</td>
<td></td>
<td>To give all citizens the opportunity to experience the stimulation of a rich cultural life and to develop their own creative, intellectual and expressive capacities. Regional or social background should not be a barrier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Victorian Communities</td>
<td>Community Support - Strengthening Communities (formerly Community Support Fund)</td>
<td>$30,000; $50,000 or $500,000 per grant depending on category. (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To support initiatives which: • Strengthen the capacity of communities and involve a wide range of groups  • Increase local leadership and support involvement of volunteers  • Improve social, learning, cultural, employment and economic opportunities.</td>
<td>The Fund supports programs addressing problem gambling, drug issues, young people and families in crisis, as well as initiatives in sport, recreation, tourism and the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Victorian Communities</td>
<td>Community Building Initiative</td>
<td>$7.5 million over three years (funded through the Community Support Fund) (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To bring local residents together with government and community agencies to plan for and address local needs, build local leadership and foster community networks. Aims are to strengthen and assist communities, develop the skills and potential of communities, achieve cultural change and better connect government with the community.</td>
<td>Works with other state departments, local government, the Commonwealth and a range of other community stakeholders to build on the Community Capacity Building Initiative. This has led to the building and upgrading of many civic facilities and generated dozens of tourism, cultural heritage, youth and community events across Victoria. Activities include building community awareness, mapping, visioning, developing and agreeing on a plan, then forming project teams. Each plan may include many components. Funding is based on the submission of expressions of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Victorian Communities</td>
<td>Community Regional Industry Skills Program - Communities</td>
<td>$2.5m per annum (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To strengthen rural and regional communities by providing targeted funding to address skill shortages and create sustainable industries and jobs in country Victoria.</td>
<td>Provides one-off funding to local, not-for profit organisations for projects in rural and regional Victoria to address skill shortages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education and Training</td>
<td>Local Learning and Employment Networks</td>
<td>$9.7m per annum (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To provide better pathways and support for young people in order to improve their education, training and employment outcomes.</td>
<td>Thirty-one LLENs were introduced across Victoria from 2001, in the first major initiative to improve the education, training and employment outcomes of young people emerging from the Ministerial Review of Post Compulsory Education and Training Pathways (2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Primary Industries</td>
<td>Victorian Agribusiness Networks <a href="http://www.dpi.vic.gov.au/dpi/nrenti.nsf/childdocs/-8AF86C3A3FFC6346CA256DDE0018DF3F?open">http://www.dpi.vic.gov.au/dpi/nrenti.nsf/childdocs/-8AF86C3A3FFC6346CA256DDE0018DF3F?open</a></td>
<td>$750,000 per annum (66% capacity building)</td>
<td>To understand the sustainable competitive advantage and current activity of agricultural industries and enterprises in the region; Identify impediments for agribusiness growth and formulate strategies to overcome these; Achieve critical mass and market the region as a place to live, do business and to invest; Build regional leadership and support community development.</td>
<td>Funds community organisations called Agribusiness Forums. The role of the forums is to contribute to strategic agribusiness development in their areas. Each forum represents a cross section of the community including farmers, processors and local government. The forums also act as umbrella organisations representing the interests of agribusiness, and develop initiatives that address issues faced in their area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Department of Primary Industries and The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>The Joint Centre for Crop Innovation <a href="http://www.jcci.unimelb.edu.au/">http://www.jcci.unimelb.edu.au/</a></td>
<td>To improve the sustainability and competitive position of Australian temperate grain crops and related industries at regional, national and international levels.</td>
<td>Undertakes research in crop innovation to improve the sustainability and competitive position of Australian temperate grain crops and related industries at regional, national and international levels. It does this by training postgraduate students through appropriate combinations of supervised research and course work. The JCCI is a student/research fellow - based Centre with internationally innovative research that provides quality postgraduate and postdoctoral training in crop innovation. It has partnerships with industry to enable work on projects that increase the long-term competitiveness of Australia’s grains and related industries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Government</td>
<td>Rutherglen Research Institute</td>
<td>To build the capacity of rural landholders.</td>
<td>Provides extension products to rural landholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport and Regional Services</td>
<td>Investment and Training in Regional Australia</td>
<td>$2.2 billion plus in kind from the Australian Local Government Association</td>
<td>To represent the interests of local governments and their communities to the federal government</td>
<td>• Seminar series to regional businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association of Queensland</td>
<td>Community Engagement Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>To building councils’ skills in working with the community. Part of the National social capital and research project.</td>
<td>• Business networking and mentoring service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association of Queensland</td>
<td>Local area multicultural partnership program</td>
<td></td>
<td>To build the skills of councillors to better work with communities.</td>
<td>• Online coaching system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association of Western Australia</td>
<td>Perth Biodiversity Project <a href="http://www.walga.asn.au/projservices/pbp/">http://www.walga.asn.au/projservices/pbp/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds an officer to work with councillors and community groups.</td>
<td>• Provide training to councillors and staff in Biodiversity and how this can be implemented through the council processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association of Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide maps of vegetation/reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funder</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program/ Institution/ Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capacity Building Aims</strong></td>
<td><strong>Types of Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Association of New South Wales/ National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality</td>
<td>NRM and councils</td>
<td>To build the skills of councils to address NRM matters and to work regionally.</td>
<td>Provides funding for building the skills of councils to address NRM matters and to work regionally. Cultural Policy Officer - Community Team facilitates policy development and capacity building in cultural development in line with Cultural Accord 2. NRM Facilitator builds links between the CMAs and local government. Also ensures that plans are not duplicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Association of Victoria</td>
<td>Capacity Building for NRM Steering Committee</td>
<td>To identify the resource and human capital needs of Victorian local government to deliver and enforce planning permit conditions for natural resource management, with a focus on native vegetation management and roadsides conservation.</td>
<td>Administers the Municipal Association of Victoria Local Government Capacity Building for NRM Steering Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDUSTRY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation, Australian Women's Weekly, ABC Radio and Rural Press.</strong></th>
<th>RIRDC Rural Women's Award</th>
<th>$175,000 per annum</th>
<th>Aims are focused on the individuals chosen for the award and their skill development.</th>
<th>Grants awarded to women in rural industries who are seen to have the potential to achieve and deliver benefits for their industry and community. Coordinated by the Departments of Primary Industry in each state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land and Water Australia Dairy Australia</strong></td>
<td>Subtropical Dairy</td>
<td>$247,001 (40% capacity building)</td>
<td>To build the capacity of people to be effective farm owners, managers and employees, and contribute to the development of the dairy industry.</td>
<td>On farm research, tours to see other farming systems, continuous improvement workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Farm Change Management/Improving Human Resources | [http://www.aanro.net/dairy/page/farmchange.htm](http://www.aanro.net/dairy/page/farmchange.htm) | $8m 2005/2006 (100% capacity building)                                        | To increase the capacity of people in the dairy industry and thus ensure its future.  
• opportunities from science and technology can only deliver this future through developing the capacity of people.  
• people with greater capacity capture more opportunities under conditions of complexity and change.  
• capacity can be built at individual, organisational and industry levels and these levels add to each other to deliver this future.                                                                 | • Learning Packages  
• Regional Development Programs  
• Investment in University of Melbourne  
• Centre for Change Management  
• Dairy Moving Forward                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
Farmers enjoy a better quality of life; SW Victoria is developing an independent market presence;  
Cooperation between all regional stakeholders is strong and productive; South West Victoria is considered a good place to work and do business.  | • Enhances the capacity of farmers to sit on boards  
• Upgrades skills of accountants and other professionals to work with dairy farmers  
• Grows the next Generation  
• Gives politicians hands-on dairy awareness  
• Runs a course for company directors  
• Brings a NRM focus to farms  
• Trains young farmers in skills complementary to or other than farming  
• Trains facilitators for discussion groups links project  
• Teaches learning skills and development  
• Trains board members                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
• Fosters development of opportunities for women  
• Develops effective decision support systems that support the implementation of research and extension outcomes and shorten the time to adoption.  
• Develops information packages and tools that consolidate and disseminate research outcomes  
• Promotes safe, healthy workplaces  
• Facilitates effective coordination and partnerships with research and development providers, industry and community organisations.                                                                                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | Best Management Practice       |               | To ensure world best environmental practice on Australian cotton farms | • Voluntary adoption of Best Management Practices (BMP)  
• Addressing community accepted landscape planning milestones  
• Offers practical rewards for growers implementing BMP  
• Supports research that ensures world best environmental practice on farm. |
|        | People Development Projects    | $624,000 per annum (100% capacity building) | To ensure that Australians derive maximum benefit from fisheries research and development. | The knowledge skills and people in the Australian fishing industry and in the wider community are developed to enhance uptake of new research and development. |
| Fisheries Research and Development Corporation | China Australia Wool Innovation Network (CAWIN) | $4.98m August 2003-January 2009 to Deakin University | To build upon the market strength in China and provide a sustainable Chinese wool market for Australian growers through education that develops a new generation of graduates and professionals with a thorough knowledge of wool. | AWI is funding 130 undergraduate, masters and PhD research scholarships and fellowships in the wool textile area in China, through Deakin University. |
| Australian Wool Innovation | Scholarship and Studentship program | $2.9m July 2003 - June 2008 | To support students and researchers in their efforts to develop skills relevant to the future of the wool industry, both on-farm and along the wool industry pipeline. | Post doctoral fellowships; PhD scholarships (including ARC/APA top ups); Masters degrees by research scholarships; Honours degrees by research scholarships; Undergraduate scholarships; and Studentship placements. |
| Australian Wool Innovation | Bestprac phase 2 | $977,000 May 2003 - May 2006 | To support groups of farmers around Australia in the application of the Better Practices process. | • Accredited facilitators support a network of pastoralists who identify constraints and then benchmark their performance against local best practices in rangeland management.  
• Identify potential management packages for the major rangeland vegetation classes which will assist on-farm decision making by pastoralists. |
<p>| Australian Wool Innovation | Bestwool 2010 phase 2 | $1.4m July 2002 - June 2005 | To have 35% of wool producers in Victoria adopt new practices (e.g. in advanced wool marketing and risk management) by 2005 and for growers to become more proactive and independent in identifying their needs and seeking solutions to farm management issues. | Provides a grower based extension framework for tapping into existing training and learning opportunities. Participating woolgrowers choose the membership and coordinator for their group and together they work on issues identified as important in their business to lift on-farm productivity and profitability. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• To provide wool producers with information and practical tools to address land management issues that affect productivity. |  |
| **Sugar Research and Development Corporation** | Sugar Research and Development Corporation [http://www.srdc.gov.au/](http://www.srdc.gov.au/) | Approx. $10 million per annum. (10-15% of total is allocated to SRDC Program “Industry Capacity”) | To enhance human capacity for change, learning and innovation in the sugar industry. |  |
| **Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation** | Combined capacity-building projects (including Regional Innovation and Training Adoption Program) [http://www.gwrdc.com.au/](http://www.gwrdc.com.au/) | $500,000 out of a $15m budget | To ensure that winemakers and grape growers receive maximum benefit from their participation in RITA sponsored activities. | National outcomes from the Corporation's funding of RITA projects in 2003-04 have included: a nationwide program to 'train the trainers' in the latest crop forecasting techniques; continuing emphasis on irrigation practice and water use efficiency; and regional disease management including the publication of a Botrytis control check list.  
For example the Research to Practice Hands On program uses co-learning to allow grape farmers to share knowledge and engage with new research, on their own farms and in their own contexts. |
<p>| <strong>Grains Research and Development Corporation</strong> | Grains Research and Development Corporation <a href="http://www.grdc.com.au/">http://www.grdc.com.au/</a> | Over $1 million (100% capacity building) | To accelerate the adoption of research outcomes and innovation through the professional development of growers, advisors and research development to support their capacity and ongoing development. | The National Youth science Forum, building human capacity through schools and universities, training awards, conference awards and scholarships which are available to growers and researchers, support of the Australian Rural Leadership Program, Research Horizons (a course which is fully funded by the GRDC), and support of the Australian Nuffield Farming Scholarship |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Grains Research and Development Corporation, Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation, Corporate Sponsorship** | Birchip Cropping Group [http://www.bcg.org.au/](http://www.bcg.org.au/) | $1.7m per annum (20% capacity building) | To increase awareness of our research results and their relevance for farmers on the ground. To empower people with this information to make better decisions in agriculture to make businesses and communities more sustainable. | • Survey members on what information they want  
• Hold field days where research work is presented for members, the wider farmer community and agribusiness  
• Hold an expo in July where Agribusiness and members can talk about issues affecting the industry. This is an opportunity for exchange between business and farmers.  
• Hold workshops on succession planning  
• Host travelling groups from Australia and overseas (about 3000 people a year)  
• Run workshops on a needs basis. For example recent workshops have been held on climate change and managing climate risk. |
| **Horticulture Australia**                                             | [http://www.horticulture.com.au/home.asp](http://www.horticulture.com.au/home.asp) | Invests approximately $78 million annually. | To invest in programs that will benefit the Australian horticultural industry.       | Undertakes research that will benefit the horticultural sector. It is made up of around 25 peak industry associations, such as Apple and Pear Australia, the Australian Macadamia Society Ltd and the Australian Passionfruit Industry Association. Projects are funded through research and development or marketing levies, voluntary contributions and federal government matched funding. |
| **Meat and Livestock Australia**                                       | Various capacity building programs including EDGEnetwork [http://www.mla.com.au](http://www.mla.com.au) | $3.5m per annum                     | • To increase livestock producer knowledge skills and confidence by 10% by 2011  
• To achieve adoption targets for Key Management Practices  
• To communicate and facilitate the use of and help deliver tools and information from Research and Development to producer stakeholders. | • Information access through publications, magazines, websites, face to face producer forums  
• Programmed learning – EDGEnetwork  
• Technology transfer through Producer Initiated Research and Development (PIRDs)  
• Facilitated empowerment through producer networks  
• Mentoring – MLA runs an office through the LambPlan program which producers can call in for one-to-one advice about genetic selection in sheep. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Producer Initiated Research and Development                           | Producer Initiated Research and Development http://www.mla.com.au                               | $15,000 per project                               | • Producers can conduct their own research and development to address everyday problems and find practical solutions  
• Producers can trial new technologies in their own environment for local issues that directly impact on profitability.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Through PIRDs, farmers conduct on-farm trials.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Meat and Livestock Australia/Grains Research and Development Corporation/Australian Wool Innovation/Land and Water Australia | Grain & Graze http://www.grainandgraze.com.au/                                                | $14.5m plus $12.5M in-kind support from CMAs plus in-kind support from State Government departments over 5 years 2003-2005 (100% capacity building) | To provide mixed farming enterprises in southern Australia with new “whole-farm” knowledge, tools and capability to adopt management changes that will increase production of crops, pastures and animals while maintaining or enhancing biodiversity and the catchment resources which sustain them.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Grain & Graze partners work together and with regional, catchment and farming groups, to share the huge amount of information and knowledge that is already available about the best ways to manage farming systems within a catchment context, as well as to invest in new research into the financial and environmental impact of management practices on farms, farmers and catchments. The eight regional groups have been given $1M over five years to set the agenda for their own research and development. |
| Grains Research and Development Corporation, National Landcare Program | Southern Farming Systems http://www.sfs.org.au/                                               | $90,000 per annum (100% capacity building)        | • To measure the impacts of recruitment work done 7-8 years ago in a wool-growing area in Western Victoria.  
• To increase the uptake and effectiveness of capacity building programs  
• To build the capacity of training and facilitation bodies and individuals                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Seminars, field days, workshops.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
<p>| OTHER INDUSTRY BODIES                                                |                                                                                               |                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Australian Wool Industries                                           | Specialised Approach to Recruiting Wool Producers into Extension and Adoption Activities       | $90,000 per annum (100% capacity building)        | Uses the facilitated recruitment process to work with communities in an attempt to keep them engaged with industry extension activities. Evaluates these processes and refines them according to feedback from communities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry, Ricegrowers' Association of Australia</td>
<td>Environmental Sunrice Champions Program <a href="http://www.rga.org.au/environment/champions.asp">http://www.rga.org.au/environment/champions.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>To improve the image and practices of rice farmers.</td>
<td>Educational program and accreditation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Farmers Federation</td>
<td>Victorian Farmers Federation <a href="http://www.vff.org.au">www.vff.org.au</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>To encourage farmers to attend events. To develop policy recommendations and lobby government.</td>
<td>Encourages farmers to attend courses, endorses products from other institutions if they see them as useful for farmers, with regard to Environmental Management Systems has overall communication role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUSINESS ORGANISATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo Bank</td>
<td>Community Enterprise <a href="http://www.bendigobank.com.au">www.bendigobank.com.au</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To encourage and enable the growth and dignity of individuals</td>
<td>• families, children and youth initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To provide equality of opportunity for people of all ages throughout Australia</td>
<td>• public health programs and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To nurture innovation, imagination and creativity, while working in partnerships to manage risk in a discreet and responsible way.</td>
<td>• community capacity building projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• public education, including tertiary education, school buildings and libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• innovative community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cultural and arts initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• environmental projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitre 10 and Landcare</td>
<td>Mitre 10 Junior Landcare <a href="http://www.mitre10.com.au/landcare/grants.asp">http://www.mitre10.com.au/landcare/grants.asp</a></td>
<td>Hundreds of grants of $500 have been given out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondinin Group</td>
<td>Kondinin Training Group <a href="http://www.kondinin.com.au/">http://www.kondinin.com.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To train our members to increase their capacity and the capacity of their communities</td>
<td>Kondinin Group Industry Training is an accredited RTO which runs and develops courses to improve the skills of members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To fill the gaps in currently available training for farmers</td>
<td>• Members are invited onto oversight committees, and to participate in trials and tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Farming manuals, workbooks and teaching resource kits for school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Overseas study tours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITIES AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| National Association of Agricultural Educators  
http://www.naae.asn.au/ | | • To provide leadership at a national level in the promotion and development of agricultural education  
• To join together in an association all persons having an interest in agricultural education  
• To provide a national forum for the discussion of, and exchange of information relevant to the teaching of agriculture and related studies  
• To engage in activities aimed at assisting the development of agricultural education | Provides access to resources such as Analysing Agriculture online journal |
| Dalby Agricultural College  
http://www.agriculturalcollege.qld.edu.au | | | Provides practical agricultural courses in horticulture, cotton and broadacre production, animal husbandry and farm engineering. |
| Faculty of Natural & Agricultural Sciences (University of WA) - Offers studies in the science of natural resources and their management  
http://www.fnas.uwa.edu.au/ | | | |
| La Trobe University - Department of Agricultural Sciences - Focuses on teaching and research in the sciences that underpin Australia’s food and fibre industries  
http://www.latrobe.edu.au/agriculture/ | | | |
| Longreach Pastoral College - Provider of practical agricultural training, based at Longreach in Queensland.  
http://www.agriculturalcollege.qld.edu.au | | | Links students with farms so to facilitate the on-farm experience which is a required part of their degree course |
| Marcus Oldham College - Rural business management college specialising in agribusiness and equine management  
http://www.marcusoldham.vic.edu.au/ | | To engage with communities and provide them and our graduates with the skills to make agriculture sustainable | • Runs a week-long youth leadership course in consultation with the local council  
• Students are required to spend a year of their degree on-farm  
• Runs a national leadership course at the college and in Canberra |
| Centre for Water and Landscape Management  
http://www.dookie.unimelb.edu.au/water | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| University of New England - School of Rural Science and Agriculture  
http://sciences.une.edu.au/rsaag/ | Trains undergraduate students as scientists with a holistic view of rural and agricultural systems while also providing individual postgraduates with training in specific discipline areas of rural science. Located at Armidale, New South Wales. |                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Agresearch New Zealand  
http://www.agresearch.co.nz/ |                                                                                               |                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| University of Western Sydney - Hawkesbury Campus  
http://www.uws.edu.au/about/locations/hawkesbury | To pioneer strategies for transformational learning that produce agriculture graduates who can respond rapidly to change in the modern work environment. To broaden and enrich perspectives and practices through the School of Education and Lifelong Learning. |                | Courses link learning and education within school, community, teacher education and other professional learning contexts, utilising ecological, complexity, post-modern and lifelong learning perspectives, together with an awareness of gendered contexts, as a basis for our developing transdisciplinary approach to teaching and research. Transformation through learning (or transformative learning) is theorized and applied as a key concept in learning and change in educational, community and organisational settings. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Longreach Pastoral College                  |                                                                                               |                | Skills based courses for students. There are no courses for the community in general.                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| University of Melbourne - Dookie Agricultural College and the Centre for Change Management within the Institute of Land and Food. | To deliver capacity building courses to the Goulburn Valley and nationally in the case of postgraduate coursework programs using the Dookie estate and the Goulburn Valley generally as an outdoor laboratory. |                | Capacity Building is strongly integrated into all activities including existing education programs, short courses and future graduate coursework programs.  
- Undergraduate: Farming systems courses work with students in their final year by taking them on farm and applying what they have learnt.  
- Postgraduate: PhD and Masters students are engaged in projects such as continuous business improvement, working with intermediaries such as extension staff and also directly with farmers, especially where the extension officer is the PhD student. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>The School of Natural and Rural Systems Management <a href="http://www.uq.edu.au/">http://www.uq.edu.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>To stimulate participatory action-research in PhD programs and within the programs of some lecturers. Offers tertiary study in Agriculture, Primary Industries and Environment. Campuses located at Gatton and Brisbane, Queensland.</td>
<td>Participatory action research studies involving working with community groups in the Philippines and Indonesia. Some work in Australia as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| the University of Queensland, the Queensland Department of Primary Industries, and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation | Centre for Rural and Regional Innovation - Queensland http://www.crriq.edu.au/                                                                                          | 100% capacity building | To build a broader comprehension of rural and regional community opportunities alongside human capacity for change, learning and innovation through:  
- Attitudinal and practice change  
- Building capacity to embrace the unknown  
- Enhancing and developing literacy in capacity building  
- Providing leadership in the development of new forms of learning and learning delivery  
- Developing innovative approaches to and understandings of attitudinal and practice change  
- Capacity building for entrepreneurship  | Clients are students who are employees of government, undergraduate students and members of the community. Provides interactive courses that have assignments that take place in the workplace. |
<p>| University of Western Sydney - School of Social Ecology and Lifelong Learning and the School of Environment and Agriculture <a href="http://www.uws.edu.au/about/acadorg/cass/cassell">http://www.uws.edu.au/about/acadorg/cass/cassell</a> and <a href="http://www.uws.edu.au/about/acadorg/cste/seaa">http://www.uws.edu.au/about/acadorg/cste/seaa</a> |                                                                                                                | 100% capacity building | To improve farmer adoption of new technology, thereby leading to better NRM outcomes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Have undertaken various studies and reviews on farmer adoption of innovations. Studies on the effect of extension on perceptions and adoption. A new project from CVCB called &quot;The roles for capacity building in regional NRM.&quot; A project with an alliance of farmer grower groups that has an information sharing role. The Communication and Extension Program of the CRC for Plant-Based Management of Dryland Salinity. Interpreting CB to include provision of new technologies to farmers, lots of biological research, particularly in the above CRC. |
| University of Western Australia <a href="http://www.uwa.edu.au/">http://www.uwa.edu.au/</a>               |                                                                                                                |                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Tasmania - Centre for Research and Learning in Rural Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crlra.utas.edu.au/">http://www.crlra.utas.edu.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative Research Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>Coastal Zone Cooperative Research Centre <a href="http://www.coastal.crc.org.au/index.asp">http://www.coastal.crc.org.au/index.asp</a></td>
<td>Total CRC budget $3.3m (&lt;5% capacity building)</td>
<td>To engage with community and consult with stakeholders, asking what they want before undertaking new research.</td>
<td>Citizens Science Toolbox is a decision support system which helps people work out what sort of tools they can use to engage community. Another project is currently looking at how NRM groups interrelate with community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOUNDATIONS AND TRUSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Rural and Regional Renewal</td>
<td><a href="http://www.frrr.org.au/">http://www.frrr.org.au/</a></td>
<td>Has allocated $5.5 million and leveraged a further $50 million into rural and regional Australia.</td>
<td>To champion the economic and social strength of Australia's regional, rural and remote communities through partnerships with the private sector, philanthropy and governments.</td>
<td>FRRR supports projects which stimulate the renewal of whole communities and which address some of the following issues: The development of innovative business ventures and/or the use of advanced information technology and electronic commerce to enhance or create business opportunities. Projects should lead to potentially sustainable economic and social benefits; Support youth to remain in secondary and tertiary education, and/or reduce unemployment and enhance youth leadership skills; Support Indigenous Australians to realise their economic and social aspirations; Support people to access education and training which will lead to improved job prospects, especially in new or expanded businesses; Recognise and enhance the role of women in rural community building, farm management and business development; Recognise and enhance the role of volunteers in building the capacity of rural communities; Environmental projects which add value to existing products, demonstrate best practice in natural resource management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ian Potter Foundation</td>
<td>The Ian Potter Foundation</td>
<td>Total annual funding pool of $7-8m</td>
<td>To develop educative partnerships with communities, government, and the private sector to prevent irreversible damage to the environment, and to encourage maintenance of biodiversity.</td>
<td>Funds smaller projects around Australia that combine elements of biodiversity and ecology preservation, volunteerism, and community education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The George Alexander Foundation</td>
<td>The George Alexander Foundation</td>
<td>Total annual funding pool of $350,000</td>
<td>To help talented young people, especially those experiencing economic disadvantage, to achieve educational and employment goals.</td>
<td>Grants given to projects which are designed to address difficult social and environmental needs and requests for small grants to enable smaller community organisations to begin or continue to make a positive difference in their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E Ross Trust</td>
<td>The R.E. Ross Trust</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>To support the conservation of flora/fauna through self supporting projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazda Foundation</td>
<td>Mazda Foundation</td>
<td>Bi-annual grants</td>
<td>To assist a broad range of individuals and organisations including young people through education and employment skills, the advancement of technology and improvement of the natural environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Buckland Foundation</td>
<td>William Buckland Foundation</td>
<td>Provides grants quarterly</td>
<td>To support groups developing community projects to promote taking responsibility and control of the factors which affect their lives. The foundation strives to identify, research and support initiatives that have the capacity to make a lasting and positive impact on the well-being of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Wettenhall Foundation</td>
<td>The Norman Wettenhall Foundation</td>
<td>Total annual funding pool of $100,000</td>
<td>To support and encourage research, education, recording and publication of all aspects of the natural living environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private corporations and Industry bodies</td>
<td>Nuffield Farming Scholarships</td>
<td>Total annual funding pool of $500,000 (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To promote excellence in all aspects of Australian agricultural production, distribution and management through the adoption of local and international best practice, and continuous development of a unique network of industry leaders and innovators.</td>
<td>The Nuffield Farming Scholarship programme invests in the &quot;human capital&quot; of Australian agriculture by developing well-informed, visionary agriculturalists to lead their industries into the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation for Young Australians</td>
<td>The Foundation for Young Australians</td>
<td>$6m per year portfolio of grants</td>
<td>To work in partnership with young people and communities to act as a catalyst for change.</td>
<td>In 2004, the Foundation funded over 40 initiatives across Australia under the Youth for Youth Investments program. Initiatives ranged from cultural camps, festivals, mentoring and leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Program/ Institution/ Project</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Capacity Building Aims</td>
<td>Types of Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and private sponsors</td>
<td>Inspire/Beanbag Net Centre <a href="http://www.inspire.org.au/projects_beanbag.html">http://www.inspire.org.au/projects_beanbag.html</a></td>
<td>$85,000 per annum (100% capacity building)</td>
<td>To inspire young people, specifically through addressing internet access and local content issues for young people living in urban locations throughout Australia.</td>
<td>Provides free internet access for young people in youth-friendly locations; tailored computer and internet training for young people, that will also provide them with skills to train others; and the development of local community websites by young people that will build a positive profile of them and the communities in which they live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspire/ Reach out <a href="http://www.inspire.org.au/projects_reachout.html">http://www.inspire.org.au/projects_reachout.html</a></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Formed in response to Australia's unacceptably high rates of youth suicide and attempted suicide, the mission of the Inspire Foundation is to create opportunities for young people to help themselves and help others.</td>
<td>Individual support and/or referrals by our Young Women's Worker or Young Men's Worker. Education, further training, employment, accommodation, health and sexuality, legal problems. Groups and Projects such as Break Dancing, Polynesian dancing, Aerosol Art Workshops, DJ Workshops, Young Women's Projects, Young Men's Projects, Table Tennis Workshops, Drama Projects. Joint Programs with other youth and cultural services. Links to Learning Program to work with students at risk of leaving school early. There are centres all over Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Resource Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Australian Rural Leadership Foundation, through 33 sponsors public and private. | The Australian Rural Leadership Program [http://www.rural-leaders.com.au/](http://www.rural-leaders.com.au/) | The Australian Rural Leadership Program funds 30-35 participants at a cost to each sponsor of $46,000 per participant. (100% capacity building) | • To provide world-class leadership development opportunities with a focus on strategic and innovative programs  
• To match participants' expectations with the requirements of their industries  
• To provide ongoing support for graduates of the Foundation's programs  
• To advocate for a national centre for rural and regional leadership development  
• To include international participants in the future  
• To work with members of other leadership programs to achieve coordinated outcomes. | Australian Rural Leadership program, Murray Darling Basin Leadership Program |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Program/ Institution/ Project</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Capacity Building Aims</th>
<th>Types of Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ACIAR/DFAT             | John Dillon Fellowship                         |               | • To provide career development opportunities for outstanding young agricultural scientists or economists from ACIAR partner countries who are involved in a current or recently completed ACIAR project.  
• To develop leadership skills in the areas of agricultural research management, agricultural policy and/or extension technologies. This is achieved by providing exposure to Australian agriculture across a range of best-practice organisations involved in research, extension and/or policy making. | One or more fellowships are offered a year. The visit programs are tailored by negotiation between ACIAR and the selected Fellow to meet the needs of individual Fellows and their employing organisation. Applicants should be under 40 at the time of application. The applicants must be associated with ACIAR bilateral projects that are either active or completed in the last 24 months. The Fellow can be associated with either a National Agricultural Research System or a CGIAR centre (if the applicant is involved in an ACIAR bilateral project), but must be a citizen of an ACIAR partner country. |
| First Mildura Irrigation Trust | Aims to improve the economic and environmental sustainability of the irrigation industry. |               | Funds a Land & Water Management Officer who facilitates irrigation extension services, assists with the delivery and promotion of the Irrigation Management Courses, evaluates past and current incentive programs funded through the Mallee Catchment Management Authority and provides one-to-one assistance to irrigators. Also assists in running the Irrigation Efficiency Expo held at this years Sunraysia Horticultural Field Days. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

**USEFUL SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.regionalaustralia.gov.au">www.regionalaustralia.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Helps community groups and individuals find suitable and relevant Commonwealth grants for projects and assists with the completion of application forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.grantslink.gov.au">www.grantslink.gov.au</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>