

# milestone report

Project code: L.PGS.1813

Prepared by: Steve Banney  
Grazserv Pty Ltd

Date published: 26 July 2019

PUBLISHED BY  
Meat and Livestock Australia Limited  
PO Box 1961  
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

## Leadership Group member - Grazserv

Milestone 5 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**

PGS has not met project targets in the north. While maintaining the core principals, PGS for the north must be customised given the different culture and environment in the north. Working with existing producer groups such as PDS and Grazing Best Practice groups and being flexible in how PGS will operate in the north is essential. This also involves elasticity around producer contributions to costs. A priority is to work more closely with northern pastoral companies and all producers who have completed EDGE course. Working with supportive resellers/agents should greatly increase the exposure of PGS to producers and deliverers. Recent appointments to the northern State coordination and Leadership teams along with agreed flexibility for PGS in the north should ensure greater uptake by deliverers and producers. So much of the success with this program will come down to a high level of trust between producers and the deliverer.

## Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Milestone description .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Milestone 5 .....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Project objectives .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Overarching Project Objectives .....	4
2.2	Leadership Team Objectives .....	4
2.3	Progress towards meeting objectives (quick reference table) .....	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Operational Review .....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusions/recommendations .....</b>	<b>7</b>

# 1 Milestone description

## 1.1 Milestone 5

### Progress Report and Activity Forecast

Final report submitted to MLA for review and approval.

# 2 Project objectives

## 2.1 Overarching Project Objectives

The overarching objective of the PGS program is to encourage and support red meat producers to improve their management skills, to increase profit. The program objectives to be completed by 2022 are:

1. To increase the average profitability of participating red meat producers by 2.5% ROAM by improving their skills and capability.
2. A commercial model which involves user pays for the private good component of the activity (generally the delivery), with MLA contributing a maximum of 30% of the delivery cost of supported learning projects.
3. 5,000 producers attend feeder activities with 10 -15% of them going on to participate in a supported learning program.
4. 2,900 producers participate in supported learning programs to increase their skills and knowledge:
  - a. 2150 producers increase their skills and knowledge above a skills audit score of 75% (competent);
  - b. 50 deliverers have increased capability to a point where they can deliver effective high quality supported learning programs;
  - c. Increase the average confidence rating of participating producers to use key skill sets or do key tasks to greater than 8/10;
  - d. At least 70% of participating producers have made practice changes underpinned by a change in skills.

## 2.2 Leadership Team Objectives

The engagement of a leadership team is intended to provide support to the national and state coordinators in performing their roles. Further to this, the leadership team will mentor deliverers to assist to improve the capacity of service providers to develop and deliver supported learning projects (SLPs).

This will be achieved by participating in the following activities:

1. Participate in the delivery of feeder and recruitment activities on behalf of the delivery network
2. Support state or national coordinators in reviewing supported learning projects developed by MLA or deliverers, as required
3. Deliver supported learning projects under the proposed adoption program banner (minimum of one per year)
4. Mentor PGS deliverers (between 3 and 6 deliverers per mentor per year)

5. Provide support to the PGS national coordinator by providing feedback and recommendations for overarching program improvement and individual supported learning project progress
6. Act as a champion for PGS
7. Support good governance of PGS Program

## 2.3 Progress towards meeting objectives (quick reference table)

Area of Participation	Number	Comment (nature of work done and outcomes achieved)
Support Coordination team/deliverers to recruit producers and deliverers		<p>Ongoing telephone discussions with Rebecca Mohr-Bell about promotion of the program to potential deliverers and producers. Priority is getting interest from corporates with properties in NT and WA.</p> <p>Spoke with the Western Queensland RBRC chair, Nina House about interest in evolving existing and new PDS into a northern version of PGS. Nina is interested, however until the drought breaks she and her colleagues will not have the time to fully consider the possibilities. Up until a recent workshop in Brisbane, Nina did not fully comprehend the PGS concept.</p> <p>Discussions have continued with Angela and others about developing a northern Leadership Team.</p> <p>I have not had contact with any deliverers for the north.</p>
Support State Coordinators to review SLPs		Nil to date
Mentor Deliverers in development and delivery of SLPs		Nil to date
Developing/Delivering SLPs		The development by MLA of off-the-shelf SLPs is a good idea. These should be producer driven and locally relevant if they are to be successful.
PGS coordination team advisory activities		Contributions via teleconferences and conversations with program leader. Attended PGS meetings in Brisbane on 30 April and 1 May 2018.
Representation/Awareness		Continuing very little awareness in north of PGS. The pastoral companies have been made aware of PGS, however it is going to take face to face meetings with company representatives at both the head office and

		local levels for this awareness to convert to any real interest and activity.
--	--	---

### 3 Discussion

#### 3.1 Operational Review

Question	Discussion
<b>1. Support and capacity development for service providers</b> a. Based on your exposure to SLPs submitted to PGS, provide comment on the level of service provider capacity (particularly in terms of ability to develop SLPs in line with PGS guidelines). b. Give an overview of the nature (type, timing) of support you have had the opportunity to provide to service providers.	a. No exposure to submitted SLPs as yet. The question that deliverers continue to ask is “what’s in it for me?” Successful deliverers cannot see why they would want to be involved with PGS. There are relatively few potential deliverers in the north compared to southern Australia. Based on the feeder activity (Breeding EDGE) in the north-west, the logical areas to be addressed by a subsequent SLP are basic breeding objectives/systems and record keeping to improve herd fertility. b. Nil to date.
<b>2. Coordination team support</b> a. Describe how you have engaged and collaborated with coordination team members and comment on how effective this has been? b. Can you suggest ways to enhance the support provided to SCs/NC?	a. Most effective has been one-on-one phone or in person conversations. Useful discussions with team members including the MLA adoption team at the recent PGS meeting in Brisbane. b. As a matter of priority arrange meetings with selected pastoral companies and resellers/agents interested in training and adoption. There is a big opportunity to work more closely with interested resellers as this is where a lot of producers source their ‘trusted’ information. As identified at the Darwin adoption workshop in 2017, there is scope and a need to work more closely with local deliverers and producers and with the RDRCs.
<b>3. Development and review of SLPs</b> a. In what capacity have you participated in the development of SLPs (your own and those of your mentees)? b. Describe your experience to date in terms of the SLP review process including common mistakes/issues encountered. c. Comment on your experience working with State Coordinators through the SLP review/approval process.	Nil to date.
<b>4. Funding model</b>	a. Most producers in the north are reluctant to pay full price for any training. Where it is shown that MLA and others are co-contributors to the funding model, this will

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What is the appetite for producers in terms of paying to participate?</li> <li>b. What has been the level of interest shown by potential funding partners (non-MLA)?</li> <li>c. Comment on the nature of identified co-funding opportunities.</li> <li>d. Do service providers believe there is adequate financial benefits to motivate participation?</li> <li>e. Can you suggest ways to improve the value proposition for service providers?</li> </ul>	<p>be much more appealing to the majority of producers. Those producers who are willing to pay the full price are mostly already involved in existing consultancy and training, e.g. Resource Consulting Services training.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. If not already done, a formal approach should be undertaken with the major resellers/agents in working together with their existing, commercial client base.</li> <li>c. The culture of subsidised training in northern Australia is strong with regional NRM organisations and the likes of Resource Consulting Services offering heavily subsidised training opportunities.</li> <li>d. Unsure and this should be carefully monitored and reviewed.</li> <li>e. Work more closely with local service providers and ensure there is adequate local ownership and producer empowerment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Communication and promotion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Comment on the quality, availability and effectiveness of the guidelines and materials/tools used for promoting the project</li> <li>b. Give an overview of the activities/initiatives you have engaged in to promote the project (including producer/deliverer) recruitment activities</li> <li>c. Do you have any suggestions of other methods that may be effective for promoting the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Communication materials seem adequate except it will be good to have more case studies when these are available.</li> <li>b. Worked with Ted Parish and Angela Hammond to make the pastoral corporates aware of PGS. Also mentioned at various Grazing BMP workshops.</li> <li>c. Working with supportive resellers/agents should greatly increase the exposure of PGS to producers and deliverers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Program advisory services and governance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Describe how you have engaged with MLA and the coordination team to enhance the effectiveness of the program</li> <li>b. Describe your input to and provide feedback on the M&amp;E process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Been involved in meetings and teleconferences and communicated directly with the program leader.</li> <li>b. No input or feedback on the M&amp;E process.</li> </ul>

## 4 Conclusions/recommendations

Close the loop at Beef Up forums and other MLA sponsored group activities.

Supporting learning will deliver improved producer skills, confidence and practice change, however the producer has to firstly have a high level of trust with the deliverer.

It is encouraging to see the move away from the PGS model developed in southern Australia by southern consultants. The northern team attending the recent Brisbane workshop is very capable and passionate about getting PGS off the ground in the north.

The development of at least seven off the shelf SLPs is an excellent move provided there is strong evidence there is genuine interest and support in these areas.

Assisting producers to firstly identify their two major problems on their property is a good way to get ownership and involvement from the start.

The Brisbane workshop confirmed to me that PGS progress in the north will rely on the initiative, rapport and trust that deliverers have with producers. The motto now should be 'just do it' meaning that PGS will work in the north by adopting the core principles of PGS, recognising that it is not a rigid program.

In the north, change will occur if the 'training' is seen as support and follow up to existing training, e.g. EDGE products. This should be seamless, not threatening and flexible for producers.