



Australian Government
**Rural Industries Research and
Development Corporation**

RIRDC Completed Projects in 2007 - 2008 and Research in Progress as at June 2008

RIRDC Publication No. 09/051



COOPERATIVE VENTURE FOR CAPACITY BUILDING

RIRDC Innovation for rural Australia



Australian Government

**Rural Industries Research and
Development Corporation**

RIRDC Completed Projects in 2007–2008 and Research in Progress as at June 2008

Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building

March 2009

RIRDC Publication No 09/051

© 2009 Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation.
All rights reserved.

ISBN 1 74151 854 7
ISSN 1440 6845

RIRDC Completed Projects in 2007–2008 and Research in Progress as at June 2008 – Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building
Publication No. 09/051

The information contained in this publication is intended for general use to assist public knowledge and discussion and to help improve the development of sustainable regions. You must not rely on any information contained in this publication without taking specialist advice relevant to your particular circumstances.

While reasonable care has been taken in preparing this publication to ensure that information is true and correct, the Commonwealth of Australia gives no assurance as to the accuracy of any information in this publication.

The Commonwealth of Australia, the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation (RIRDC), the authors or contributors expressly disclaim, to the maximum extent permitted by law, all responsibility and liability to any person, arising directly or indirectly from any act or omission, or for any consequences of any such act or omission, made in reliance on the contents of this publication, whether or not caused by any negligence on the part of the Commonwealth of Australia, RIRDC, the authors or contributors.

The Commonwealth of Australia does not necessarily endorse the views in this publication.

This publication is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, all other rights are reserved. However, wide dissemination is encouraged. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to the RIRDC Publications Manager on phone 02 6271 4165.

Research Manager for Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building Program

Ms Jane Fisher
02 6271 4149
jane.fisher@rirdc.gov.au

In submitting their project report, the researcher has agreed to RIRDC publishing this material in its edited form.

RIRDC Contact Details

Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation
Level 2, 15 National Circuit
BARTON ACT 2600
PO Box 4776
KINGSTON ACT 2604

Phone: 02 6271 4100
Fax: 02 6271 4199
Email: rirdc@rirdc.gov.au
Web: <http://www.rirdc.gov.au>

Printing by Union Offset Printers, Canberra
Electronically published by RIRDC in March 2009

Foreword

RIRDC produces Research in Progress summaries of continuing projects and those completed during 2007-2008. Our intention is to:

- give stakeholders early access to the results of ongoing and completed work to inform their decisions, and
- inform researchers of results to shape research directions

The complete report on all programs is on our website at <http://www.rirdc.gov.au>

The Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building (CVCB) Program *Completed Projects in 2007 – 2008 and Research in Progress at June 2008*, contains short summaries of continuing projects as well as those that were completed during 2007 – 2008. This program aims to ensure an effective system for continuous capacity building in primary industries in Australia by coordinating and funding a targeted R&D program. The program ended in June 2008.

Income for the CVCB relies on contributions from partner agencies who are RIRDC, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Australian Wool Innovation, Dairy Australia, Grains R&D Corporation, Land and Water Australia, Meat & Livestock Australia, Murray-Darling Basin Commission, Cotton R&D Corporation and Sugar R&D Corporation.

- This report is an addition to RIRDC's diverse range of over 1800 research publications, which are available for viewing, downloading or purchasing online through our website: www.rirdc.gov.au.

Peter O'Brien

Managing Director

Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation

3.9 Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building – COMPLETED PROJECTS

Project No	Project Title	Researcher	Phone	Organisation	Page No
PRJ-000533	Synthesising policy implications from CVCB program	Michael Cuthill	07 3381 1278	The University of Queensland	2
PRJ-000630	Nesting community-based NRM for regional accountability and grassroots cooperation	Graham Marshall	02 6773 3376	University of New England	4
PRJ-000749	Maximising the connection between R&D providers and agribusiness	Gordon Stone	07 4615 2255	Gordon Stone & Associates	7
PRJ-000789	Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building Evaluation Project	Jan Paul van Moort	02 9241 5655	Hassall & Associates	9
PRJ-000805	On the fast-track: Bringing capacity building research and practice together	Dr Ruth Nettle	03 8344 4581	University of Melbourne	11
PRJ-000823	The roles for capacity building in regional NRM	David Pannell	08 9844 8659	University of Western Australia	13

Completed Projects – Capacity Building for Innovation in Rural Industries– Cooperative Venture

Project Title	Synthesising policy implications from CVCB program
RIRDC Project No.: Start Date: Finish Date: Researcher: Organisation: Phone: Fax: Email:	PRJ-000533 01/08/2006 28/09/2007 Michael Cuthill The University of Queensland 07 3381 1278 07 3381 1407 m.cuthill@uq.edu.au
Objectives	The project aims to enhance the capacity building and extension components of emerging policies and institutional arrangements.
Background	Substantial research on capacity building in rural industries was commissioned over the past 5 years by rural Research and Development Corporations through the Co-operative Venture for Capacity Building. This research looked to inform relevant operations, policy and institutional arrangements. However, there was limited take up of research findings by policy makers, nor by practitioners. The Synthesising Policy Implications project was timely given the increasing investment in capacity building by both regional natural resource management bodies and agribusiness
Research	An action learning framework was used to guide the four stages of the project. This approach facilitated an inclusive and responsive process involving active participation of key stakeholders to formulate responses to enhance capacity building outcomes. Research began with a series of stakeholder interviews which helped develop an ideal vision for capacity building in rural industries and natural resource management. Second, existing research was synthesised into a discussion paper (Kelly et al. 2006), which provided an overview of the current situation in Australia. Third, working from information presented in the discussion paper, a set of workshops, seminars and a web-based discussion considered how to move forward on identified issues. A final report identifies the need for policy-makers in government and RDCs to collaborate more to achieve effective capacity building outcomes, and suggests way of improving collaboration.
Outcomes	Capacity building attracts considerable interest within rural industries and NRM in Australia. The effectiveness of operational initiatives is constrained by a lack of collaboration at the national policy and strategy levels. Collaboration was found to be the key to improving capacity building in the future. The requirements for going beyond current practice of collaboration include [1] Sharing a common language; [2] Linking a diversity of models and activities (appropriate to environmental and social contexts); [3] Expanding collaborative teamwork (appropriate skills for managing change); [4] Transforming institutional arrangements (to include integrative structures); and [5] Reaching a collective knowledge synthesis. Interest from commonwealth government agencies was high, with ongoing requests for information.
Implications	This project shows the potential for RDCs and other agencies to collaborate to improve capacity building in rural industries and natural resource management. It provides a foundation for policy development

in this area

Publications

Kelly D., Cuthill M., Brown V., Ross H. and Byrne T. (2006) Synthesising Policy Implications: Discussion Paper for the CVCB. Report prepared for the CVCB by the UQ Community Engagement Centre January 2007, University of Queensland Brisbane. Cuthill M., Kelly D., Brown V., Byrne T. and Ross H. (2006) CVCB Synthesis Project: summary and action framework. Brochure produced by the UQ Community Engagement Centre October 2006 for the CVCB, University of Queensland Brisbane.

Completed Projects – Cooperative Venture

Project Title	Nesting community-based NRM for regional accountability and grassroots cooperation
RIRDC Project No.: Start Date: Finish Date: Researcher: Organisation: Phone: Fax: Email:	PRJ-000630 01/02/2004 31/01/2008 Graham Marshall University of New England 02 6773 3376 gmarshall@une.edu.au
Objectives	<p>The deliverables from the project would include: 1) a set of design principles for nested community-based NRM supported by a user-friendly manual as well as by discussion papers a final project report and journal and other scientific papers; 2) recommendations on how government and community-based NRM processes might be better integrated; 3) practical guidelines for regional/catchment organisations about how they might bolster their capacities to accept greater accountability including through more effective local monitoring sanctioning and enforcement; and 4) recommendations on how organisational innovations in community-based NRM might be communicated better within the policy community to secure successful adoption</p>
Background	<p>Since the 1980s, community-based NRM has evolved from its origins with small groups of landholders to the present situation where regional bodies are each expected to foster community ownership and voluntary cooperation from the large and diverse populations (comprising up to hundreds of thousands of people) inhabiting their regions. Aside from the challenge presented by this quantum up-scaling of the community-based approach, another challenge derives from the pressures on regional bodies to assume responsibilities that risk them becoming perceived by their constituents as extensions of government. A further challenge follows from governmental expectations that regional bodies will invest their funds strategically, rather than spread available funds across their constituency, and the consequent risk that community ownership of regional decisions may be weakened by perceptions of inequity, favouritism or 'playing politics'. International research has identified 'nested' approaches to community-based NRM as a potential way of responding to such challenges. A nested multi-level system arises predominantly from a bottom-up process in which lower-level units are active participants in the design and operation of higher levels of the system. Such a bottom-up process offers the possibility of making manageable the problems of establishing voluntary cooperation from large and diverse populations that otherwise would likely remain insurmountable. This is not to deny important roles for governments in resourcing and facilitating the bottom-up process of institutional development, and in defining parameters for the process so that it might integrate effectively with governmental programs.</p>
Research	<p>The case-study method involved complementary application of qualitative techniques (data from workshops and semi-structured interviews) and quantitative techniques (data from mail-out farmer surveys analysed by multiple regression). This method was used to explore whether and how nested community-based NRM applies to the</p>

regional delivery model, particularly in respect of engaging farmers' voluntary cooperation in achieving targets set under this model. The qualitative research involved workshops and key informant interviews. It elicited stakeholders' perceptions of the regional delivery model as an exercise in community-based NRM, their assessments of its strengths and weaknesses in this respect, and their views on how the weaknesses might be ameliorated. The quantitative research involved multiple regression analyses, and was concerned with identifying whether farmers' trust in the regional delivery model was associated with their plans to cooperate with that model by adopting the kinds of conservation practices promoted to them under the model. The three regions used as case studies were the South West Catchments Region in Western Australia (for which the regional body is the South West Catchments Council), the Fitzroy Basin Region in Queensland (for which the regional body is the Fitzroy Basin Association (FBA)), and the Mallee Region in Victoria (for which the regional body is the Mallee Catchment Management Authority). In the South West Catchments Region, the subregional focus was on the Blackwood Basin, with the Blackwood Basin Group (BBG) as its subregional body. In the Fitzroy Basin Region, the subregional focus was on the Central Highlands subregion, with the Central Highlands Regional Resources Use Planning Cooperative (CHRRUP) as its subregional body. The focus in the Mallee Region was on dryland districts, to facilitate comparability with the other two subregions where agriculture was also mainly dryland-based.

Outcomes

Community-based NRM at the scale of regions defined under the regional delivery model seems capable of motivating voluntary cooperation from farmers in adopting practices promoted to them under this model, but only to the extent that community-based bodies are able to establish trust from their farmer constituents and engage them effectively enough that they come to follow reciprocity strategies in their dealings with these bodies. It seems that subregional bodies have an advantage over regional bodies in eliciting such behaviour from farmers because the former are better positioned to engage them effectively. This indicates the value of a nested multi-level approach to community-based NRM within regions, at least where capacities below the regional level are sufficient to justify devolution of significant responsibilities to subregional or other levels. The research identified eight guidelines for success with community-based NRM in building system-wide capacities to motivate voluntary farmer adoption of conservation practices. In their succinct form, the guidelines are: (1) establish vertical trust; (2) subsidiarity; (3) representation; (4) competence; (5) build and maintain lower-level capacities; (6) secure lower-level rights; (7) respect lower-level autonomy; and (8) counter resistance.

Implications

The research suggests that community-based approaches are capable of succeeding under the regional delivery model in motivating greater voluntary cooperation from farmers than would be possible without such approaches. However, they also highlight that success of this kind cannot be taken for granted. In particular, the findings highlight the importance of farmers coming to adopt reciprocity strategies in respect of their key relationships under the regional delivery model. It can be expected that these key relationships for farmers will be with their subregional body where one exists, or otherwise with their regional body. Nevertheless, leading farmers to follow reciprocity strategies with higher levels of authority is no easy matter. Only when farmers come to trust that governance structures are prepared to reciprocate their cooperation – by valuing their input, rather than dismissing it, taking it for granted or using it against them – can they be expected to progress from free-riding and opposition to adoption of reciprocity strategies. The

eight guidelines identified above for community-based NRM should be viewed as points of departure for a system-wide process of 'institutional diagnosis' seeking to identify and remedy the key issues in any setting that are limiting the effectiveness of such an approach in motivating the trust and reciprocity from farmers that is needed for them to cooperate more voluntarily in adopting the kinds of conservation practices promoted to them under the regional delivery model. A process of this kind has an important contribution to make towards the 'good science' which policymakers continue to emphasise as integral to the regional delivery model.

Publications

Marshall, G.R. (2004), 'Towards design principles for nesting in Australian watershed management', Paper presented at WoW3: The Third Pentannual Workshop on the Workshop, 'Building Social Capital and Self-Governing Capabilities in Diverse Societies', Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA, 2-6 June. Marshall, G.R. (2005), *Economics for Collaborative Environmental Management: Renegotiating the Commons*, Earthscan, London. (Ch. 5 was a product of the literature review for this project.) Marshall, G.R., 2008. 'Nesting, subsidiarity and community-based environmental governance beyond the local level', *International Journal of the Commons*, 2(1), 75-97. [online: <http://www.thecommonsjournal.org/index.php/ijc/article/viewFile/50/19>]

Completed Projects – Cooperative Venture

Project Title	Maximising the connection between R&D providers and agribusiness
RIRDC Project No.: Start Date: Finish Date: Researcher: Organisation: Phone: Fax: Email:	PRJ-000749 23/08/2005 31/05/2008 Gordon Stone Gordon Stone and Associates (07) 4615 2255 (07) 4615 2330 gordon@cdi.net.au
Objectives	Establish and test a management system that will facilitate the transfer of RDE through Agribusiness to farmers.
Background	Stone's previous project in 2005 – 'Agribusiness role in extension, education and training – a case study' reported that agribusiness was emerging as the most significant information delivery conduit to growers and is expected to take that niche within five years. There appeared a strong disconnect between R&D providers, especially RDCs, and agribusiness. Information access, in forms most relevant to growers, was reported as being a significant impediment to the growth and development of farming enterprises.
Research	A systematic process through some form of a Management System was recommended as a focused way to facilitate the required engagement. It was proposed to use a series of case studies as a means of developing then trialing a Management System. A series of forums was proposed to commence a formal RDC-agribusiness engagement process. Due to a range of impediments, an alternative process focused on surveying growers and advisers about the characteristics of such a Management System. The engagement of RDCs was facilitated through formation of a CVCB Agribusiness Working Group. A commercial Information Repository, FarmPlus, was identified during the project and examined for a possible role as an Information Repository or an Information Management System – in order to meet the number one priority of all stakeholders – quick, focused access to information in terms relevant to those stakeholders.
Outcomes	The case studies proved an ineffective way of investigating the development and operation of a management system. Access to information proved to be the common motivator and need for all stakeholders. The CVCB Agribusiness Working Group nominated that investigation of the FarmPlus model of information delivery, and a formal connection with the AANRO e-library concept, ought to be the major focus of the project in its final stages. Issues of cultural divisions between the R&D management culture and the agribusiness client outcomes driven culture proved a barrier to the development of relationships. Therefore no formal RDC-agribusiness engagement occurred during the project. It was proposed that a one-year project implementation phase be agreed so that an engagement strategy could commence in 2008/9.
Implications	A formal product based method of information access and delivery, in terms relevant to agribusiness advisers / growers, is the key requirement of rural industry. A one-stop shop, commercially driven Information

Publications

Repository - accessing all R&D outputs - is a key requirement. Advisers occupy a significant and critical niche in the R&D outputs delivery, synthesis and advisory task sought by growers. Cultural differences prove a barrier that needs to be addressed. An engagement process is now needed to 'build relationships'.

proposed Occasional Paper derived from final report Stone, G (2006) – 'Agribusiness role in extension, education and training – a case study', Australasia-Pacific Extension Network (APEN) 2006 conference paper.
Stone, G (2007) – Public and Private Extension – chapter of APEN Extension Book, In Press, September 2007

Completed Projects – Cooperative Venture

Project Title	Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building Evaluation Project
RIRDC Project No.:	PRJ-000789
Start Date:	15/12/2006
Finish Date:	30/10/2007
Researcher:	Jan Paul van Moort
Organisation:	Hassall & Associates
Phone:	02 9241 5655
Fax:	02 9241 5684
Email:	jvanmoort@hassall.com.au
Objectives	To identify current 'best practices' in rural extension/education and training to assist in the design and delivery of learning.
Background	The CVCB was a partnership between RIRDC, rural RDCs and Australian Government agencies. Between 2001 and 2007 the CVCB invested in research and development initiatives focused on enhancing the understanding of learning, improving organisational arrangements to support rural human capacity building, and inspiring innovative farming practices. The CVCB's first phase was completed in 2007 and an evaluation was undertaken to determine impact.
Research	The evaluation involved document review and stakeholder consultation against a tailored program logic which encapsulated the CVCB's outcomes and activities.
Outcomes	<p>The CVCB deepened understanding of capacity building through research which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defined capacity building, principles and the community of practice concept; • Characterised who undertakes capacity building, including the private sector; • Outlined challenges in maintaining capacity building professionals; • Described capacity building models and their application; • Analysed how the VET sector integrates with capacity building • Documented factors which influence learning and rural landholders. <p>The CVCB sought to influence both strategic/policy and operational target audiences through participatory research and communication of results. The development and delivery of grounded capacity building materials had a significant impact on operational staff who were able to directly utilise the materials within their sphere of influence. The impact on strategic/policy target audiences was less. While the research generated strategic and policy insights, the results were not clearly applicable often beyond their locus of control. The CVCB did not fully achieve its outcomes and/or potential due to 5 factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A logical rather than strategic portfolio of research; • Inadequate consideration of how research results would achieve impact; • Inability to demonstrate performance and maintain stakeholder confidence; • Inability of RD&E to address all the capacity building issues identified; and • Insufficient mandate to position and coordinate capacity building strategically.
Implications	Capacity building is an essential element to improving rural and regional

sustainability and is widely used by RDCs, government and the private sector. However the following priorities need to be addressed to ensure capacity building is appropriately positioned and used efficiently and effectively:

- Continued development of best practice methods and models;
- Building the capacity building skills of professionals;
- Improving the strategic fit of capacity building within organisations;
- Collaboration between organisations involved in capacity building; and
- Informing policy development, particularly on capacity building. To address these priorities a professional and organisational development rather than a research approach is needed to build the capacity building skills of professionals and their organisations. At the same time a mechanism is needed to inform policy and coordinate/collaborate capacity building across organisations. This will require a shift from RD&E to on-going engagement of policy makers and the establishment of collaborative initiatives on capacity building between government, RDCs and the private sector.

Publications

Completed Projects – Cooperative Venture

Project Title	On the fast-track: Bringing capacity building research and practice together
RIRDC Project No.: Start Date: Finish Date: Researcher: Organisation: Phone: Fax: Email:	PRJ-000805 01/12/2006 15/02/2008 Ruth Nettle Dairy Australia (03) 8344 4581 ranettle@unimelb.edu.au
Objectives	<p>The project aims to test and refine CVCB research findings in the key result areas of What works and why? and Fostering participation? amongst CVCB member organizations. The project focuses on current issues in capacity building of member organizations and will bring together key capacity building project managers and practitioners across at least 5 CVCB member organizations to enhance their capacity to choose (invest) design support and evaluate their capacity building programs.</p>
Background	<p>The Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building's (CVCB) research, conducted over 6 years, is recognised as adding significantly to the stock of knowledge about capacity building, however, the CVCB has struggled to apply these research outputs into member organizations or significantly influence capacity building efforts. On the Fast Track was a member initiated project of the CVCB aimed at improving the use of its research outputs amongst rural R&D corporation project managers and practitioners. In essence the project was a trial of a "route to market" for the CVCB's research investment.</p>
Research	<p>The On the Fast Track approach consisted of 10 key elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CVCB members collaborate to develop a route-to-market for the CVCB research investment 2. Issues in capacity building are identified, CVCB research outputs reviewed for their fit with these issues and a framework developed for people to think about capacity building ("The Capacity Building Wheel") 3. CVCB research outputs translated into a workbook and workshop design building off "The Capacity Building Wheel" 4. Participants are invited to join the project through CVCB member networks 5. Mentors for these participants are invited to join the project using CVCB member networks 6. Cross-sector 2-day workshops are delivered in 3 locations around Australia 7. Workshop participants develop action plans for their work and choose mentors 8. Action plans are put into practice with mentor support 9. Mentors are supported in their role through regular teleconferences and assistance from a mentor developer 10. A final workshop reports on results of participants Sixty three people (including 20 mentors) were involved and participants were highly satisfied with the project: - Involvement in the project increased the reported rate of use of CVCB research from 25% pre project to 55.6% post project. - Nineteen of 33 participants agreed or strongly agreed

<p>Outcomes</p>	<p>that they (or their mentee) now have a more robust project from a capability building perspective - Twenty-eight of 33 participants agreed or strongly agreed that they (or their mentee) now have a framework to use in future Capacity building efforts and an ongoing ability to critically appraise and find out information about capacity building - Mentoring was shown to be an important process in the On the Fast Track approach</p> <p>Participants reported a range of impacts and outcomes from their involvement including: *improved team work in projects *more engagement with stakeholders in projects leading to better participation and greater results *better quality projects from well executed engagement strategies and design, delivery and evaluation of projects. *using their experience to train others in capacity building *more motivated extension teams Overall, Participation increased the engagement with, and use of, CVCB research, which led to increased confidence in capacity building which led to better RD&E projects, which led to increased benefits to producers and communities involved in projects (i.e. increased return on investment from RD&E).</p>
<p>Implications</p>	<p>As a route-to-market for research in capacity building it is clear that the On the Fast Track approach delivered increased use of CVCB research and was well accepted by practitioners as a way to increase their confidence and improve their practice. In this way, the approach offers a way for rural industries to develop their current and future capacity building professionals.</p>
<p>Publications</p>	<p>McKenzie, J. (2007) On the Fast Track Workbook, RIRDC.</p>

Completed Projects – Cooperative Venture

Project Title	The roles for capacity building in regional NRM
RIRDC Project No.: Start Date: Finish Date: Researcher: Organisation: Phone: Fax: Email:	PRJ-000823 01/08/2005 30/09/2007 David Pannell University of Western Australia (08) 9844 8659 david.pannell@uwa.edu.au
Objectives	Allow CMAs to better identify issues and areas where capacity building is the most appropriate and effective response for NRM outcomes focussing on the example of salinity.
Background	Effective use of the funds provided to regional organisations for investment in NRM is a key concern of state and national governments. There have been comments about the effectiveness and targeting of investments under government-funded programs. Considerable investment in capacity building under regionally-based NRM programs has occurred, but there has been little or no rigorous analysis of the institutional arrangements put in place for these programs, including arrangements for support of capacity-building activities.
Research	Case studies were conducted with two regional catchment management organisations, the North Central CMA in Victoria and South Coast NRM in Western Australia, to understand their capacity needs for technical analysis and decision analysis, and the capacities of organisations and agencies within the regions to develop and deliver capacity building activities for land managers. A wider survey of 18 catchment management organisations throughout Australia was also conducted, along with a survey to understand the goals of small non-commercial landholders and their motivation to undertake NRM activities
Outcomes	The research showed a number of capacity gaps restricting the effectiveness of regional NRM. The key ones are in the areas of: selection and evaluation of scientific information; use of economic and social information; integration of diverse information types in planning and prioritisation; and monitoring and evaluation. The results of this project reinforce the view that good regional NRM planning and prioritisation requires a strong evidence base and good analysis, combined with good judgment by decision makers.
Implications	The study highlights that current policy in Australia provides insufficient incentive or support for regional environmental management bodies to use technical and socio-economic knowledge effectively to improve long-term environmental and natural resource outcomes. There is considerable scope for more formal integration of information through structured decision frameworks. Additionally, the project has generated a diverse set of insights relevant to capacity building in regional NRM that have the potential to assist catchment organisations and governments improve the development and implementation of regional catchment strategies.
Publications	Pannell, DJ, 2008, 'Public benefits, private benefits, and policy intervention for land-use change for environmental benefits', Land

Economics (forthcoming). Marsh, S, Pannell, D, Seymour, E, Ridley, A & Wilkinson, R 2008, 'Capacity needs for effective management of dryland salinity at the regional level: a tale of two catchment organisations', in Proceedings of the 2nd International Salinity Forum, Adelaide, 31 March–3 April 2008 (forthcoming). Seymour, E, Pannell, D, Ridley, A, Marsh, S & Wilkinson, R 2008, 'Decision making by catchment management organisations in Australia: current processes and capacity gaps', Australasian Journal of Environmental Management (submitted). Ridley, AM and Pannell, DJ, 2008 'Piloting a systematic framework for public investment in regional NRM', Land Use Policy (submitted) Wilkinson, R 2008, 'Tailoring salinity investment to the social needs of lifestyle landholders', Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension (submitted).

COOPERATIVE VENTURE FOR CAPACITY BUILDING

RIRDC Publication No. 09/051

RIRDC's Cooperative Venture for Capacity Building R&D program aimed to ensure an effective system for continuous capacity building in primary industries in Australia by coordinating and funding a targeted R&D program. The program ended in June 2008.

The Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation (RIRDC) manages and funds priority research and translates results into practical outcomes for industry.

Our business is about developing a more profitable, dynamic and sustainable rural sector. Most of the information we produce can be downloaded for free from our website: www.rirdc.gov.au.

RIRDC books can be purchased by phoning 02 6271 4160 or online at: www.rirdc.gov.au.



This publication can be viewed at our website—
www.rirdc.gov.au. All RIRDC books can be
purchased from:

www.rirdc.gov.au

Contact RIRDC:
Level 2
15 National Circuit
Barton ACT 2600

PO Box 4776
Kingston ACT 2604

Ph: 02 6271 4100
Fax: 02 6271 4199
Email: rirdc@rirdc.gov.au
web: www.rirdc.gov.au

RIRDC Innovation for rural Australia