



final report

Project code: B.MBP.0117
Prepared by: Peter Schuster
Schuster Consulting Group Pty Limited
Date published: November 2013

PUBLISHED BY
Meat & Livestock Australia Limited
Locked Bag 991
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

More Beef from Pastures National Coordinator Final Report

Meat & Livestock Australia acknowledges the matching funds provided by the Australian Government to support the research and development detailed in this publication.

This publication is published by Meat & Livestock Australia Limited ABN 39 081 678 364 (MLA). Care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication. However MLA cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in the publication. You should make your own enquiries before making decisions concerning your interests. Reproduction in whole or in part of this publication is prohibited without prior written consent of MLA.

Abstract

More Beef from Pastures Phase II matured over the three years since it's commencement in July 2010, from being a program with a tentative mandate in a changing R&D extension environment to being the primary vehicle for the dissemination of southern beef R&D outcomes to producers. Valuable partnerships have been established within the MBfP delivery network both between MLA and coordination partners as well as State Coordinators and deliverers. The M&E processes introduced with the program have delivered valuable data on the 11,985 participants who have engaged with the program.

Executive summary

The More Beef from Pastures Phase II program commenced in July 2010, but did not become fully operational until early 2011. State based delivery, coordinated by a State Coordinator under the oversight of a National Coordinator and MLA manager, constituted the mode of operation with the performance of the states being measured against agreed KPIs for program awareness (category A activity), building knowledge skills and confidence (category B activity) and supporting practice change (category C activity).

The achievement of these agreed KPIs was the focus of a business plan prepared by each State Coordinator and updated on an annual basis. The process of preparing, updating and reporting against these business plans in a peer review environment proved to be very effective in allowing timely changes to operations to be made if and when required to ensure the achievement of KPIs.

These plans and subsequent operations were discussed during regular face to face and teleconference meetings between the State Coordinators, National Coordinator and MLA management; meetings which played a valuable role in helping to establish and maintain a productive operating environment, characterised by regular communication, for the program.

The M&E processes established to report against these KPIs were adopted by deliverers as a condition of program participation and refined based on feedback throughout the term of the program. By the end of the contract period, these M&E procedures were being universally applied and had provided useful information on 11,985 program participants.

All states, with the exception of NSW Category A and B and Victoria Category B, have met their three-year KPI target for the number of participants in Category A, B and C events. NSW's failure to meet these KPIs was a result of organisational issues beyond the control of the program and in the case of Victoria; this was a result of a change in event attribution by MLA midway through the program.

While there have been differences in performance between states, overall the MBfP matured through Phase II from being a program unsure of its role in the delivery and extension market place, particularly with respect to private sector engagement, to being a highly credible and effective producer engagement vehicle.

Table of contents

1. Background	5
1.1. Project objectives.....	5
1.2. Methodology	6
2. Results	6
2.1. Progress against deliverables.....	8
3. Discussion.....	13
4. Conclusion and recommendations.....	16
Appendix 1	17

1. Background

1.1. Project objectives

According to the contract governing the delivery of services under B.MBP.0117:

The National Coordinator's performance will be based upon achievement of More Beef from Pastures phase 2 (MBfP II) key performance indicator (KPI) targets outlined in the business plan for awareness (category A activity), building knowledge skills and confidence (category B activity) and supporting practice change (category C activity). Direct feedback on the National Coordinator's (NC) performance will be provided to the MBfP Project Executive from a sample of producer advocates, public and private sector intermediaries and deliverers. The key deliverables for this role include:

- a. Professionally and efficiently coordinate the national MBfP II program to ensure the approved KPIs are achieved, activities are aligned and integrated and all monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is carried out as outlined in the MBfP II strategy.
- b. Assist in the design and setting up of state delivery plans in conjunction with the respective State Coordinator (SC).
- c. Set up systems to maintain regular communication with SC to track progress against milestones and identify potential issues that may hinder achievement of stated milestones in individual contracts.
- d. Drive effective linkages between the MBfP program and other the MLA producer learning activities and programs.
- e. Arrange and coordinate training of SCs and their respective teams on the MBfP II products and tools as well as ensuring all teams are competent and able to implement the MBfP II monitoring and evaluation processes.
- f. Provide executive support and respond effectively to the requirements of the Project Advisory Committee and the MBfP Project Executive along with reporting progress against KPIs to the Southern Australia Beef Research Council (SABRC).
- g. Engage and lead a team of MBfP II advocates and intermediaries and develop and manage relationships with training and extension providers.
- h. Develop and coordinate a national communications strategy for overall program promotion, activities (including Producer Demonstration Sites) and events, and stories for MLA publications (Prograzier and Feedback magazines and the MBfP eNewsletter).
- i. Collate SC M&E reports with participant engagement lists and provide monthly activity reports against relevant program KPIs to the MBfP Project Executive.
- j. Assist with management and administration of all relevant MBfP Producer Demonstration Sites (PDS) ensuring there is linkage between project outputs and all other relevant MBfP activities.
- k. Assist in the maintenance of MBfP program information on the MLA website and ensure currency is maintained.
- l. Coordinate and convene a working group to review and update the MBfP tools when required."

MBfP II was initially scheduled to commence in July 2010. Actual commencement was delayed until early 2011 due to:

1. Protracted contract negotiations between MLA and the organisations from which the SCs were enlisted (including the withdrawal of PIRSA from the program due to internal organisational resourcing constraints and the subsequent undertaking of an open tender process to appoint a SC for South Australia); and
2. Difficulties in agreeing with the states and operationalising the monitoring and evaluation processes.

1.2. Methodology

A SC was appointed in each of the southern beef production states for a term consistent with that agreed for MBfP II (with a possible two year extension). The relevant state departments of primary industries were initially approached to fill this position and did so in all but one case, South Australia. In South Australia, a competitive open tender process resulted in the appointment of Rural Directions to the South Australia SC position.

Each state was required to prepare a business plan for years one, which was subsequently updated for years two and three, detailing the activities that would be undertaken to achieve the KPIs allocated to each state. Progress against KPIs to September 2013 is reported in *More Beef from Pastures Phase 2 Year 3.25 Evaluation Report: Rolling data to September 2013. Prepared by Tania Sloan (data and graph compilation) v 1.0 -19 November 2013.*

2. Results

State KPI targets

A detailed overview of the performance of each state against the agreed KPIs is provided in *More Beef from Pastures Phase 2 Year 3.25 Evaluation Report: Rolling data to September 2013. Prepared by Tania Sloan (data and graph compilation) v 1.0 -19 November 2013.* A summary of each state's performance against KPIs for number of participants and evaluation return rate is provided in Tables 1 - 10.

Number of participants KPI

Table 1

NSW % of three year target achieved for number of participants in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	4,277	3,155	74%
Category B KPI	1,283	676	53%
Category C KPI	642	837	130%

Table 2

VIC % of three year target achieved for number of participants in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	2,779	5,406	195%
Category B KPI	833	791	95%
Category C KPI	418	796	190%

Table 3

TAS % of three year target achieved for number of participants in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	410	1,062	259%
Category B KPI	125	271	217%
Category C KPI	65	105	162%

Table 4

SA % of three year target achieved for number of participants in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	729	1,013	139%
Category B KPI	219	714	326%
Category C KPI	110	285	259%

Table 5

WA % of three year target achieved for number of participants in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	713	1,349	189%
Category B KPI	215	448	208%
Category C KPI	115	239	208%

All states, with the exception of NSW category A and B and Victoria category B, have met their three-year KPI target for the number of participants in category A, B and C events.

KPIs are aligned to the Years 1-3 KPIs, not the 5 year targets.

Return rate KPI

Table 6

NSW % of three year target achieved for evaluation return rate in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	65%	1,307	75%
Category B KPI	80%	461	68%
Category C KPI	80%	471	64%

Table 7

VIC % of three year target achieved for evaluation return rate in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	65%	2,186	54%
Category B KPI	80%	634	80%
Category C KPI	80%	358	66%

Table 8

TAS % of three year target achieved for evaluation return rate in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	65%	247	36%
Category B KPI	80%	98	36%
Category C KPI	80%	42	40%

Table 9

SA % of three year target achieved for evaluation return rate in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	65%	147	57%
Category B KPI	80%	473	66%
Category C KPI	80%	25	60%

Table 10

WA % of three year target achieved for evaluation return rate in category A, B and C activities.

	KPI	Actual	% achieved of 3 yr target
Category A KPI	65%	457	55%
Category B KPI	80%	339	76%
Category C KPI	80%	46	68%

None of the states were performing at a level which suggested they would achieve their three-year KPI targets for evaluation return rate.

KPIs are aligned to the Years 1-3 KPIs, not the 5 year KPIs.

2.1. Progress against deliverables

Table 11 provides an overview of progress against each contract deliverable.

Table 11

<p>a. <i>Professionally and efficiently coordinate the national MBfP II program to ensure the approved KPIs are achieved, activities are aligned and integrated and all M&E is carried out as outlined in the MBfP II strategy.</i></p>	<p>Central to ensuring that the approved KPIs were achieved and activities aligned and integrated were the state business plans. Business plans were sought from each state at the commencement of the program and these were subsequently reviewed and extensively updated each year with the State Coordinator required to present their business plan to the other State Coordinators. The State Coordinators were required within these business plans to detail how the agreed KPIs would be achieved over the following 12 months.</p> <p>The annual plans were required to consider performance to date and, reflecting upon this performance, ensure that resources were appropriately</p>
---	--

	<p>allocated and aligned to achieve the year three KPIs.</p> <p>A change to the way KPIs are attributed in 2012 resulted in Victoria exceeding its KPI for category C but not achieving its category B KPI due to redistribution from B to C. The failure to achieve this KPI reflects a technicality rather than a performance issue.</p> <p>The cyclical data collection and interrogation process adopted throughout Phase II, together with regular M&E discussions during SC teleconferences and face to face meetings, ensured that M&E was carried out in a timely fashion and as per MLA's requirements. The open and frank nature of these discussions also helped ensure that the system continued to evolve in response to the need for information, the allocation of scarce resources (determining appropriate allocation of funds to M&E related activities and delivery activities) and the realities of extension and delivery.</p>
<p><i>b. Assist in the design and setting up of state delivery plans in conjunction with the respective SC.</i></p>	<p>The state delivery plans were incorporated in the state business plans which were developed as a prerequisite for the SC contracts in year one and updated each year.</p> <p>The annual revision of the state business plans proved to be a worthwhile exercise in that the task required the SCs to reflect upon how the program was delivered over the preceding 12 months and more and modify their delivery to address issues that may have arisen. This has meant that issues have been identified and addressed, rather than compounded. Further benefit has been derived from the process by presenting the business plans at the SC meetings so that the group is able to learn from each other's experiences, particularly in the area of private sector engagement.</p> <p>Where states have experienced a change in SC, the business plans have helped maintain program delivery stability and assisted the succession process.</p>
<p><i>c. Set up systems to maintain regular communication with SC to track progress against milestones and identify potential issues that may hinder achievement of stated milestones in individual contracts.</i></p>	<p>Teleconferences with the SCs, NC and MLA program manager were held on a regular basis, generally six weekly, and as required. These teleconferences provided a forum for the reporting of progress against business plans and KPIs, notification of R&D outcomes and points of interest, updates on administrative functions (such as event reporting) and also serve an important function in maintaining a cohesive relationship within the MBfP program management and coordination team.</p> <p>Regular communication, typically weekly, occurred between the NC and SCs on finer details of delivery and coordination. Interaction was on a needs basis with some states requiring a greater level of consultation than other states.</p>

	<p>Face to face meetings between the SCs, NC and MLA occurred at least every six months and on a needs basis. At the outset of the program, M&E dominated the discussion; however, by midterm, SCs had become accustomed to the process and the meetings became more focussed on R&D outcomes and strategy. KPIs and critical analysis of progress against milestones were standing agenda items at all meetings.</p> <p>M&E data reporting occurred quarterly with helpful reminder protocol having been established by Tania Sloan, MLA.</p> <p>Use of the MBfP Extranet by the SCs has been inconsistent. Usage has been encouraged by the posting, rather than distribution by email, of meeting agendas and actions and by the loading of useful information resources developed by the MLA program manager.</p>
<p><i>d. Drive effective linkages between the MBfP program and other the MLA producer learning activities and programs.</i></p>	<p>Various members of MLA's ICE team were consulted on a regular basis regarding program developments and were involved in the sign off process for the program's eNewsletter.</p> <p>Regular contact was maintained with the Making More from Sheep NC (Mike Wagg) and the MLA goat program R&D manager to identify and leverage opportunities for information sharing, such as via field days and program newsletters. Opportunities to leverage programs such as the PDS program are explored on a regular basis.</p> <p>The program for face-to-face SC meetings is typically diverse and includes speakers from across MLA's range of producer learning activities to ensure that SCs are aware of these activities and opportunities to collaborate. The most recent meeting included interaction with Future Beef, FARM300, the MBfP pastoral supplement and Livestock Data Link. Emails are also circulated through the SC network as more specific opportunities arise, such as the MLA Challenge.</p>
<p><i>e. Arrange and coordinate training of SCs and their respective teams on the MBfP II products and tools as well as ensuring all teams are competent and able to implement the MBfP II monitoring and evaluation processes.</i></p>	<p>Each SC has been responsible for ensuring an adequate level of delivery expertise among their delivery teams. The level of professional development opportunity provided within each state varied with excellent opportunities offer in Victoria and little or no opportunity available in other states. Victoria has led a number of shared learning exercises with other SCs.</p> <p>The MBfP program partnered with Vic DPI to develop several MBfP delivery packages for deliverers and these have been well accepted in Victoria and are in</p>

	<p>demand from other states.</p> <p>SCs are regularly advised of training opportunities and the development of new resources via email, teleconferences, webinars and meetings. During 2013, face-to-face SC meetings included information sessions covering issues such as Evergraze, PCAS, FARM300, the MBfP pastoral module, MSA and Livestock Data Link which, while not strictly training, assisted SC understanding of developments within the industry.</p> <p>M&E was addressed throughout the three years to ensure that the SCs were able to address any questions regarding the process that their deliverers may have.</p>
<p>f. <i>Provide executive support and respond effectively to the requirements of the Project Advisory Committee and the MBfP Project Executive along with reporting progress against KPIs to the Southern Australia Beef Research Council (SABRC).</i></p>	<p>Executive support was provided on a needs basis to the relevant MLA managers. There was no direct formal contact between the NC and the Project Advisory Committee, the MBfP Project Executive or SABRC due to changes in reporting requirements since the commencement of the program.</p>
<p>g. <i>Engage and lead a team of MBfP II advocates and intermediaries and develop and manage relationships with training and extension providers.</i></p>	<p>A good team of MBfP II Producer Advocates (PA) were engaged and called upon to a varying extent by the states. A combined PA/SC meeting was held in September 2013 and this played an important role in developing skills and confidence as well as building relationships within the PA/SC network.</p> <p>PAs were underutilised in NSW, largely due to the instability associated with NSW DPI throughout the course of Phase II. The NC intervened in NSW to placate the PAs and seek a continuation of their support for MBfP during what was a difficult period for the administration of the program in NSW.</p> <p>Relationships with training and extension providers were variable between states and highly correlated with the SC's relationships with the same. The success of these relationships was influenced by each state's level of resourcing and attitude toward engaging with providers outside their immediate network.</p> <p>Issues arose in NSW as a result of a lack of experience in dealing with extension providers from the private sector.</p>
<p>h. <i>Develop and coordinate a national communications strategy for overall program promotion, activities (including PDS) and events, and stories for MLA publications (Prograzier and Feedback magazines</i></p>	<p>A communication strategy was developed in year one; however, as awareness was a relatively minor component of MBfP II, in comparison to Phase 1, communication tended to be more opportunistic than strategic, with the exception of the MBfP eNewsletter</p>

<p><i>and the MBfP eNewsletter).</i></p>	<p>which was managed according to a content formula and delivery schedule developed to facilitate information sharing and cross promotion with other MLA communications such as the MLA website, Friday Feedback and Feedback magazine.</p> <p>The advertisement of MBfP events improved with the introduction of a simplified event reporting process, coordinated by MLA, during year two.</p>
<p><i>i. Collate SC M&E reports with participant engagement lists and provide monthly activity reports against relevant program KPIs to the MBfP Project Executive.</i></p>	<p>Shortly after the contracting of the NC role, management of the collection and processing of data was assumed by MLA. The NC's role was to maintain contact with the SCs to ensure the complete and timely collection of data and liaison with MLA to ensure that the SCs were delivering data in accordance to their agreements.</p> <p>SC data reports were provided directly to the MLA Administrative Assistant and copied to the NC on a quarterly basis. A six monthly report is then generated for the MBfP Project Executive.</p>
<p><i>j. Assist with management and administration of all relevant MBfP PDS ensuring there is linkage between project outputs and all other relevant MBfP activities.</i></p>	<p>The management and administration of PDSs was assumed by MLA shortly after the contracting process. MBfP related PDSs were discussed during teleconferences and face-to-face meetings and the outcomes reported through the MBfP eNewsletters. While the opportunity to extend MBfP activities via PDSs was regularly promoted to the SCs, there was relatively little uptake in this area in part due to a reluctance to increase the administrative workload carried by the SCs and, in WA, issues associated with animal ethics.</p> <p>The results of the PDS review in 2013 were discussed at the SC meeting.</p>
<p><i>k. Assist in the maintenance of MBfP program information on the MLA website page and ensure currency is maintained.</i></p>	<p>The MLA website was been updated as required to reflect changes to the MBfP program and personnel and on a quarterly basis to include the content developed for the MBfP eNewsletter.</p> <p>The MBfP Extranet was updated on a regular basis with information resources, meeting agendas, actions, minutes, presentations and key dates.</p>
<p><i>l. Coordinate and convene a working group to review and update the MBfP tools when required.</i></p>	<p>Tool development and review was regularly discussed during teleconferences and at face-to-face meetings. The suite of tools relevant to the program was highlighted through the revised producer's manual which was redeveloped for online use.</p>

3. Discussion

While there have been differences in performance between states, overall the MBfP matured through Phase II from being a program unsure of its role in the delivery and extension market place, particularly with respect to private sector engagement, to being a highly credible and effective producer engagement vehicle.

The M&E associated with the delivery of the program has contributed to cultural change among some of the program partners and forced many of the deliverers to change their approach to M&E. While the new approach was met with cynicism by some at first, most have come to realise the value of the data being collected and tolerate, if not embrace, the process.

- **New South Wales**

The experience with NSW DPI was compromised by a number of external issues from the outset. These influences resulted in extended delays to the contracting process, unacceptably high turnover of SCs and poor handover between SCs, underperformance against KPIs and in the engagement of the private sector, underuse of and poor engagement with the Producer Advocates and, ultimately, with drawl from the program.

The SCs themselves were without exception capable individuals; however, their ability to coordinate the program and deliver against the program requirements was compromised by an unstable organisation and, therefore, delivery environment throughout the course of Phase II, particularly in the latter half of the program.

Progress was made in the area of private sector engagement and this likely reflected a cultural change on the part of the organisation precipitated by recognition that the erosion of internal resources within NSW DPI had compromised the capacity of the organisation to deliver without engaging external resources. While this was not without issues, this move did constitute a significant development and a commendable departure from the status quo.

It is anticipated that a significant investment in establishing a delivery network will be required in NSW in the continuation of Phase II under a new SC as the pre-existing DPI network no longer exists.

- **Victoria**

Victoria's performance throughout Phase II has been exemplary; greatly assisted by relatively generous Vic DPI support through the Better Beef Network (BBN). The BBN has proved to be a highly functional delivery network, well connected with and supported by private delivery providers.

Training and professional development opportunities for public and private deliverers were a feature of MBfP Phase II in Victoria. Resources to support the delivery of the program were developed and extended to deliverers through well attended professional development workshops.

While it was understood that many of the opportunities in Victoria were augmented by funding over and above that made available through MBfP, the opportunities realised in the state were extended as much as was possible through the broader MBfP program through the diligence of the SC and collaboration with other states.

- **Tasmania**

The performance in Tasmania against KPIs was excellent over the reporting period, as was the SC's contribution to the MBfP primary communication tool – the MBfP eNewsletter. Encouraging progress was made in the later stages of the program in extending the reach of MBfP in Tasmania to other regions within the state and via private deliverers. Further work in these areas would reinforce MBfP in the state.

- **South Australia**

The success of the arrangement with private provider Rural Directions in South Australia was one of the key achievements of MBfP Phase II.

While it is appreciated that the level of performance of the SC was financially unsustainable for Rural Directions, the ability of the private provider to engage with other private deliverers and for the private sector SC to deliver against KPIs in a timely and efficient manner was commendable. With modifications to the funding, this model may well provide a valuable precedent for the way R&D outcomes may be delivered via the private sector in partnership with MLA.

- **Western Australia**

The delivery of MBfP Phase II in WA was variable; being problematic in the early stages of the program and then improving to deliver robustly against program KPIs through both DAFWA and private sector deliverers during the second half of the program.

Of particular note was the delivery relationship fostered between DAFWA and the private delivery networks of Evergreen and DIRT. This allowed MBfP to be made available to a much wider network of producers than might otherwise have been the case.

- **Target audience engagement**

The data reported in *More Beef from Pastures Phase 2 Year 3.25 Evaluation Report: Rolling data to September 2013. Prepared by Tania Sloan (data and graph compilation) v 1.0 -19 November 2013*, indicates that MBfP II successfully engaged with the target audience; larger producers within the majority market.

The median property size across 11,985 producers who participated in the program from July 2010 to September 2013 was 401 hectares and the median number of total cattle was 300, with 41% of participants running between 100 – 400 head and a further 33% running between 401 – 1,600 head.

- **Producer Advocate engagement**

Producer advocates were underutilised in most states. This was due to a combination of factors including a lack of coaching and mentoring opportunities and a deliberate move away from category A awareness type activities to group based activities. In group based activities, particularly those delivered by private providers, the role Producer Advocates may play was not always clear.

- **Agribusiness engagement**

Agribusiness engagement was a priority for all states and a range of different approaches were employed throughout Phase II. Most of the issues that were encountered between the SCs and the private deliverers related to the M&E requirements. Overtime, however, most deliverers reportedly came to realise the need to collect and the benefit of collecting this data and became supporters of the process.

- **The producer's manual**

The revised producer's manual has been well received by deliverers and feedback regarding the online resource indicates that this version has effectively addressed the relevance issues associated with the previous version.

- **M&E**

The collection and reporting of M&E data has become routine with all states implementing effective systems to ensure the timely collection and reporting of data.

- **Evaluation return rate**

None of the states were performing at a level which would suggest that they would achieve their three-year KPI targets for evaluation return rate despite some states providing significant incentives for both their deliverers to collect this data (requirement for payment) and participants to complete the forms (show bags).

4. Conclusion and recommendations

MBfP has become established as an effective and measurable vehicle for the dissemination of R&D outcomes to producers.

The following recommendations are made on the basis that the program will continue until December 2015.

- **Recommendation 1: M&E data**

Ways to improve access to and leverage the value of the M&E data for partner partners and deliverers should be explored.

- **Recommendation 2: Strategy**

MBfP SCs should be called upon to play a more strategic role in the consideration of R&D outcome extension, particularly in face to face meetings.

- **Recommendation 3: Collaboration**

Opportunities for interstate collaboration should be more widely explored.

- **Recommendation 4: Producer advocates**

Opportunities to better engage and utilise Producer Advocates should be explored.

- **Recommendation 5: Professional development**

Opportunities for the program to facilitate the professional development of deliverers should be explored.

- **Recommendation 6: Delivery resources**

Opportunities for the development of resources to support delivery, such as those developed by Vic DPI, should be explored as well as ways that these may be shared between states through the program.

- **Recommendation 7: Evaluation returns**

The characteristics of events, deliverers or groups which are able to deliver a high evaluation return rate should be investigated such that recommendations can be made to improve the rate of return.

Appendix 1**Budget****MBfP 2010-2011**

Month	Fees	Exp
Jul-10	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 2,749.34
Aug-10	\$ 6,675.00	\$ 45.65
Sep-10	\$ 10,150.00	\$ 1,302.18
Oct-10	\$ 10,125.00	\$ 767.88
Nov-10	\$ 10,900.00	\$ 443.93
Dec-10	\$ 8,250.00	\$ 73.48
Jan-11	\$ 4,350.00	\$ 129.15
Feb-11	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 888.01
Mar-11	\$ 7,550.00	\$ 1,908.20
Apr-11	\$ 7,825.00	\$ 1,954.36
May-11	\$ 1,680.00	\$ 1,019.71
Jun-11	\$ -	\$ -
TOTALS	\$ 92,005.00	\$ 11,281.89

MBfP 2011-2012

Month	Fees	Exp
Jul-11	\$ 23,850.00	\$ 267.28
Aug-11	\$ 2,475.00	\$ 51.09
Sep-11	\$ 8,015.63	\$ 835.38
Oct-11	\$ 7,767.00	\$ 389.57
Nov-11	\$ 1,518.75	\$ 68.92
Dec-11	\$ 4,320.00	\$ 50.98
Jan-12	\$ 4,140.00	\$ 48.85
Feb-12	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 257.75
Mar-12	\$ 5,175.00	\$ 36.36
Apr-12	\$ 8,550.00	\$ 474.65
May-12	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 551.69
Jun-12	\$ 9,540.00	\$ -
TOTALS	\$ 89,751.38	\$ 3,032.52

MBfP 2012-2013

Month	Fees	Exp
Jul-12	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 92.11
Aug-12	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 3,138.61
Sep-12	\$ 11,812.50	\$ 1,257.66
Oct-12	\$ 9,500.00	\$ 47.91
Nov-12	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 641.56
Dec-12	\$ 6,625.00	\$ 47.69
Jan-13	\$ 6,625.00	\$ 946.47
Feb-13	\$ 9,562.50	\$ 1,591.79
Mar-13	\$ 6,687.50	\$ 50.46
Apr-13	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 45.45
May-13	\$ 8,500.00	\$ 887.57
Jun-13	\$ 5,225.02	\$ 45.45
TOTALS	\$ 99,537.52	\$ 8,792.73

MBfP 2013-2014

Month	Fees	Exp
Jul-13	\$ 9,500.00	\$ 1,107.74
Aug-13	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 429.89
Sep-13	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 77.89
Oct-13	TBA	TBA
Nov-13	TBA	TBA
TOTALS	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 1,615.52