

final report

Project code: B.COM.0081
Prepared by: John Logan
Axiom Research
Date published: October 2009
ISBN: 9781741917611

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

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

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.

Executive Summary

The **Livestock Production Innovation's (LPI) Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Survey's** have been based on a research methodology that concentrates on the assessment of communication & research adoption performance indicators with a focus on key program streams including EDGENetwork, PIRDS, MBfP, MMfS and COP amongst the targeted producer groups of Northern & Southern Beef and Sheep/Lamb.

This annual survey involves quantifying the level of **awareness** that exists amongst a random sample of livestock producers of MLA courses and programs, as well as the rate of **practice change** by producers using innovations and alternative management practices being promoted within the MLA learning activities.

In **2009** the **primary KPI's** are to achieve the following:

1. At least **80%** of targeted producers* are **aware of at least one** MLA On-farm R&D communication / extension program (awareness), and that MLA members **rate their value** as at least 2 out of 3.
2. At least **10%** of targeted producers* (representing at least 15% of the production base) have engaged and **learned something of value** to their business from at least one MLA On-farm R&D communication / extension learning activity or related information.
3. At least **50%** of those producers (representing at least 7.5% of the production base) who have engaged with MLA On-farm R&D communication / extension learning activities or related information, **change practices** as a result of their engagement (adoption).

**defined by the % of total Northern Beef, Southern Beef and Lamb/Sheepmeat producers respectively with Estimated Value of Agricultural Output >\$5000 (source: ABS)*

The 2009 KPI survey has been undertaken amongst a sample of MLA's targeted producer segments to a 90% confidence interval for each segment based on an overall sample of **n=500**.

This was split into 2 sample tiers to address the KPI's:

Tier 1 has been constructed to evaluate **program awareness** amongst the general or **overall livestock producer population**, it included **n=300** producers randomly selected from FARMbase®, a database of over 80,000 targeted livestock producers across Australia. Responses to this element of the survey remain healthy with call conversion rates consistent with other Axiom projects.

Tier 2 provides a measure of the **level of practice change** around the use of key management practices amongst MLA's **extension & communication program participants**, the **2009** survey has obtained a sample of **n=200** producers. This includes only producers who participated in programs since the last survey undertaken in July 2008 (including attendees of EDGENetwork, More Beef from Pastures, PIRDS, COP, Making More from Sheep, Beef Up Forum, MSA and GLM courses). This sample frame was difficult to achieve this year due to the quality of the participant contact lists provided to MLA by course coordinators. Whilst the number of course participants appears good, many of the participants listed did not have addresses or telephone contact details included.

Both sample tiers include scale of production profiles for each producer segment based on industry population data provided by MLA. Based on the random sampling by enterprise size, each segment samples proportional representation reflects the population distribution for that segment. In most cases the scale of operation appears not to reflect awareness or change in management practice, however it does show that proportionally, more of the larger enterprises do tend to participate in MLA activities.

The contents of this report outline the findings of the 2009 survey as well as findings from recent KPI surveys undertaken from 2006-2008.

The empirical findings from 2009 are represented in detail in two appended data files:

- **MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1**
- **MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2**

Awareness - 2009 (Tier 1 n=300)

In **2009** the awareness of MLA extension programs continues to remain high at **92%**. This represents a consistent increase in course awareness equalling **5%** since the 2006 KPI survey. This outcome is **7% higher** than the 2008 KPI target and **exceeds** the **80% KPI** set by MLA.

The figures below represent the **tier 1 aided & unaided awareness** of MLA extension programs as well as aggregated awareness.

- **46%** of respondents indicated an unprompted or **unaided awareness** of MLA program(s). This is up from a low of 29% in 2008 and more consistent with 38% in 2007. This result is significantly higher than 2008 and appears to be trending upwards from the 28% result from the 2006 survey. However it does show signs of year on-year off awareness, this may correspond with MLA course and program communication initiatives.
- **90%** of respondents have a **prompted awareness** of one or more of the MLA courses or program(s) mentioned, this represents a significant increase from 80% in 2008 and 78% in 2007 and 84% in 2006.

Total tier 1 Awareness: In total **92%** of targeted producers recall one or more of the MLA courses or program(s) mentioned (85% in 2008, 84% in 2007 & 87% in 2006).

- This increased awareness level (92%) more than satisfies the **2009 KPI of 80%** awareness and is consistent with an improving level of awareness from previous surveys. In 2008, 85% could recall an MLA program and in 2007, 84%. This increase when measured longer term represents an increase of 19% from 73% awareness recorded in 2005 and is still 5% higher than the previous best result of 87% in the 2006 survey. The 2009 result is **12% higher** than the **objective KPI of 80%**.
- **8%** of respondents were **unaware** of any MLA courses or program(s), this is significantly fewer than 15% in 2008 and the high levels of unawareness found in 2005. This outcome confirms the recent improvement in levels of awareness of MLA initiatives, continuing the decrease from 16% in 2007 and 13% in 2006.

MLA Membership: In 2009 **71%** of **tier 1** survey participants indicated they are MLA members, in 2008 this was as high as 85%. The 2009 result is the same as in 2007 when 71% were identified as MLA members. Membership has been determined by receipt of the **Feedback** publication (the 2007 survey's measure of MLA membership status).

- **95%** of members were aware of one or more MLA extension program(s), this is up on 87% in 2008 and is consistent with previous findings of 93% in 2007 and 90% in the 2006 survey, these variations fall with in the margin of error, however the increasing trend reflects the impact of the LPI communication activity amongst the membership base.
- **36%** of **members** indicated they had attended an MLA course, down from 51% in 2008.

Attendance amongst targeted producers: **31%** of the **92%** of targeted producers surveyed who are **aware** of MLA courses indicated they had **attended or participated** in an MLA course or program. This result is less than the 48% recorded in 2008. Overall, this equates to **28%** of all targeted tier 1 producers surveyed, and represents a fall in participation from 40% in 2008, this result is still higher than 21% reported in 2007.

The **value of courses** to targeted producers is an evaluation introduced to the survey in 2008. This measure determines the value producers place on the courses and programs they have experience with using a simple rating out of 3, where a **rating of 0 = no value** at all and a **rating of 3 = high value** or the top rating possible.

- In tier 1, **90%** of targeted producers surveyed who attended courses, indicated they rated the courses as **good (2)** or **high value (3)**, up from 62% in 2008. This equates to a mean rating of **2.26** over the 2 out of 3 specified in the 2009 KPI's. This is up from **1.55** in 2008.

- This results comprised of **36%** of targeted producer who rated the courses they had experience with as **high value** (up from 15% in 2008), and **54%** as **good value** (up from 47% in 2008), followed by 8% as little value (down from 14% in 2008) and 1% as no value at all (down from 23% in 2008). Indicating an increasing trend in the value participants place on courses.
- **Northern beef producers** recorded the **highest value** ratings with an aggregated **97%** of producers rating the MLA courses as **good** or **high value**.
- **87%** of all course participants were **MLA members**, **90%** of them indicated they rated the courses as **good or high value**, this also resulted in a mean rating of **2.26** (again well above the 2009 KPI of 2).

In gathering this awareness data, the survey's questionnaire¹ specifically mentions Meat & Livestock Australia, and the range of programs for beef, sheep, lamb and goat producers. The questionnaire asks 'Which MLA courses or program(s)' is the respondent aware of, then probes for any additional courses.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1)

¹ Refer to appendix for questionnaire details.

Management Change - 2009 Participants (Tier 2 *n*=200)

In **2009**, **59%** of course participants have implemented management practice change as a result of course participation. This outcome represents 3,190 of the 5,407 participants contained in databases, the result is slightly less than 61% in 2008 and is **9% higher** than the **2009 target KPI of 50%**.

The participant lists provided by MLA for the 2009 KPI survey included details of **5,407** producers who had attended one or more of the MLA courses or programs since July 2008. The previous 2008 survey was underpinned by 2,789 producers, in 2007 3,418 producers and in the 2006 survey, 3,080 producers.

At the conclusion of the **2009** survey interval there is 4 years of longitudinal survey data, each year's data representing the most recent 12 months of LPI activity. The findings have been represented using 12 month data only, where trend analysis is required a rolling 12 month average analysis should be used.

The **2009 tier 2** survey sample yielded a sample of ***n*=200**, all respondents are livestock producers who have attended an MLA extension program in the last 12 months.

Looking at the **2009 tier 2** findings for the **most recent 12 months** of courses (i.e. the 12 months leading up to the 2009 survey):

- Of those **tier 2** producers surveyed who recently attended an MLA extension program, **59%** indicated they **had implemented a change in management practices** as a result of participating in an MLA course or program. This result is slightly down from 61% in 2008 yet is consistent with the recent trend of 58% and 50% in the 2007 and 2006 surveys. This result is also consistent with comments made in 2008 that suggested adoption rates of management practice change had slowed, if only because many producers had already made changes.
 - The highest change proportionally is amongst participants of **EDGEnetwork** courses (*n*=53), with **66%** of course participants indicating a change in management practices. This is up from 58% in 2008 and 60% in 2007 (this result appears to have been driven by Beef Cheque, MSA Beefing up business/performance, Prograze and GLM).
 - **50%** of producers participating in the **More Beef from Pastures** program implemented change, consistent with 51% in 2008, 53% in 2007 and up also up from 35% in the 2006 survey.
 - **Making More from Sheep** has also performed well with **57%** of participants making changes compared with 42% in 2008
 - **53%** of **PIRD's** participants changed management practices, also consistent with 52% in 2008 and 51% in 2007.
 - **17%** of **Beef Up Forum** participants changed management practices, down significantly from 36% in 2008.
 - **Each of the targeted producer segments** recorded varying rates of management change in the 2009 survey, **northern beef** recorded **43%** (down from 57% in 2008 & 65% in 2007), **southern beef** recorded **60%** (consistent with 62% in 2008 & an improvement on 52% in 2007) and **sheep/lamb** recorded **65%** (still performing well from 64% in 2008 & 68% in 2007).
- This poorer result is driven entirely by the **northern beef producer** segment where a smaller than usual sample was obtained (*n*=44), due to fewer participants and lower than usual completion rates. However, management practice change in the **southern beef** and **sheep/lamb** segments is consistent with past performance and exceeds the 2009 KPI's.
- Another contributing factor in lower change rates amongst producer segments is those producers (41%) who have not made changes, **44%** indicated they felt they were '**already doing**' the management practices described. Northern beef producers also stated financial circumstances and time constraints as reasons why they have not made changes.

The **2009 tier 2** respondents were also asked to **rate the value** of the courses they attended during 2009.

- In tier 2, **92%** of overall targeted producers surveyed indicated they rated the courses as **good** (2) or **high value** (3), down from 98% in 2008.
 - This equates to a mean rating of **2.27** and **exceeds** the **KPI target** of 2 out of 3.

Of the 2009 tier 2 course participants who had changed management practices, **90%** reported that the changed management practices they undertook had some **positive impact**, this is an increase from 71% in 2008.

Of these, the main **positive impacts** mentioned include:

- **Profitability increase**, mentioned by **25%** of course participants, up from 9% of participants in 2008.
- **Better herd management/stocking rates**, mentioned by **18%** of course participants.
- **Pasture utilisation**, mentioned by **12%** of course participants, down from 26% in 2008.
- **Increased productivity**, mentioned by **11%** of course participants, down from 17% in 2008.
- **Improved stock health**, mentioned by **11%** of course participants, is the same as 11% in 2008.
- **Better feed management**, mentioned by **10%** of course participants.
- **10%** of them indicated the main positive outcome was **improving business skills** and **viewing their activities as a business**, down from 27% in 2008.

The 2009 survey also identified a range of **issues preventing management change**, these include:

- Of the **41%** of course participants who have **not implemented** management change, **44%** indicated they felt they were '**already doing**' the management practices being represented in the course content. This is consistent with 44% in 2008 and is an increase on 27% in 2007. This result actually represents the successful uptake amongst targeted producers of the key messages and practices being promoted in the MLA courses.
- In 2009 again, as few as **7%** indicated the **drought conditions** were preventing them from implementing change, this is consistent with current climate conditions and remains the same as 7% in 2008. However this is still a dramatic decrease from 16% in 2007.
- **13%** felt the management practices being promoted did **not suit** their existing enterprise structure or operations, this is consistent with 16% in 2008 and 18% in 2007.
- **7%** indicated they did not have the **financial resources** to effect change, this is a drop from 15% in 2008 and indicates fewer producers blame their financial situation when failing to effect change.
- **9%** indicated they had only **recently completed the course** and were **still thinking about** change, similar to 11% in 2008.
- Interestingly **5%** indicated that '**changes were being made because they needed to be made**' and not because MLA suggested changes. It was suggested that changes were inevitable in the current climate where drought situations forces change.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2)

Contents

	Page
1 Background	10
2 Project Objectives	11
3 Methodology and Sample.....	11
3.1 Sample Overview	12
3.1.1 Sample Profile and Demographics.....	12
4 KPI Survey Results	16
4.1 MLA Course & Program Awareness (2009 Tier 1 Sample n=300)	16
4.1.1 MLA Course Awareness within Target Producer Segment	19
4.1.2 Overall Course Awareness by MLA Membership Status.....	22
4.1.3 MLA Programs or Courses Attended - Tier 1 only.....	23
4.1.4 Rating of MLA Programs or Courses	24
4.1.5 General Awareness of MLA Procedures & Tools	24
4.1.6 Management Practices Currently Undertaken.....	25
4.2 Change in Management Practices (2009 Tier 2 Sample n=200)	26
4.2.1 Management Changes Overall.....	26
4.2.2 Management Change Year on Year by Course	27
4.2.3 Management Change Year on Year by Producer Segment	28
4.2.4 Management Practices Changed after Attending MLA Courses or Programs.....	30
4.2.5 Management Practices Changed as a Result of Activity Participation	31
4.2.6 Why did the MLA course not influence management practice change?.....	32
4.2.7 Impact of Management Change	33
4.2.8 MLA Course attendance outcomes	34
4.2.9 Rating of MLA Programs and Courses.....	35
4.3 More Beef from Pastures & Making More from Sheep.....	36
4.3.1 More Beef from Pastures (MBfP) Course Influence (n=40).....	36
4.3.2 Making More from Sheep (MMfS) Course Influence (n=37).....	37
4.3.3 Procedures & Tools (MBfP).....	38
4.3.4 Procedures & Tools (MMfS)	39
4.4 Other Business insights - (2009 Tier 2 Sample n=200).....	39
4.4.1 MLA Program Element Most Influential	39
4.4.2 Farm Business Priorities (New).....	40
4.4.3 Internal and External Threats (New)	41
4.4.4 Confidence in Red Meat Industry (New)	42

5	Conclusions and Recommendations	42
5.1	Conclusions.....	42
5.2	Recommendations	43
6	Appendices.....	45
6.1	Appendix 1 Main data file(s) details	45
6.2	Appendix 2 – 2009 Questionnaire.....	46
6.2.1	<i>The Breeding EDGE</i> (Nth Producers only).....	70
6.2.2	<i>Terminal Sire Selection or Effective Breeding (lambs)</i>	71
6.2.3	<i>Wean More Lambs</i>	71
6.2.4	<i>The Nutrition EDGE</i> (Nth Producers only).....	71
6.2.5	<i>Effective Breeding (beef)</i>	71
6.2.6	<i>Money Making Mums (sheep)</i>	71

1 Background

Meat & Livestock Australia (MLA) is responsible for the communication and extension of on-farm R&D results to improve the profitability and sustainability of the Australian red meat industry.

Previous evaluations of the performance of the LPI communication programs have been undertaken using a quantitative sample design and telephone questionnaire. The **KPI 2009** survey provides a revision of the top line findings using an efficient survey sample to assess progress of the level of **awareness** of MLA programs, **participation** in them as well as the rate of **practice change** that recognises the innovations and management practices being promoted within established development programs.

MLA has contracted Axiom Research (Axiom) since 2005 to undertake market research to measure progress against these primary objectives. These objectives have been translated into specific **Key Performance Indicators** (KPI's) and apply across each of the targeted producer segments including, **Northern Beef**, **Southern Beef** and **Southern Sheep/Lamb** producers.

Axiom's research and survey activity in the rural sector is underpinned by FARMbase® (a database containing over 80,000 livestock producers across Australia). This is Axiom's own well segmented database of Australia's primary industry participants.

In **2009** Axiom conducted a **telephone survey** amongst a sample of **n=500** targeted producers, using a **2 tiered** sample approach to satisfy overall industry **awareness** as well as the rate of participant **change** of management practices.

MLA specified that the statistical validity of the survey and its findings must satisfy a 90% confidence interval. Axiom stratified the sample to provide statistically significant data for each of the 2 producer tiers, including northern and southern beef producer and southern sheep and/or lamb producer segments. The sample aims to represent all MLA's targeted livestock producers as well as those producers who have actually participated in MLA courses and programs.

- **Tier 1** was constructed to evaluate **program awareness** amongst the **general** or overall **livestock producer population**, it included **n=300** producers randomly selected from FARMbase®, to represent the overall livestock industry's awareness of the MLA courses and programs.
- **Tier 2** provides a measure of the **level of adoption** of management practices amongst MLA's **extension program participants**. For **2009** the survey obtained a sample of **n=200** producers. This includes only producers who participated in extension programs since the last survey undertaken in July 2008, including attendees of EDGENetwork (MSA Beefing up business/performance, Beef Cheque, Prograze & GLM), More Beef from Pastures, PDS/PIRDS, Making More from Sheep and Beef Up Forums from July 2008 to June 2009.

2 Project Objectives

The KPI 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006 surveys have been undertaken with a brief to provide the current level of course awareness and level of management change or adoption of knowledge and practices using an efficient survey methodology.

The project specifically aimed to measure Livestock Production Innovation's achievements towards the annual Key Performance Indicators (KPI's).

In **2009** the MLA's annual On-Farm Adoption & Capacity KPI's were to ensure that:

1. At least **80%** of targeted producers are aware of at least one MLA On-farm R&D communication/extension program, and MLA members rate their value as at least 2 out of 3 (Tier 1 Sample).
2. At least **10%** of targeted producers (representing at least 15% of the production base) have engaged and learned something of value to their business from at least one MLA On-farm R&D communication/extension learning activity or related information (Tier 1 Sample).
3. At least **50%** of those producers (representing at least 7.5% of the production base) who have engaged with MLA On-farm R&D communication/extension learning activities or related information, **change practices** as a result of their engagement (Tier 2 Sample).

The underlying objective of the KPI Survey is to evaluate the impact of the extension programs on producer management change, and the effectiveness of the communication, delivery and extension processes employed by LPI to achieve this change.

3 Methodology and Sample

Axiom has consistently followed the sampling protocols established in previous KPI survey's to construct a segmented sample of targeted livestock producers. The survey has been undertaken using 2 sample tiers and measures the KPI's relevant to producer segments within each sample tier.

1. **Tier 1 Sample ($n=300$):** Evaluates **awareness** of MLA course/program(s) using a **random sample** of the **targeted** population of **producers** segmented by their region and enterprise into Northern beef, Southern beef and Southern Sheep/Lamb.
(*FARMbase random sample - target sample $n=305$*)
2. **Tier 2 Sample ($n=200$):** Evaluates short-term **management practice changes** amongst a sample of producers who are participants from one or more of the MLA courses/programs since July 2008. These contacts were drawn from MLA's own databases of **course participants** from all MLA program or course groups undertaken from July 2008 to June 2009.
(*MLA participant sample - target sample $n=280$, sample shortfall is due to low sample frame compliance²*)

Based on this approach the project had two critical elements, the first is the detailed sample construction that represents the wider producer population and course participants as well as the validity issues required. Secondly is the design of the questionnaire and implementation of the survey using telephone interviewing.

The survey instrument was designed using a master questionnaire and code-frame response mechanism that directed specific questions at each of the target segments. The actual survey was managed using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) methodology, telephone interviewing (field-work) was undertaken by Ekas/Interviewing Australia (Axiom's preferred supplier of telephone field-work) with their senior analysts also undertaking all data processing.

² Sample compliance is where potential respondents refuse to be interviewed or cannot be contacted, poor quality contact lists in 2009 exacerbated this problem, particularly in the north where fewer producers are available to be surveyed.

- Screeners were also employed to ensure respondents qualified for the survey in terms of enterprise mix and type. Where respondents had less than 100 hectares we terminated the interview (refer to the questionnaire contained in the appendix).
- Those respondents who are course participants only completed those sections of the survey applicable to them.

Segmentation of the sample and the resulting data has been a key driver in the design of the survey. Aspects of the industry that influenced the sample included:

- Producer segments – Northern Beef, Southern Beef and Southern Sheep
- Included in the random sample quota were producer locations (High Rainfall, Wheat/Sheep, & Pastoral zones) representing the same production regions as in previous KPI surveys. This regional sample dimension ensures that producers are not inadvertently drawn from one region and avoiding any sample bias that may also result.
- MLA membership
- Farm size (hectares)
-

The detailed data tables generated (appended to the report) were collated to represent the findings by producer segment, age, farm size, scale, membership status and for course participants by courses/programs attended.

3.1 Sample Overview

3.1.1 Sample Profile and Demographics

MLA defines the market into three distinct property categories that encompass the targeted primary industries of beef, sheep and goats.

Table 1: Definition of Targeted Industry/Producer Segments

Northern Beef producers	All beef cattle producers in Queensland, Northern Territory, and the Kimberley/Pilbara regions of Western Australia
Southern Beef producers	All beef cattle producers in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, southern Western Australia and Tasmania
Sheep & Lamb producers	All sheep producers in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, southern Western Australia and Tasmania that are producing sheep or lambs for the red meat industry.
Goat producers³	All goat producers in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, southern Western Australia and Tasmania that are producing goats for the red meat industry.

In previous KPI survey's the tier 1 sample has been drawn from only these producer segments, this approach has been repeated for the **KPI 2009 survey** to ensure the findings directly reflect the changes for each targeted producer segment.

Axiom has constructed an overall sample of targeted producers (from within the specified MLA regions) from our own database of livestock producers known as FARMbase®, using as a base the available contacts detailed below.

³ A very small sample of goat producers was obtained, they appear in the tables as a separate enterprise type.

Table 2: FARMbase[®] Sample Profile (Available Contact Counts June 2009)

State:	Grain Sheep & Beef	Sheep & Beef	Sheep	Beef	TOTAL:
TOTALS:	21,102	7,274	9,526	26,409	64,311

This producer profile from FARMbase is based on ABS industry definitions. This profile excludes those livestock contacts that do not comply with MLA target producer specifications.

In order to qualify for one of the three MLA producer segments, respondents were screened on the basis of the significance of their key enterprise to their overall income. In the case of livestock operations the dominant enterprise is easily identified, however in mixed cereal farming situations respondents were segmented on the basis of respondents own ranking of their dominant livestock enterprise⁴.

Table 3: Sample Profile by Target Industry Segment

The table below represents details of the producer segments and *targeted* sample sizes to statistically evaluate variations within segments. The actual sample sizes obtained are also included in **bold**.

	Tier 1: FARMbase Contacts		Tier 2: MLA Course Contacts	
Producer Segment:	Awareness		Adoption/Management Change	
Northern Beef	<i>n=90</i>	<i>n=90</i>	<i>n=95</i>	<i>n=44</i>
Southern Beef	<i>n=100</i>	<i>n=98</i>	<i>n=89</i>	<i>n=81</i>
Sheep/Lamb	<i>n=100</i>	<i>n=102</i>	<i>n=78</i>	<i>n=72</i>
Goats	<i>n=15</i>	<i>n=10</i>	<i>n=18</i>	<i>n=3</i>
	<i>n=305</i>	<i>n=300</i>	<i>n=280</i>	<i>n=200</i>

The **Tier 1** (Awareness) sample target of *n=305* and **Tier 2** (Management practice change short-term) sample target of *n=280* has been determined using a minimum sample requirement of *n=50* for each industry segment (this sample base has, where possible, also been applied to each course segment within the overall quota construct), this is a minimum sample size that will satisfy a 90% confidence interval where response mean distribution (margin of error) is likely to be relatively small or narrow (within 10%).

Note that in Tier 1 some producers were also running goats, these respondents have been counted once in the total but have been included under goats and their other livestock enterprise. However it appears that in 2009 *n=10* respondents are involved only in goat production with a mean herd size of 673.

⁴ Refer to the questionnaire Section 1: Q1.

Table 4: Sample Profile by Livestock Numbers (breeding stock) – Tier 1 & Tier 2

	Northern Beef		
Breeding Cows: <i>(Note northern beef scale different from southern beef)</i>	Total Producers	Tier 1 n=90	Tier 2 n=44
Very Small (<100)	N=2,628 (25%)	n=11 (6%)	n=8 (18%)
Small (100-400)	N=3,443 (32%)	n=17 (9%)	n=12 (27%)
Medium (400-1600)	N=2,823 (26%)	n=32 (17%)	n=13 (30%)
Large (1600-5400)	N=1,395 (13%)	n=21 (11%)	n=7 (16%)
Very Large (>5400)	N=398 (4%)	n=9 (5%)	n=4 (9%)
Mean Herd Size		2,166 cows	1,344 cows
Sample Herd Size		196,330 cows	69,274 cows

	Southern Beef		
Breeding Cows: <i>(Note southern beef scale different from northern beef)</i>	Total Producers	Tier 1 n=98	Tier 2 n=81
Very Small (<100)	N=10,166 (33%)	n=28 (15%)	n=19 (23%)
Small (100-200)	N=13,699 (44%)	n=28 (15%)	n=16 (20%)
Medium (200-400)		n=19 (10%)	n=18 (22%)
Large (400-800)	N=4,594 (15%)	n=13 (7%)	n=13 (16%)
Very Large (>800)	N=2,075 (8%)	n=10 (5%)	n=15 (19%)
Mean Herd Size		519 cows	607 cows
Sample Herd Size		44,785 cows	46,453 cows

	Sheep/Lamb		
Breeding Ewes: <i>(Note code frame based on lambs for slaughter)</i>	Total Producers	Tier 1 n=102	Tier 2 n=72
Very Small (<200)	N=5,553 (24%)	n=15 (15%)	n=8 (11%)
Small (200-500)	N=6,516 (28%)	n=24 (24%)	n=10 (14%)
Medium (500-1000)	N=6,161 (27%)	n=22 (22%)	n=18 (25%)
Large (1000-2000)	N=3,293 (14%)	n=21 (21%)	n=15 (21%)
Very Large (>2000)	N=1,516 (7%)	n=20 (20%)	n=21 (29%)
Mean lamb turn-off numbers		1,184 lambs	1,873 lambs
Sample lamb turn-off numbers		139,335 lambs	149,765 lambs

2009 Tier 1 sample n=300, 2009 Tier 2 sample n=200 (3 goat farmers nei)

The sample distribution for both sample tiers by producer population for herd and flock size is remarkably consistent proportionally with MLA's industry profile data. This confirms that analysis of the survey findings by segment scale will reflect actual population distribution.

Where proportional variations occur the sample is over representing larger producers. In tier 2 this is a direct result of larger producers attending MLA activities, in tier 1 it is a function of the FARMbase database (does not contain many smaller producers) and sample response rates.

Mean herd and flock sizes in each producer segment provide confidence in the data's representation of management change amongst a representative proportion of the total beef producing herd and lamb producing flock.

Table 5: Available Course Participant Contacts (Source MLA)

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Course Participants List July 2006 – June 2007 (N=3,418)	2007 Weighted Sample as % of Course Participants	Course Participants List July 2007 – June 2008 (N=2,789)	2008 Weighted Sample as % of Course Participants	Course Participants List July 2008 – June 2009 (N=5,407)	2009 Weighted Sample as % of Course Participants
More Beef from Pastures	N=2,231	65%	N=379	14%	N=724	13%
Prime Time	N=142	4%	-	-	N=53	1%
PIRDS/PDS's	N=356	10%	N=643	23%	N=1,190	22%
EDGEnetwork	N=399	12%	N=379	14%	N=1,791	33%
Beef Up Forums	N=159	5%	N=445	16%	N=336	6%
Making More from Sheep	-	-	N=705	25%	N=1,546	29%
Evergraze	-	-			N=336	6%

The percentage distribution shown here is based on weighted course participants, the actual sample of course participants has been structured to provide a representative sample by course. This means that where participant numbers are low a valid sample has been obtained from which the findings have been calculated (i.e. in 2008 whilst EDGEnetwork participants represent 14% of all MLA course participants overall, the sample obtained was $n=57$, this equated to 19% of the total 2008 tier 2 sample).

Note: It is again apparent that the aggregation of course participation lists for the purpose of undertaking the survey may not have included all participants from all courses (refer to recommendations for comments on this situation).

Only targeted livestock producers ($n=500$) participated in the **KPI 2009 Survey**, these respondents were segmented into **2 sample tiers** to accurately represent awareness and adoption within the elements of the target population with different experiences of MLA activity.

Table 6: Actual Sample Segmentation

		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA/NT	WA	TAS	Nth Beef	Sth Beef	Sheep/Lamb	Goats
Tier 1 (Awareness)	$n=300$	68	40	70	52	50	20*	90	98	102	10*
Tier 2 (Adoption - Short Term)	$n=200$	53	40	40	35	21*	11*	44	81	72	3*

**Low Sample Base*

The Tier 2 sample has steadily increased to adequately represent the increasing number of programs and courses being undertaken by MLA. However, the 2009 sample has fallen short of the expected $n=280$ based on limited contacts within the sample frames provided.

Where interviewing has been unable to obtain minimum sample requirements some segments have fewer respondents than our target sample of $n=50$ and minimum base of $n=30$. This has resulted from low quality course contact lists and/or lack of compliance amongst the specific region or course contact list. These producer segments with samples below $n=30$ should be viewed with caution.

4 KPI Survey Results

4.1 MLA Course & Program Awareness (2009 Tier 1 Sample $n=300$)

This element of the KPI survey has been designed to determine targeted producers unaided and aided awareness of the MLA programs as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the overall communication strategy by LPI. The **Tier 1** sample is a **random sample** representative of the wider population of targeted producers.

The KPI 2009 Survey evaluated course awareness from an independent random sample of **$n=300$** livestock producers, where producers with all levels of exposure to MLA had an equal chance of participation.

- Overall a total of **92%** of all Tier 1 respondents are **aware** of one or more of the MLA courses or program(s) mentioned. This represents an increase of 7% from 85% in 2008 and 8% from 84% in 2007, and confirms the continued trend of rising awareness from 73% in 2005.
- **46%** of respondents indicated an unprompted or **unaided awareness** of MLA program(s), this represents an increase of 17% from 29% in 2008 and also up 8% from 38% in 2007 and is up from 28% in 2006.
- **90%** of respondents have a **prompted awareness** of one or more of the MLA courses or program(s) mentioned, this represents an increase of 10% from 80% in 2008 and is up 12% from 78% in 2007, and is a similar result to 84% in 2006.
- **8%** of respondents were **unaware** of any MLA courses or program(s), this is a marked improvement on 15% in 2008, 16% in 2007 on the 2006 level of 13%.

With the changing dynamic of producer populations, these awareness results will reflect the level of course activity and promotion associated with delivering them. Succession, acquisition and attrition rates within the primary producer segment, mean that further improvement on the 2009 awareness results will be difficult.

The percentages represented below will not add to overall awareness, as nett⁵ prompted or aided responses will include producers recognising other programs not previously mentioned.

Note: The Total Awareness analysis counts each producer only once no matter how many programs they recall either aided or unaided.

⁵ Where courses recalled are from the same course group, eg EDGENetwork, the nett result will remain the same however recall for those specific courses will increase.

Table 7: Unaided and Aided Course Awareness by Target Producer Segment

	2007 Tier 1 (n=206)			2008 Tier 1 (n=213)			2009 Tier 1 (n=300)		
	Unaided	Aided	Total	Unaided	Aided	Total	Unaided	Aided	Total
Northern Beef Producers (2007 n=49, 2008 n=54, 2009 n=90)	33%	76%	84%	17%	69%	72%	37%	86%	89%
Southern Beef Producers (2007 n=79, 2008 n=71, 2009 n=98)	41%	80%	82%	35%	82%	86%	47%	89%	90%
Sheep/Lamb Producers (2007 n=76, 2008 n=86, 2009 n=102)	39%	78%	86%	30%	86%	92%	52%	96%	97%
Total:	38%	78%	84%	29%	80%	85%	46%	90%	92%

The overall nett effect in the 2009 Survey, is that **92%** of livestock producers surveyed are aware of one or more MLA program(s), awareness appears to have risen across all segments, particularly amongst northern beef.

The use of the language 'MLA programs' in the questionnaire since 2007 appears to be more widely recognised or associated with MLA than in previous surveys, resulting in more consistent data. However, program names continue to cause confusion as the high aided or prompted results show.

Table 8: Unaided and Aided Course Awareness Overall

Overall awareness by course/program is as follows (Note: expressed as a percentage of all targeted livestock producers, not just those segments for which each program is targeted).

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Unaided Awareness			Aided Awareness			Total Awareness		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
More Beef from Pastures	14%	4%	6%	35%	33%	21%	46%	37%	27%
Prime Time (or Making More from Merino's)	2%	2%	2%	33%	21%	37%	34%	35%	37%
PIRD's (or Producer Demonstration Sites)	4%	1%	2%	29%	27%	23%	33%	28%	25%
EDGENetwork (any EDGE or EDGENetwork course)	13%	15%	12%	47%	64%	80%	50%	69%	81%
COP (Cost of Production workshops)	3%	1%	1%	36%	37%	23%	39%	38%	24%
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA with MLA support)	5%	-	2%	14%	14%	-	19%	15%	2%
Beef Up Forums	3%	-	3%	18%	10%	11%	22%	13%	15%
Grain and Graze	-	2%	1%	-	34%	31%	-	38%	32%
Making More from Sheep	-	3%	2%	-	34%	37%	-	38%	39%
Evergraze	-		2%	-	18%	22%	-	18%	24%
Total:	38%	29%	46%	78%	80%	90%	84%	85%	92%

KPI 2007 Tier 1 Sample Base n=206, KPI 2008 Tier 1 Sample Base n=213, KPI 2009 Tier 1 Sample Base n=300.

EDGEnetwork courses have been wound back in 2009, however awareness is still high for many EDGEnetwork related courses, particularly when prompted. These include **Prograze** with 45% awareness, **EDGEnetwork NFI**⁶ with 34%, **Terminal Sire Selection** with 23%, GLM with 22%. Also included were Lamb Cheque 15%, Beef Cheque 12%, Nutrition Edge 14% and Breeding Edge 13%.

A number of EDGEnetwork courses and programs were exclusively recalled by Northern Beef producers, bolstering overall awareness for EDGEnetwork courses. These included Northern Beef awareness for GLM (74%), Nutrition Edge (47%) and Breeding Edge (43%).

Total awareness of each program by target industry segment is as follows (Note: expressed as a percentage of those producers for which each program is targeted).

Table 9: Course Awareness by Target Producer Segment and Overall

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Northern Beef			Southern Beef			Sheep/Lamb			Total (n=206)	Total (n=213)	Total (n=300)
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
More Beef from Pastures	39%	2%	-	65%	63%	52%	33%	35%	27%	46%	37%	27%
Prime Time (or Making More from Merino's)	8%	17%	20%	32%	18%	31%	55%	60%	59%	34%	35%	37%
PIRD's (or Producer Demonstration Sites)	33%	20%	21%	37%	32%	28%	29%	29%	26%	33%	28%	25%
EDGEnetwork (any EDGE or EDGEnetwork course)	53%	46%	81%	51%	72%	76%	49%	81%	87%	50%	69%	81%
Cost of Production workshops	29%	44%	-	42%	38%	34%	43%	35%	34%	39%	38%	24%
Non MLA Events (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA with MLA support)	16%	11%	1%	18%	21%	2%	21%	12%	3%	19%	15%	2%
Beef Up Forums	37%	44%	44%	25%	4%	3%	9%	1%	1%	22%	13%	15%
Grain and Graze	-	37%	14%	-	23%	29%	-	45%	48%	-	38%	32%
Making More from Sheep	-	11%	12%	-	25%	30%	-	64%	71%	-	38%	39%
Evergraze	-	19%	14%	-	18%	27%	-	17%	31%	-	18%	24%
Total:	84%	72%	89%	82%	86%	90%	86%	92%	97%	84%	85%	92%

KPI 2007 Tier 1 Sample Base **n=206**, KPI 2008 Tier 1 Sample Base **n=213**, KPI 2009 Tier 1 Sample Base **n=300**.

MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Tables 34-38)

⁶ NFI = No Further Information provided by respondent.

4.1.1 MLA Course Awareness within Target Producer Segment

Previous MLA surveys have tracked the changing level of awareness for its various courses and programs by target producer segments. However, variations in each of the surveys objectives, methodology and course focus has meant that not all courses conducted by MLA can be tracked longitudinally (denoted by *na* in the following tables).

Table 10: Northern Beef Producers

Awareness - Northern Beef Producers	2005 survey (n=297)	2006 survey (n=50)	2007 survey (n=49)	2008 survey (n=54)	2009 survey (n=90)
Total Awareness:	69%	78%	84%	72%	89%
PIRDS/Producer Demonstration Sites	31%	38%	33%	20%	21%
Nett EDGE:	49%	56%	53%	46%	81%
EDGENetwork	21%	14%	29%	22%	42%
Breeding EDGE	19%	na	22%	-	43%
Nutrition EDGE// Northern Nutrition	31%	48%	27%	2%	47%
Grazing Land Management	26%	42%	35%	2%	74%
Cost of Production	na	na	29%	44%	na
Non MLA Events	na	14%	16%	11%	1%
Beef Up Forum	na	na	37%	44%	44%
Grain and Graze	na	na	na	37%	14%
Making More from Sheep	na	na	na	11%	12%
Evergraze	na	na	na	19%	14%
None (No Awareness of Programs at all)	31%	22%	16%	28%	11%

- In **2009, 89%** of Northern Beef Producers are **aware** of MLA programs and courses, this represents an increase from 72% in 2008 and is a return to awareness levels of 84% in 2007 and 78% in 2006, up considerably from 67% in 2005.
- This **higher level of awareness** in 2009 appears to be largely due to Beef Up Forum's and increased EDGENetwork activities based on GLM.
- The decline in awareness of **Grain and Graze** and **Evergraze** has also impacted on the significance of awareness amongst other courses.
- The significant reduction of **non-aware** respondents has meant that there is automatically 10% more awareness.

The EDGENetwork course awareness is the result of obtaining a nett EDGENetwork awareness from a random sample of producers. In 2005 the questionnaire prompted respondents to identify levels of awareness for specific EDGENetwork courses in the target regions, this process has been repeated in all subsequent surveys to support the validity of the nett EDGENetwork results comparison.

In 2009 the main EDGENetwork courses that targeted producers are aware of included, Prograze 47% (*n*=136), EDGENetwork 34% (*n*=102), Terminal Sire Selection 23% (*n*=68), GLM 22% (*n*=67), Lamb Cheque 15% (*n*=46), Beef Cheque 12% (*n*=36), Nutrition Edge 14% (*n*=42) and Breeding Edge 13% (*n*=39).

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1- Tables 34-38)

Table 11: Southern Beef Producers

Awareness - Southern Beef Producers	2005 survey	2006 survey	2007 survey	2008 survey	2009 survey
	Southern Beef (n=321)	Southern Beef (n=73)	Southern Beef (n=79)	Southern Beef (n=71)	Southern Beef (n=98)
Total Awareness:	73%	86%	82%	86%	90%
<i>PIRDS/Producer Demonstration Sites</i>	32%	32%	37%	32%	28%
<i>Prime Time or Making More from Merinos</i>	27%	26%	32%	18%	31%
<i>More Beef from Pastures</i>	61%	60%	65%	63%	52%
Nett EDGE:	26%	58%	51%	72%	76%
<i>EDGEnetwork</i>	25%	32%	25%	28%	33%
<i>Prograze</i>	na	40%	32%	61%	58%
<i>Sire Selection</i>	na	na	na	24%	22%
<i>Beef Cheque</i>	na	18%	4%	na	22%
<i>Lamb Cheque</i>	na	8%	1%	1%	24%
Cost of Production	na	29%	42%	38%	34%
Non MLA Events	na	32%	18%	21%	2%
Beef Up Forums	-	-	25%	4%	4%
Grain and Graze	na	na	na	23%	29%
Making More from Sheep	na	na	na	25%	30%
Best Wool/Best Lamb	na	na	na	10%	12%
Evergraze	na	na	na	18%	27%
None (No Awareness of Programs at all)	27%	14%	18%	14%	10%

- **90%** of Southern Beef producers are **aware** of MLA programs in **2009**, this is up slightly from 86% in 2008 and 82% in 2007, and is consistent with 2006 when 86% of Southern Beef producers were aware of MLA programs.

This result represents a long-term increase of 17% from 73% in 2005 for all programs promoted to this target producer segment. Specific beef programs remain prominent with 52% of producers aware of the MBfP course and 58% aware of Prograze. As many Southern Beef producers are also involved with sheep, the awareness of other off-target courses and programs is also significant.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Tables 34 - 38)

Table 12: Sheep/Lamb Producers

Awareness - Sheep/Lamb Producers	2005 survey (n=279)	2006 survey (n=78)	2007 survey (n=76)	2008 survey (n=86)	2009 survey (n=102)
Total Awareness:	80%	92%	86%	92%	97%
PIRDS/Producer Demonstration Sites	41%	42%	29%	29%	26%
Prime Time or Making More from Merinos	65%	68%	55%	60%	59%
Nett EDGE:	31%	72%	49%	81%	87%
<i>EDGEnetwork</i>	30%	33%	30%	26%	35%
<i>Prograze</i>	<i>na</i>	49%	26%	62%	72%
<i>Sire Selection</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	34%	39%
<i>Lamb Cheque</i>	<i>na</i>	17%	4%	1%	20%
Cost of Production	<i>na</i>	43%	43%	35%	34%
Non MLA Events	<i>na</i>	33%	21%	12%	3%
Grain and Graze	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	45%	48%
Making More from Sheep	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	64%	71%
Best Wool/Best Lamb	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	5%	24%
Evergraze	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>	17%	31%
None (No Awareness of Programs at all)	19%	8%	16%	8%	3%

- **97%** of Sheep/Lamb producers are aware of MLA programs in **2009**, up significantly from 92% in 2008 and the 2007 KPI survey where 85% were aware of MLA programs.

This is again consistent with previous survey results, from 2006 where 92% of Sheep/Lamb producers were aware of MLA programs and courses. The 2009 result represents a 17% increase on the 80% result in 2005.

- **Evergraze** is an example of an MLA activity focusing on all southern producers (n=200), overall n=58 southern producer respondents are aware of Evergraze, **29%** of all southern producers.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Tables 34 - 38)

4.1.2 Overall Course Awareness by MLA Membership Status

The KPI surveys have not set out to gather a representative sample of members versus non-members. However, the survey has recorded the membership status of the sample so we are able to reflect on the course awareness levels amongst members and non-members as separate population bases.

Of the targeted producers interviewed in the **2009 Tier 1 sample** ($n=300$), **71%** indicated they were **MLA Members** (received Feedback magazine). This is a fall from 85% recorded in 2008 and consistent with 2007 where 71% of respondents indicated they were MLA Members. These figures are likely to be more accurate than the 2006 result of 79%, which at the time was regarded as overstating the actual level of membership. A change in the question in 2007 to record receipt of Feedback magazine was deemed a more accurate measure of membership status.

- **95%** of members are aware of one or more MLA courses or program(s), this represents an increase from 87% in 2008 and a return to awareness levels similar to 93% in 2007. The result is consistent with 90% in 2006 and represents a long-term increase of **15%** since the 2005 survey.
- **86%** of members are now aware of the **EDGENetwork** courses, up from 73% in 2008 and 61% in 2007. Fewer members are aware of **More Beef from Pastures**, down to **33%** in 2009 from 39% in 2008. Only 5% of members do not recall any MLA course or programs, far fewer than the 13% recorded in 2008.
- Awareness amongst non-members has also increased to **84%**, marginally up from 83% in 2008 and up from 63% in 2007, indicating a high level of awareness of one or more MLA courses. This outcome amongst non-members continues to trend up from 59% in 2006 and 49% in the 2005 survey.
- **12%** of non-members are aware of **MBfP**, down from 25% in 2008 and **70%** are aware of **EDGENetwork**, up from 58% in 2008.

Table 13: Course Awareness by Membership Status

	2005 Awareness ($n=907$)		2006 Awareness ($n=204$)		2007 Awareness ($n=201$)*		2008 Awareness ($n=204$)*		2009 Awareness ($n=300$)	
	Member	Non Member	Member	Non Member	Member ($n=147$)	Non Member ($n=54$)	Member ($n=180$)	Non Member ($n=24$)	Member ($n=212$)	Non Member ($n=73$)
Membership Status	-	-	79%	21%	71%	29%	85%	15%	71%	24%
Aware of MLA Programs	80%	49%	90%	59%	93%	63%	87%	83%	95%	84%
None (No Awareness of Programs at all)	19%	49%	10%	41%	7%	37%	13%	17%	5%	16%

*In the 2007 Tier 1 sample, 2% or $n=5$ producers did not know if they were MLA members, In the 2008 sample, 4% or $n=9$ producers did not know if they were MLA members and in the 2009 sample, 5% or $n=15$ producers did not know if they were MLA members.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Table 38)

4.1.3 MLA Programs or Courses Attended - Tier 1 only

The KPI survey aims to determine what proportion of targeted producers overall had attended an MLA program or course and if not what reason did they give for choosing not to participate in MLA extension programs. (2009 Tier 1 aware sample $n=278^*$)

- **31%** of the **92%** of targeted producers surveyed in **2009** who are **aware** of MLA courses indicated they had attended or participated in an MLA course or program, down from 48% in 2008. This equates to **28%** of overall targeted producers, a fall from 40% in 2008, still up from 21% in the 2007 survey.
- **16%** of those 28% of overall targeted producers who had attended or participated in an MLA course or program, had done so within the last 12 months and **15%** of these producers had attended a course more than 12 months ago, this represents the above total of **31%**.
- **69%** of the **92%** of targeted producers surveyed in **2008** who are **aware** of MLA courses indicated they had **never** attended or participated in an MLA course or program, this does not include the 8% of producers who are unaware of MLA courses at all. This is well up from 52% in 2008 and represents a significant fall in course participation. Of these 69% who did not attend, **16%** indicated they did **not know about the course** despite indicating they were aware of MLA courses and programs. This was higher amongst non-members (25%) and indicates that despite high overall course awareness, producers are not receiving specific information about local activities.
- **36%** of **members** indicated they had attended an MLA course, down from 51% in 2008.

Table 14: Attended MLA Programs

	Total Sample:		Northern Beef		Southern Beef		Sheep/Lamb		Goats	
Survey Year:	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Nett attendance	48%	31%	38%	33%	52%	24%	47%	35%	100%	22%
Yes (1 course in the last 12 months)	16%	16%	18%	19%	13%	12%	18%	16%	-	22%
Yes (1 course prior to last 12 months)	31%	15%	21%	14%	39%	12%	29%	19%	100 %	-
No (Never attended)	52%	69%	62%	68%	48%	76%	53%	65%	-	78%

*2009 Tier 1 sample $n=278$ (92% Aware of courses), 2008 Tier 1 sample $n=181$ (85% Aware of courses)

The KPI survey seeks to understand why producers chose not to participate in MLA extension programs. Some producers provided more than one reason for not being able to attend.

- **40%** of those respondents interviewed who did not attend any MLA courses indicated that **‘they had no time’**. This is consistent with 41% in 2008 and 39% in 2007.
- **16%** of non-attendees indicated they **‘did not know about’** the courses, up from 15% in 2008 and less than 19% in 2007 reflecting the impact of the local communication strategy for courses.
- **8%** indicated the **‘topics were of no interest’** to them, up from 14% in 2008 and 11% in 2007.
- Only **2%** of non-attendees cited the **drought** as preventing them from attending any MLA course or program, this is less than the 3% in 2008 and well down on the 6% recorded in the 2007 survey and possibly reflects a slight improvement in pasture growth since 2007.
- **2%** indicated courses were too expensive, **1%** said they did not like group activities.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Table 39-40)

4.1.4 Rating of MLA Programs or Courses

A question introduced in the 2008 KPI survey aims to determine the **value of MLA courses** to producers by asking them to rate the value of the course or program that they had experience with. This question has been answered by each of the sample tiers relative to their level of awareness or participation in any MLA course or program.

In order to represent the distribution of results a value has been assigned to the response range to generate a mean rating out of 3. The question asks producers to indicate if they placed a high or low value on the courses and programs they have experienced. The analysis model then applies a simple numeric rating out of 3 to the responses, where a **rating of 0 = no value** at all and a **rating of 3 = high value** or the top rating possible.

- In tier 1, **90%** of targeted producers surveyed who attended courses, indicated they rated the courses as **good or high value**, up from 62% in 2008. This equates to a mean rating of 2.26 or well over 2 out of 3. This is up from **1.55** in 2008.
- This comprised of **36%** of targeted producer who rated the courses they had experience with as **high value** (up from 15% in 2008), and **54%** as **good value** (up from 47% in 2008), followed by 8% as little value (down from 14% in 2008) and 1% as no value at all (down from 23% in 2008).
- **Northern beef producers** recorded the **highest value** ratings with an aggregated **97%** of producers rating the MLA courses as **good or high value**.
- **87%** of the tier 1 course participants were **MLA members**, **90%** of them indicated they rated the courses as **good or high value**, this also resulted in a mean rating of **2.26** (well above the 2009 KPI of 2).

Table 15: Rating or Value of Courses Experience with

Survey Year:	Total Sample:		Northern Beef		Southern Beef		Sheep/Lamb		Goats*	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
High Value (3)	15%	36%	10%	35%	15%	41%	19%	34%	-	50%
Good Value (2)	47%	54%	46%	62%	52%	50%	42%	51%	100 %	50%
Little Value (1)	14%	8%	10%	4%	16%	9%	15%	11%	-	-
No Value at all (0)	23%	1%	43%	-	16%	-	24%	3	-	-
Mean Value:	1.55	2.26	1.33	2.31	1.66	2.32	1.56	2.17	2.00	2.5

Tier 1 Sample 2009 n=85, 2008 n=181

* Very low sample base.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Table 41, course value means table)

4.1.5 General Awareness of MLA Procedures & Tools

The random sample of n=300 targeted producers were also asked to identify any of the MLA Procedures and Tools that the courses and programs promote:

- **69%** indicated they are aware of **Feedback magazine**
- **40%** are aware of **Prograzier**
- **37%** are aware of **Cost of Production (COP) calculators**
- **31%** are aware of **Pasture Ruler**

- **31%** are aware of **Stocking Rate calculator**
- **24%** are aware of **Feed Demand calculator**
- **21%** are aware of **Rainfall to Pasture growth outlook tool**
- **17%** are aware of **Frontier magazine** and **8%** are aware of **Beefspecs tool**
- Only **3%** of producers mentioned **other tools** not included in the codeframe.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Table 42-44)

4.1.6 Management Practices Currently Undertaken

In **2009** tier 1 producers were asked what management practices they currently undertook, this results allows some comparison with management practices changed as a result of course participation amongst the tier 2 producer sample.

- **All** of the $n=300$ tier 1 producers interviewed indicated they are currently **undertaking at least 1** of the management practices listed, **41%** of producers undertake between **12-16** of the management practices listed (mean number of practices **12.63**).

Table 16: Percentage of Tier 1 Respondents who Currently undertake Management Practices

Management Practices:	Total Sample:	Northern Beef	Southern Beef	Sheep/Lamb
Fat score or condition score stock at joining	27%	17%	27%	37%
Pay for services of a specialist advisor	23%	16%	17%	36%
Fat score or condition score stock selling	62%	54%	58%	74%
Fat score or condition score stock at lambing	14%	1%	15%	25%
Track for a particular Market for livestock based on average age at sale time	55%	64%	64%	40%
Calculate the Cost of Production (COP)	76%	77%	78%	74%
Routinely weigh livestock to monitor growth / Weight gain	44%	33%	52%	49%
Measure Weaning %	64%	69%	50%	73%
Measure Mortality %	61%	66%	69%	49%
Use EBV's in sire selection	41%	31%	45%	45%
Change stocking rates / Measure and adjust stocking rates	72%	78%	70%	66%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using rotation length	45%	37%	48%	48%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using pasture residues	48%	52%	50%	42%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using pasture availability	77%	78%	80%	74%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using animal requirements	63%	56%	68%	66%
Routinely assess pasture quality eg. dry matter	55%	73%	47%	48%
Calculate a forage or pasture budget	23%	23%	24%	21%
Pregnancy test cows routinely	40%	53%	53%	19%

First calf heifers managed separately from main herd	51%	58%	78%	22%
Monitor worm egg counts	25%	4%	17%	47%
Vaccinate to prevent clostridial diseases	54%	30%	61%	71%
Rotationally graze (regularly move same mob)	60%	44%	67%	65%
Increase the % of land sown to perennial pastures	29%	21%	34%	29%
Have a written formal farm management plan including a weed management plan	23%	27%	20%	24%
Develop a formal succession plan	32%	26%	34%	37%

KPI 2009 Tier 1 Sample Base $n=300$.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1 - Table 45)

4.2 Change in Management Practices (2009 Tier 2 Sample $n=200$)

4.2.1 Management Changes Overall

The KPI survey specifically asks producers if they have changed their management practices as a **direct** result of participating in the specific course or program(s) they indicated they had attended. This approach **links management change** directly with specific **course attendance**.

The KPI **2009** Survey has sampled $n=200$ course attendees from the **most recent 12 months** to determine if course participation directly influenced a change in management or adoption of new management practices. This sample is made up of 83% who indicated they were MLA members, 22% Northern Beef, 41% Southern Beef and 36% Sheep/Lamb, 2% were Goat producers.

Over the past 12 months, 51% of course participants interviewed attended 1 course, 41% had attended 2 courses and 6% had attended 3 courses.

- **59%** of course participants indicated they have **changed management practices** as a direct result of attending one or more of the MLA course or programs they had attended in the **last 12 months**.
- This represents a 2% fall from 61% in 2008 and is up 1% on 58% in 2007. The 2009 result is 9% higher than the 2006 survey where 50% of course participants changed practices.
- This result is driven entirely by the **northern beef producer** segment where a smaller than usual sample was obtained, however the sample of $n=44$ has still indicated a low rate of change, at only 43% this is lower than previous surveys and does not meet the 2009 KPI of 50%.
 - Sample compliance and contact quality⁷ meant that the target sample of $n=95$ was not achieved (all available contacts were exhausted before closing the quote, standard 3 call attempt contact procedures were used).
- Management practice change in the **southern beef** and **sheep/lamb** segments is consistent with past performance and exceeds the 2009 KPI's.

⁷ Refer to recommendation at the conclusion of the report where tier 2 list quality is discussed in more detail.

Table 17: Management Practice Change – Year on Year by Target Producer Segment

Producer Segments:	2006 Survey	2007 Survey	2008 Survey	2009 Survey
	12 Month Change	12 Month Change	12 Month Change	12 Month Change
Northern Beef Producers	49%	65%	57%	43%
Southern Beef Producers	45%	52%	62%	60%
Sheep/Lamb Producers	55%	68%	64%	65%
Total :	50%	58%	61%	59%

KPI 2006 Tier 2 sample base **n=236**, KPI 2007 Tier 2 sample base **n=287**, KPI 2008 Tier 2 sample base **n=295**, KPI 2009 Tier 2 Sample Base **n=200**.

The main course attended⁸ was EDGE with 39% (*n*=77) of the tier 2 sample attending this course stream.

- This aggregated EDGE result is made up of MSA Beefing Up Business 15% (*n*=29), Beef Cheque 10% (*n*=19), Prograze 8% (*n*=16), GLM 4% (*n*=7), EDGENetwork 4% (*n*=7) and Lamb Cheque 2% (*n*=4).
- Other courses attended included, MBfP 27% (*n*=50), MMfS 21% (*n*=42), PIRD's 18% (*n*=35), Beef Up Forums 15% (*n*=29), Prime Time 4% (*n*=8) and COP 3% (*n*=5).

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 -Table 40)

4.2.2 Management Change Year on Year by Course

Management change when represented **year on year** provides an evaluation of the impact of each MLA course or program specifically within each KPI survey year. The numbers below represent the percentage of course participants who changed management practices as a direct result of attending that particular course.

- During **2009**, **59%** of all course attendees were influenced to change management practices, this overall figure is down marginally from 61% in 2008. This may be the result of the poor sample availability in northern beef.
- The highest change proportionally is amongst participants of **EDGENetwork** courses with **66%** indicating change, this higher than normal result was due to the high performance amongst sheep/lamb producers.

⁸ Readers note that some of the course identification and attendance was collected directly from respondents using information provided by MLA, other courses attended is based solely on the recollection of the respondent and may be subject to a margin of error in the recall of the specific course they actually attended.

Table 18: Management Change - Year on Year by Course Participants

	2006 (n=236)	2007 (n=287)	2008 (n=295)	2009 (n=200)
More Beef from Pastures*	35%	53%	51%	50%
Prime Time/Making More from Merinos	44%	85%	-	-
PIRD's/Producer Demonstration Sites	72%	51%	52%	53%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	47%	60%	58%	66%
Cost of Production	36%	48%	48%	-
Beef Up Forum	-	46%	36%	17%*
Making More from Sheep	-	-	42%	57%
Evergraze	-	-	-	29%
Total Changed:	50%	58%	61%	59%

2006 Tier 2 sample n=236, 2007 Tier 2 sample n=287, 2008 Tier 2 sample n=295, 2009 Tier 2 sample n=200.

* Low Sample base n=23.

4.2.3 Management Change Year on Year by Producer Segment

Table 19: Management Change - Northern Beef Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Northern Beef - Course Participants				Course Participants Who Changed Management Practices			
	2006 (n=53)	2007 (n=96)	2008 (n=96)	2009 (n=44)	2006	2007	2008	2009
More Beef from Pastures	n=3*	-	-	n=1*	67%	-	-	-
PIRD's/Producer Demonstration Sites	n=8*	n=7*	-	n=5*	75%	71%	-	75%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	n=45	n=53	n=46	n=19	42%	69%	52%	61%
Beef Up Forums	-	n=35	n=47	n=22	-	46%	36%	18%
Beef Plan	-	-	n=20	n=1	-	-	75%	-

*Low Sample base

- Overall, **43%** of northern beef producers have changed management practices as a result of course participation during the 2008 - 2009 survey interval. This result is down from 57% in 2008, the poorer performance reflects the impact of Beef Up Forums and the weaker samples obtained from key course contact lists (PIRD's, MSA and GLM), as well as external influences such as lack of financial resources and time (refer to section 4.2.5).

Table 20: Management Change - Southern Beef Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Southern Beef - Course Participants				Course Participants Who Changed Management Practices			
	2006 (n=74)	2007 (n=81)	2008 (n=90)	2009 (n=81)	2006	2007	2008	2009
More Beef from Pastures	n=61	n=51	n=57	n=38	33%	50%	51%	55%
PIRD's/Producer Demonstration Sites	n=6*	n=14*	n=16*	n=14*	67%	29%	38%	64%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	n=15	n=14*	n=6*	n=40	53%	34%	67%	62%
Cost of Production	n=4*	n=5*	n=11	-	75%	100%	36%	-

*Low sample base

- **60%** of southern beef producers have changed management practices as a result of course participation during the 2008 - 2009 survey interval, consistent with 62% in 2008.
- This has largely been driven by participation in **MBfP** and **EDGENetwork** programs where **55%** and **62%** of participants respectfully have made changes a result of participation.

Table 21: Management Change - Sheep/Lamb Producers

MLA Course/Program classifications:	Sheep/Lamb - Course Participants				Course Participants Who Changed Management Practices			
	2006 (n=109)	2007 (n=109)	2008 (n=91)	2009 (n=72)	2006	2007	2008	2009
Prime Time	n=66	n=19*	-	n=6*	42%	89%	-	-
PIRD's/Producer Demonstration Sites	n=18*	n=26	n=14*	n=16*	72%	58%	64%	38%
EDGE/EDGENetwork workshops	n=38	n=27	n=5*	n=16*	50%	69%	100%	100%
Cost of Production	n=7*	n=24	n=22	n=2*	14%	46%	55%	-
Making More from Sheep	-	-	n=50	n=38	-	-	42%	60%

*Low sample base

- **65%** of sheep / lamb producers have changed management practices as a result of course participation during the 2008 - 2009 survey interval, consistent with 64% in 2008.
- Sheep/lamb producers attend a wide range of courses, more than other segments, with change being effected as a result of attending many of them, the main influence is **MMfS** with **60%** of participating producers making management changes as a result of attending.
- **Evergraze** is an MLA activity targeted at all southern producers, the 2009 quota for Evergraze participants was for n=7 respondents from this activity. The survey also picked up 2 other activity participants who in addition to their primary activities also participated in Evergraze. Based on a sample of n=7 any specific activity analysis is statistically unsound (limited sample capacity to provide further analysis).

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Tables 40 - 44 & MLA KPI Request 140909 Tier 2 – Table 4)

4.2.4 Management Practices Changed after Attending MLA Courses or Programs

The 2005, 2006 2007 and 2008 survey's repeatedly identified grazing management, pasture management, supplementary feeding and nutrition practices as the main areas in management where producers have made changes.

In **2009** this management change question was expanded to include specific current practices as well as providing further insight into the significance of those changes that have been made. Where direct comparisons are possible last years figures have also been represented.

- **20%** of those 59% of course attendees who made changes, made grazing management changes by **rotationally grazing** (equivalent of 12% of all course participants). This represents a fall from 27% in 2008.

Whilst **EDGENetwork** and **MMfS** workshops appear to have had the greatest impact on management change in terms of producer numbers, on average producers made **2.53** significant management changes as a result of course attendance. The best performing program is **PIRD's** where, on average, **3.67** management changes have been made.

Table 22: Percentage of Course Attendees who Changed Management by Practices Changed

Management Practices:		PIRD's	MMfS	COP	Beef Up Forums	More Beef from Pastures	EDGE	Total:
	2009	n=34	n=37	-	n=23	n=40	n=53	n=200
Rotationally Graze / Regularly move livestock	2009	10%	11%	-	-	29%	29%	20%
	2008	37%	12%	35%	17%	36%	24%	27%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement / rotation length	2009	29%	4%	-	20%	25%	14%	16%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement / pasture residues	2009	24%	4%	-	-	8%	9%	9%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement / pasture availability	2009	19%	4%			13%	11%	10%
Feeding Practices / Supplements / Supplementary Feeding	2009	19%	33%	-	20%	17%	9%	19%
	2008	26%	12%	20%	22%	6%	36%	20%
Other Mating / Birthing Weaning Practices	2009	19%	33%	-	-	17%	6%	18%
Calculate the Cost of Production (COP)	2009	19%	-	-	20%	8%	6%	8%
	2008	11%	8%	45%	13%	6%	9%	13%
Routinely weigh livestock to monitor growth / Weight gain	2009	5%	7%	-	-	4%	9%	6%
	2008	4%	12%	5%	4%	12%	6%	7%
Measure Weaning %	2009	-	4%	-	20%	8%	6%	5%
Use EBV's in sire selection	2009	29%	-	-	-	-	9%	8%
Change stocking rates / Measure and adjust stocking rates	2009	14%	11%	-	-	4%	17%	11%
	2008	7%	12%	5%	13%	-	3%	6%

Tier 2 2009 Sample base n=200, Tier 2 2008 Sample base n=295.

Percentages represent the proportion of 2009 survey participants who have changed management practices (59%) as a result of attending these specific courses.

- Additional question responses to these changes are included in the tables where the latest **average weaning %** is **80%**, which is down from the nominated previous weaning % of 85%.
- Rotational grazing or regularly moving mobs is a practice change implemented by 20% of participants, of these **54%** do this on a **weekly** basis.
- **Retention is high, 99%** of those **59%** of course participants who made changes are still using the new or changed management practice.

4.2.5 Management Practices Changed as a Result of Activity Participation

In **2009** tier 2 producers were asked what management practices they changed as a result of participating in an MLA activity, these results allow some comparison with management practices currently undertaken amongst the tier 1 producer sample (refer table 16).

- **59%** of the $n=200$ tier 2 producers interviewed indicated they are changed **at least 1** of the management practices listed, on average producers made changes to **2.5** of the management practices listed.

Table 23: Percentage of Tier 2 Respondents who Changed Management Practices

Management Practices:	Total Sample:	Northern Beef	Southern Beef	Sheep/ Lamb
Fat score or condition score stock at joining	8%	11%	6%	9%
Pay for services of a specialist advisor	xx%	16%	17%	36%
Fat score or condition score stock selling	3%	5%	4%	2%
Fat score or condition score stock at lambing	3%	5%	-	6%
Track for a particular Market for livestock based on average age at sale time	4%	11%	4%	2%
Calculate the Cost of Production (COP)	8%	11%	10%	4%
Routinely weigh livestock to monitor growth / Weight gain	6%	11%	2%	6%
Measure Weaning %	5%	11%	2%	4%
Measure Mortality %	1%	5%	-	-
Use EBV's in sire selection	8%	11%	10%	6%
Change stocking rates / Measure and adjust stocking rates	11%	16%	10%	9%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using rotation length	16%	21%	24%	6%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using pasture residues	9%	11%	12%	6%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using pasture availability	10%	11%	12%	6%
Set grazing targets to determine stock movement using animal requirements	8%	11%	8%	2%
Routinely assess pasture quality eg. dry matter	7%	5%	6%	9%
Calculate a forage or pasture budget	6%	-	10%	4%
Pregnancy test cows routinely	3%	-	4%	2%

First calf heifers managed separately from main herd	1%	5%	-	-
Monitor worm egg counts	2%	-	-	4%
Vaccinate to prevent clostridial diseases	2%	11%	-	-
Rotationally graze (regularly move same mob)	20%	-	35%	15%
Increase the % of land sown to perennial pastures	1%	5%	-	-
Have a written formal farm management plan including a weed management plan	3%	5%	4%	2%
Develop a formal succession plan	2%	11%	-	-
Feeding practices – feed letting/supplementary feeding	19%	32%	10%	23%

KPI 2009 Tier 1 Sample Base **n=300**.

(refer to MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 71 - 114)

4.2.6 Why did the MLA course not influence management practice change?

Respondents who had not made any changes to management practices as a result of attending an MLA course were asked why not?

In **2009**, **41%** of course participants did not make any changes, compared with **39%** in **2008** and 36% in 2007. These respondents were asked to indicate why they had not done so.

Many respondents provided more than one reason for not implementing change, the main responses have been coded and represented below:

- **44%** indicated they felt they were '**already doing**' the management practices being represented in the course content. This is consistent with 44% in 2008 and is an increase on 27% in 2007. This result continues to represent the successful uptake amongst targeted producers of the key messages and practices being promoted in the MLA courses.
- In 2009 again, as few as **7%** indicated the **drought conditions** were preventing them from implementing change, this is consistent with current climate conditions and remains the same as 7% in 2008. However this is still a dramatic decrease from 16% in 2007.
- **13%** felt the management practices being promoted did **not suit** their existing enterprise structure or operations, this is consistent with 16% in 2008 and 18% in 2007.
- **7%** indicated they did not have the **financial resources** to effect change, this is a drop from 15% in 2008 and indicates fewer producers blame their financial situation when failing to effect change. This was highest amongst northern beef producers where 12% blamed limited financial resources as the reason for not making management change.
- **9%** indicated they had **time constraints** or had only **recently completed the course** and were **still thinking about** change, similar to 11% in 2008. Again this was highest in northern beef with another 12% indicating they might make changes soon.
- Interestingly **5%** indicated that changes were being made **despite** MLA involvement. It was suggested that changes were inevitable in the current climate.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 118)

4.2.7 Impact of Management Change

The KPI **2009** Survey has again attempted to measure the **impact** that management change has had on targeted producers. The Tier 2 sample of **n=200** course attendees from the most recent 12 months were asked to nominate the level of impact the adoption of change has had on their farm business.

- In the recent 12 months, **90%** of all course participants reported that the changed management practices they undertook as a result of attending an MLA course or program had some **positive impact**, this is an increase from 71% in 2008.
- Alternatively **3%** of course participants interviewed felt the management changes they had implemented had No Impact, this is 23% less than 26% recorded in 2008 and reflects the more long term results previously obtained from the Tier 3 sample in 2008.

Table 24: Impact of Management Practice Change by Target Industry Segment

		Total Sample:	Northern Beef	Southern Beef	Sheep/ Lamb
Very Positive Impact	2009	32%	32%	39%	28%
	2008	19%	23%	21%	13%
Some Positive Impact	2009	58%	47%	55%	66%
	2008	52%	46%	59%	54%
No Impact at all	2009	3%	5%	4%	-
	2008	26%	28%	18%	33%
Negative Impact	2009	1%	5%	-	-
	2008	-	2%	-	-

Tier 2 2009 Sample base **n=200**, 2008 Tier 2 Sample Base **n=295**, *low sample base

The courses that appear to have the most positive impact include:

- **MBfP** where **92%** of participants said the course had a positive or very positive impact.
- **EDGEnetwork** where **92%** of participants said the course had a positive impact.
- **PIRD's** where **90%** of participants indicated the course had a positive or very positive impact.
- Only a single **Beef Up Forum** participant provided some **negative** feedback, meeting market specifications meant some inefficiency was being introduced (very low sample base).

Interestingly in **2009**, of those **90%** of producers who indicated a **positive impact** or outcome, the following specified in what way did the positive outcome manifest itself:

- **25%** nominated **profitability increases** and **11%** nominated **productivity increases**
- **18%** better herd management/stocking rates
- **12%** pasture utilisation
- **3%** nominated soil erosion, land management and sustainability
- **3%** nominated **cost of production**

In the previous **2008** survey, 71% of course participants reported a positive impact, these included:

- **27%** nominated **viewing enterprise as a business**
- **9%** nominated **profitability increases** and **17%** nominated **productivity increases**
- **26%** pasture utilisation
- **8%** better herd management/stocking rates
- Similarly, **3%** nominated **cost of production**
- **1%** nominated **environmental impact**

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 115-117)

4.2.8 MLA Course attendance outcomes

The survey also explored (using an open ended question) what the **positive and negative outcomes** were as a result of attending any of the courses.

Positives - of those **90%** of course participants who saw positive outcomes (up from 71% in 2008):

- **25%** indicated the main positive outcome was an increase in **profitability**, this is up from 9% in 2008.
- **10%** of them indicated the main positive outcome was that **viewing activities as a business**, down from 27% in 2008.
- **12%** identified **pasture utilisation** as the main positive outcome, down from 26% in 2008.
- **11%** said **increased productivity** which is down from 17% in 2008.
- **11%** again indicated that **improved stock health** was a positive outcome.

Negatives - only 2 respondents indicated a negative outcome and neither nominated anything specific.

Table 25: Positive Outcome by Course Attendees

Areas of impact:		PIRD's	MMMS	COP	Beef Up Forums	MBfP	EDGE	Total:
	2009 (2008)	n=21 (n=24)	n=27 (n=28)	- (n=26)	n=5* (n=28)	n=24 (n=45)	n=35 (n=44)	n=106 (n=211)
Management Skills / Business (Increase)	2009 2008	11% 25%	8% 14%	- 54%	33% 32%	5% 29%	13% 23%	10% 27%
Better herd management / Better stocking rates	2009	5%	4%	-	-	27%	34%	18%
Pasture Utilisation (Increase)	2009 2008	5% 26%	21% 29%	- 31%	- 11%	9% 40%	16% 27%	12% 26%
Productivity (Increase)	2009 2008	21% 17%	8% 18%	- 23%	33% 14%	18% 20%	3% 9%	11% 17%
Improved Stock health	2009 2008	- 13%	17% 18%	- 4%	- 11%	9% 11%	9% 16%	11% 11%
Improved feed management	2009 2008	16% 17%	8% 7%	- 4%	- 7%	14% 9%	9% 18%	10% 10%
Profitability (Increase)	2009 2008	47% 4%	17% 4%	- 19%	- -	32% 9%	13% 11%	25% 9%

Tier 2 2008 Sample, n=211, Tier 2 2009 Sample, n=106 (includes only respondents who mention positive outcomes)

*low sample base

Many specific tools and management practices were nominated as **positive** outcomes, **8%** simply said that it confirmed they were heading in the **right direction**.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 116)

4.2.9 Rating of MLA Programs and Courses

As reported in the Tier 1 summary a question has been introduced into the KPI survey which aims to determine the **value of MLA courses** to producers by asking them to rate the value of the course or program that they have participated in.

In order to represent the distribution of results a value has been assigned to the response range to generate a mean rating out of 3, respondents were given this value rating when the question was asked. In developing the rating model a 0 value has been included to allow respondents to answer with no value at all.

This measure asks producers to indicate if they placed a high or low value on the courses and programs being offered. The analysis model then applies a simple numeric rating out of 3 to the responses, where a **rating of 0 = no value** at all and a **rating of 3 = high value** or the top rating possible.

- In Tier 2 Overall, **92%** of overall targeted producers surveyed in **2009** indicated they rated the courses as **good or high value**, down slightly from 98% in 2008. This equates to a mean course value rating of 2.27 slightly below **2.43** in 2008 (simply put, this equates to 2 ¼ out of 3, down from 2 ½).
- Overall this result is comprised of 37% of course participants who rated the courses they had experience with as high value and 55% as good value followed by 8% as little value, almost no Tier 2 respondents rated courses as having no value at all. These value results have slipped slightly from 2008 and again could reflect the poor distribution of Tier 2 sample by courses.

Table 26: Rating or Value of Courses Participated in last 12 months

		Total Sample:	Northern Beef	Southern Beef	Sheep/ Lamb
High Value (3)	2009	37%	27%	43%	33%
	2008	46%	54%	48%	33%
Good Value (2)	2009	55%	61%	49%	58%
	2008	52%	45%	50%	62%
Little Value (1)	2009	8%	11%	7%	7%
	2008	2%	1%	1%	5%
No Value at all (0)	2009	1%	-	-	1%
	2008	-	-	1%	-
Mean Value:	2009	2.27	2.16	2.36	2.24
	2008	2.43	2.54	2.44	2.27

2009 Tier 2 sample n=200, 2008 Tier 2 sample n=295

- **92%** of course participants indicated they **would participate in a similar activity again**.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 46)

4.3 More Beef from Pastures & Making More from Sheep

4.3.1 More Beef from Pastures (MBfP) Course Influence (n=40)

The KPI surveys includes a separate section specifically addressing the impact of the **More Beef from Pasture** (MBfP) course and the **Making More from Sheep** (MMfS). As part of the overall survey a sample of $n=30$ was sought for each of these activities, The MBfP sample of $n=40$ will return a 15% confidence interval (+/- 7.5%) with 95% certainty (confidence level), the MMfS sample of $n=37$ will return a 16% confidence interval with 95% certainty.

- **50%** of **More Beef from Pastures** course participants during 2008 - 2009 made changes to management practices as a result of participation, consistent with 51% in 2008 and 53% in 2007.

In 2009, $n=40$ More Beef from Pastures course participants were asked whether they received a manual and which modules they have read as well as what procedures and tools have they adopted as a result.

- Of those More Beef from Pastures participants interviewed in 2009 ($n=40$), **55%** indicated they received a More Beef from Pastures manual, significantly less than 85% in 2008 and 79% in 2007. Of those 55% of More Beef from Pastures course participants who received a manual, **73%** read 1 or more modules, an increase from 61% in 2008 and still down from 83% in 2007:
 - **9%** could not remember which modules they had read.

- **18%** did **not read** any modules, down from 20% in 2008 and 17% in 2007. This reflects the **consistent** behaviour of producers.
- **46%** read >5 modules, **14%** read 4 modules, **5%** 3 modules, **5%** 2 modules and **32%** read only 1 module. The mean is **4.14** modules read.

Table 27: MBfP Manual - Modules Read

More Beef from Pastures Manual Modules:	% of MBfP attendees who have read manual modules		
	2007 (79%, n=42)	2008 (85%, n=56)	2009 (55%, n=22)
Setting Directions	37%	38%	36%
Tactical Stock Control	49%	56%	45%
Pasture Growth	64%	78%	59%
Pasture Utilisation	58%	62%	64%
Genetics	40%	58%	50%
Weaner Throughput	27%	58%	50%
Herd Health & Welfare	39%	60%	27%
Meeting Market Specifications	30%	62%	41%
Other (incl. Don't Know)	32%	18%	14%

Tier 2 MBfP Sample 2007 n=65, 2008 n=66, 2009 n=40

- Of the 55% of MBfP course participants who have received the manual, **64%** read **pasture utilisation**, **59%** read **pasture growth**, **50%** **genetics** and **50%** also read **weaner throughput**. **45%** also read the **tactical stock control** module, **41%** read **meeting market specifications**.
- In 2009 of those 27% of MBfP manual recipients who did not read a module, **50%** did **not have time** and **33%** said they **intended to read** it, **33%** said they could not remember (low sample base).
- **Mean** number of MBfP modules read is **4.14**.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 119-124)

4.3.2 Making More from Sheep (MMfS) Course Influence (n=37)

This section and data refers only to **Making More from Sheep** (MMfS) in 2009.

- **57%** of **Making More from Sheep** course participants during 2008 - 2009 made changes to management practices as a result of participation. In 2009, **n=37** Making More from Sheep course participants were also asked whether they received a manual and which modules they have read as well as what procedures and tools have they adopted as a result.
- Of those MMfS participants interviewed in 2009 (n=37), **70%** indicated they **received a Making More from Sheep manual**. Of those 55% of Making More from Sheep course participants who received a manual, **96%** read 1 or more modules.
 - Only **4%** did **not read** any MMfS modules (all of these saying they **did not have time**).

- **75%** read >5 modules, **8%** read 4 modules, **8%** 3 modules and **12%** read only 1 module. The mean is **6.19** modules read.

Table 28: MMfS Manual - Modules Read

Making More from Sheep:	% of MMfS attendees who have read manual modules
% who received a manual:	2009 (70%, n=26)
Wean More Lambs	81%
Market Focused Lamb and Sheepmeat production	81%
Grow More Pasture	73%
Plan for Success	69%
Healthy Soils	62%
Turn Pasture into Product	54%
Protect Your Farms Natural Assets	50%
Gain from Genetics	46%
Market focussed Wool Production	35%
Capable and Confident Producers	35%
Healthy and Contented Sheep	31%

Tier 2 MMfS Sample 2009 n=37

- Of the 70% of MMfS course participants who have received the manual, **81%** read **Wean More Lambs**, **81%** read **Market Focussed Lamb and Sheepmeat production**, **73%** **Grow More Pasture** and **69%** also read **Plan for Success**. A significant proportion of MMfS participants read other modules, this level of interest is higher than MBfP and may reflect the fact that MMfS is a new course.
- **Mean** number of MMfS modules read is **6.19**.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 119-124)

4.3.3 Procedures & Tools (MBfP)

As a result of participating in the **2009 MBfP** courses and reading the manual, readers were asked which **procedures** they had implemented:

- **31%** of **manual readers** (73% of manual recipients) indicated they '**determine the risk and vaccinate to prevent specific diseases**' (*Herd Health & Welfare*), up from 20% in 2008.
- **25%** indicated they '**select a paddock and determine grazing duration**' (*Pasture Utilisation*).
- **25%** of readers indicated they 'buy the right bulls' (*Genetics*).
- **25%** indicated they '**maximise number of live calves**' (*Weaner Throughput*).
- **25%** indicated they '**determine the enterprise strategy and herd structure**' (*Setting Directions*).

Also as a result of participating in the MBfP courses and reading the manual, readers were asked which **tools & practices** they had used:

- **13%** of manual readers indicated they had used '**pasture rulers, sticks and meters**', down from 20% in 2008.
- **19%** used '**methodology for field based pasture measurements**'.
- **25%** used '**calving ease EBV's**', up from 13% in 2008.
- **13%** used '**beef cattle market specifications**'.
- **13%** indicated they had used '**vaccination strategies**', up from 10% in 2008.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 126-145)

4.3.4 Procedures & Tools (MMfS)

As a result of participation in the **2009 MMfS** courses and reading the manual, MMfS readers were also asked which **tools & practices** they had implemented:

- **12%** of MMfS **manual readers** (96% of manual recipients) indicated they use the '**pasture assessment techniques**' tools (*Grow More Pasture*).
- **12%** indicated they use the '**stock water requirements**' tool (*Protect Farms Natural Assets*).
- **12%** indicated they use the '**condition scoring**' tool (*Wean More Lambs*).
- **12%** indicated they use the '**soil sample**' tool (*Healthy Soils*).
- **8%** indicated they use the '**lambling planner**' tool (*Wean More Lambs*).
- **8%** indicated they use the '**bodyweight targets for weaners and ewes**' tool (*Wean More Lambs*).

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 146-157)

4.4 Other Business insights - (2009 Tier 2 Sample *n*=200)

4.4.1 MLA Program Element Most Influential

In 2009, when specifically asked which element of the MLA course or extension program that had the **most influence** on attendees, **62%** of all *n*=200 course participants indicated the **workshops** were most influential. This is down from 70% in 2008 and remains a significant shift from 2007 where 36% indicated the manual was most influential.

- **25%** of course attendees indicated they felt the **manual (CD Rom)** was the most influential element of the course they participated in, these will be MBfP and MMfS participants. A further **11%** nominated the combination of the **workshop and manual**.

In addition, producers also nominated **other influential** elements:

- **31%** nominated the **Pasture Ruler**
- **24%** nominated the **MBfP Expo**
- **30%** nominated the **Feed Demand Calculator**
- **39%** nominated the **Feedback Magazine** and **34%** **Prograzier**
- **25%** nominated the **Stocking Rate Calculator**
- **32%** nominated the **COP Workshops**
- **16%** nominated the **Rainfall to Pasture Growth Outlook Tool** (used an avg. of **9.26** times a year)
- **21%** indicated none of these components influenced **change** at all as a result of participating in the MLA course or program.

In general these initiatives are mostly undertaken **annually**, however where pasture monitoring is involved producers are doing them more regularly, **monthly** and **weekly** where necessary.

Table 29: Influence of MLA Course Components

MBfP and other Course Components:	Frequency of Use during 2008 - 2009			
	2009 (n=200)	Monthly	Annually	Weekly
Workshop	62%	16%	68%	1%
Workshop & Manual	11%	16%	68%	1%
Manual (CD Rom)	25%	39%	49%	3%
Pasture ruler	31%	45%	32%	19%
Feedback Magazine	39%	5%	86%	4%
Prograzier	34%	64%	16%	6%
PIRD's/PDS	32%	14%	70%	2%
Cost of Production (COP) Workshops	32%	6%	68%	-
Stocking Rate Calculator	25%	34%	56%	6%
Feed Demand Calculator	30%	42%	31%	14%
MBfP Expos	24%	2%	81%	-
Rainfall to pasture growth outlook tool	16%	34%	44%	6%

Tier 2 Sample 2009 n=200

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2- Table 158-173)

4.4.2 Farm Business Priorities (New)

All 2009 KPI survey participants were asked to **rank** their **top 3** business priorities for the farm.

- **35%** of all 2009 course participants surveyed indicate that **increasing efficiency** was one of their top 3 business priorities.
- **Expansion and increasing the scale of production** was next most important with **33%** nominating it as one of their top 3.

Table 30: Business Priorities

Farm Business Priorities*:

% of Participants ranking Priorities

	2009
Increasing Efficiency	35%
Expansion and increasing scale of production	33%
Profitability / Making Money	18%
Maintain a holding pattern on the current level of production	16%
Survive / The drought	15%
Sustainability / Environment management	8%
Pasture Improvement / management / regeneration	7%
Building skills and knowledge to better manage our business	6%
Improving quality of meat / stock	5%

Tier 2 Sample 2009 n=200

*2009 question asked to rank top 3 business priorities

- Like other management changes these business priorities appear to be equally important within each of the MLA course and program streams.

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 174)

4.4.3 Internal and External Threats (New)

All 2009 KPI survey participants were asked to identify their **internal** and **external** threats to their farm business. **76%** of participated nominated **internal** threats and **93%** nominated **external** threats.

Internal:

- **32%** nominated **cost of production**
- **13%** nominated **cash flow**
- **12%** nominated **labour efficiency**
- **10%** nominated the **disease / animal health concerns**
- **10%** nominated the **farm management - including pasture management**

External:

- **30%** nominated **drought**
- **29%** nominated **price received**
- **29%** nominated **climate change / weather**
- **20%** nominated **government taxes**
- Interestingly, **13%** nominated a **carbon tax or offset trading scheme**
- **12%** nominated **economic downturn**
- **8%** nominated **animal welfare groups**

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 175)

4.4.4 Confidence in Red Meat Industry (New)

2009 KPI survey participants were also asked to indicate the level of **confidence** they had with the future of the red meat industry.

69% of participants indicated they had some **positive confidence** in red meat industry.

- **27% extremely confident**
- **42% some confidence**

25% indicated they were **unsure** about the level of confidence they had.

6% of participants indicated they were **not confident** in red meat industry.

- **5% not confident**
- **1% not at all confident**

(refer MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2 - Table 176)

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

The objective of the KPI Survey is to evaluate the performance of the LPI communication and extension programs by measuring the level of awareness achieved amongst the general producer population, and the adoption by program participants of the management practices and knowledge being advocated within these programs.

Overall **Awareness** of MLA courses has risen by **18%** to **92%** since the 2005 LPI Survey, this increase in overall course awareness is apparent in each of the producer segments.

- Overall, **92%** of targeted livestock producers recall one or more of the MLA Courses or Program(s) mentioned, represents an **increasing** level of awareness compared with previous survey findings of **85%**, **84%** and **87%**. This figure should be regarded as being **an optimal target** with limited chance to improve on by increasing overall awareness. However, unaided awareness can be improved on, currently very good at 46%, incremental increases could be possible with improved communication.
- **Only 8%** of respondents were unaware of any MLA Courses or Program(s), this is an improvement on **15%** from last years survey and it is difficult to believe that there will never be producers who just don't engage with progress and innovation. **Membership status** is an obvious **advantage** for communication with almost all data tables showing better than average performance amongst this segment. In 2009 **71%** of targeted livestock producers indicated they were MLA Members (received Feedback magazine), this figure is down from 85% in 2008 and on par with 71% in 2007. Whether this is identifying a trend where producers are failing to renew membership is unknown, it is certainly a significant shift and may be of concern to MLA as membership status increased the effectiveness of communication and the impact of course content.

Improving on this relatively high level of awareness will be difficult as barriers to awareness are largely due to the intake of information amongst archetypal producers who are closed to change and innovation. As these producers relinquish control through succession or failure the awareness of MLA courses and more likely the strategies they promote will increase.

Implementation of management practice changes as a result of participating in an MLA course or program have fallen consistently from 67% in 2006 to 64% in 2007 and 2008. In 2009 management practice change amongst course participants is at 59%.

- Participation in **EDGENetwork** workshops has motivated **66%** of participants to change management practices in past 12 months, this is an improvement on 2008 where 58% of participants made changes.
- **50%** of **More Beef from Pastures** program participants have implemented management change in the last 12 months, this is almost the same as 51% in 2007.
- **Making More from Sheep** has made significant progress influencing producers to adopt new management practices, **57%** made changes in the last 12 months and 42% in 2008.
- Other courses evaluated have instigated management change, **PIRD's** motivated 52% of participants to change management practices in 2008 and **53%** in **2009**.

The process of changing management practice in 2007 was heavily influenced by the drought with 16% of course participants indicating the **drought** prevented them from implementing the changes they would like, this has fallen to 7% in 2008 and 8% in 2009 signalling that producers have moved on from the impact of drought conditions. Whilst the financial fallout from the succession of poor seasons is still limiting management change, producers are now looking specifically at the value of new management practices before implementing them.

There is a rising number of respondents already implementing the changes being advocated, 44% in 2009 and 2008 compared with 27% in 2007. Whilst this mitigates the efficacy of MLA courses, it is representing the **increasing** level of management change and innovation. In this environment it follows that management change (once adopted) is unlikely to change (increase) unless additional new management practices are introduced.

In the **longer term** producers generally expressed some confidence in the red meat industry. Producers are concerned with internal factors including **cost of production** and **cash flow**, however they regard external influences such as **drought** and the **price received** for commodities as just as important. For the first time in the KPI surveys the issue of **climate change** and **water resources** has been raised by producers as a long term concern.

5.2 Recommendations

2009 producer awareness levels of MLA courses and programs indicate that the continued communication strategies of LPI have increased both unaided (unprompted) and aided (prompted) awareness levels of MLA's major courses & programs, LPI should continue to focus on branding and promotion. However at 92% it is unlikely higher levels of awareness can be achieved.

Perhaps of more significance is the impact the MLA courses and programs are having on effecting management change amongst targeted producers, at 59% in 2009 this is still consistent with previous levels of 61% or slightly better. It would appear that management change is dependent on introducing new management practices that have not been seen before, to effect any further increases in the impact of MLA courses will involve the introduction of innovations not already present in the existing course content.

With this in mind we can expect to see a slight fall in the management change index as the majority of targeted producers have already made the changes MLA are promoting.

As discussed in previous reports, many of the management changes are being promoted by other industry influencers, this may mean they are not attributed to MLA initiatives. To date it would appear this has worked in favour of MLA, recognising and supporting alternative communication channels may assist MLA in achieving better performance from their own course coordinators.

Axiom has previously recommended that LPI performance be measured on recent course activity with the rolling survey results used to plot trends, year on year data provides a robust method of evaluating each year in the field with positive initiatives identifiable through better, current adoption data.

As discussed above, achieving a continuing increase in management change amongst course attendees will be increasingly difficult. To achieve any success Axiom believe MLA must focus on:

- Encourage course attendance at a local level and promote relevance for local producers. A particular focus should be on efficiency, productivity and profit.
- Discussion on the confusion of course names and brands is still relevant, LPI should endeavour to ensure that course brands are clearly recognisable as MLA initiatives so that management change can be directly attributed to MLA.
- Encourage producers to participate in more than one course with a view to structuring the learning process so that follow up attendance is an attractive option for producers.
- Membership continues to provide a better result, both in achieving awareness and management change. Encouraging producers to take up membership will only improve MLA outcomes.
- Axiom has previously discussed the importance of **databases** in facilitating any ongoing performance evaluation. Tier 2 samples in 2009 whilst containing over 5,000 participants do in many instances lack details that are essential for future contact. Also many participants are recorded twice either as multiple attendees from the same commercial entity or as attending multiple courses. For the purposes of industry evaluation a course participant can only be recognised as a commercial entity and a representative of that entity needs to be identifiable for evaluation purposes. Clearly the MLA data collection systems amongst course co-ordinators is without structure and as a result **provides little value to MLA**. Axiom would recommend that including formal data collection processes in co-ordinators contracts will empower MLA to more efficiently monitor downstream performance of course streams. The failings of the Tier 2 database in 2009 has meant that some course stream samples could not be met, simply because interviewers exhausted available contacts, despite the high number of known participants compared with previous years.
- With such a database in place, MLA could position the Tier 2 Survey to be undertaken using a web facility to gather course performance data. Such an approach will provide a more efficient survey mechanism that does away with the indiscriminate contact success of telephone methodology. It will also mean that more detailed information can be obtained from producers when they attend courses and in the period after that when adoption of management practices is most critical. This strategy will also serve to reinforce MLA's relationship with course participants and provide an alternative channel for the dissemination of information in the future, we are suggesting that providing competition to the current course co-ordinator method may in fact improve the performance of course co-ordinators.

6 Appendices

The following appendices have been attached to this report and include further data from the 2009 KPI survey.

6.1 Appendix 1 Main data file(s) details

Word files containing SurveyCraft tables of the survey dataset. Various analysis perspectives have been required and due to the volume and complexity of the data several different data processing initiatives have been undertaken.

These have been included in the attached files:

- **MLA KPI 2009 tables 110909 Tier 1**
- **MLA KPI 2009 tables 160909 Tier 2**

Other requested tables included:

- **MLA KPI 2009 Request 140909 Tier 2**
- **MLA KPI 2009 Request 160909 Tier 2**
- **MLA KPI 2009 Request 160909 2 Tier 2**

This report can be referenced using file name: (24-11-2009) Axiom 2009_KPI_Survey_Report_V1.4

Note: Data tables include filtered and cross tabulated information, if additional cross tabs or filters are required please contact Axiom Research.

6.2 Appendix 2 – 2009 Questionnaire

The **2009** survey incorporates many enhancements from previous surveys however it retains the core KPI evaluation questions as well as the same profiling and segmentation protocols to ensure continuity of data and population representation. Minor changes include a broader course profile and the business threats section.

MLA TARGET PRODUCER 2009 KPI AWARENESS & ADOPTION SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

Good evening, my name is _____ from Axiom Research in Sydney.

I am calling on behalf of **Meat and Livestock Australia** to ask you some questions regarding your awareness of programs that MLA conduct to assist producers in their operations. Your input will help ensure that the right programs are being developed to meet both yours and the industry's needs.

IF FIRST NAME LISTED ASK:

INTRO Q#1. Am I speaking with (insert contact name)? **IF YES GO TO INTRO #2, IF NO ASK** May I speak with (insert contact name)? **IF YES** reintroduce to main contact and follow from **INTRO#1**, **if NO GO TO INTRO #2**

IF NO FIRST NAME LISTED ASK:

INTRO Q#2. Are you able to answer questions about livestock production on the property? **if NO ARRANGE CALL BACK.**

REINTRODUCE AS NECESSARY

All responses are held in the strictest of confidence and are used for statistical purposes only. You are free to not answer certain questions if you deem the question inappropriate.

INTRO Q#3. Are you able to help us by participating in our survey this evening?

YES	01	CONTINUE 'Thanks for your help, your time is appreciated'.
NO	02	ASK IF ANOTHER TIME IS MORE SUITABLE. ARRANGE CALL BACK OTHERWISE THANK & CLOSE

SC.Q1. IS YOUR TOTAL INCOME FROM AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS (EVAO) MORE THAN 40,000 DOLLARS?

YES	01	CONTINUE
NO	02	TERMINATE IF LESS THAN \$40K - THANK & CLOSE

MAY I PLEASE ASK SOME PROFILING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR PROPERTY.

SC.Q2. AS AT JULY 2009 WHAT IS THE TOTAL AREA OF YOUR PROPERTY, INCLUDING ANY LEASED LAND? THIS INCLUDES ALL GRAZING, CROPPING AND UNUSED LAND.

(Interviewer note: check whether the answer is acres or hectares)

250 Acres = 100 Hectares / 1 Hectare = 2.5 Acres / 100 Acres = 40 Hectares

ACRES		IF LESS THAN 250 ACRES, THANK AND CLOSE
	OR	
HECTARES		IF LESS THAN 100 HECTARES, THANK AND CLOSE

DP Note: SC.Q2. TO BE CODED IN HECTARE RANGES AS PREVIOUS 2008 SURVEY.

SC.Q3 OF YOUR (INSERT SC.Q2 AREA) WHAT AREA OF YOUR PROPERTY WAS.....

Read out	ACRES	HECTARES
Under crop or fallow about to be sown		
Under perennial pasture		
Under annual pasture		
Under native pasture		

DP Note: SC.Q3. TO BE ENTERED INTO TABLES AS HECTARES.

SC.Q4. DO YOU RECEIVE A COPY OF 'FEEDBACK' MAGAZINE FROM MEAT AND LIVESTOCK AUSTRALIA?

RECORD RESPONSE BELOW

Yes (Member)	1
No (Non Member)	2
Don't know	99

SC.Q5. Interviewer note: check contact database source to determine question stream

Origin of Contact:	TIE R		
FARMbase (Random sample of pop.)	1	ASK Section 1, 2	n=305
EDGE/MBfP/PIRDS/PRIME TIME/COST OF PRODUCTION (COP)/BEEF UP/MAKING MORE from Sheep (MLA Course Participant Sample)	2	ASK Section 1, 3	n=280

(DP Note: Course attendees will be segmented by course to provide a base for evaluation by course of management practice change – quotas of n=50 apply to each course. This quota does not include other course mentions not specified above).

SC.Q6. Interviewer to insert postcode / regional location of the property from contact list?

(DP to link with master region code frame to manage location quota)

POSTCODE	Nth Beef	Sth Beef	Sth Sheep	State:

(DP note: check postcode with regional definitions and rainfall zones for quota management. livestock type will also need to be included in quota).

INDUSTRY SEGMENTATION

SECTION 1: ASK ALL RESPONDENTS (TIER 1 & TIER 2)

Q1.1 IN THE LAST FINANCIAL YEAR (**2008 – 2009**), ROUGHLY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR TOTAL GROSS FARM INCOME, THAT IS, ONLY INCOME FROM YOUR FARM, CAME FROM THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES?

READ OUT & RECORD

Beef cattle	%	IF 10% OR MORE, CLASSIFY AS "BEEF".
Wool	%	IF ADD TO 10% OR MORE, CLASSIFY AS "SHEEP".
Lambs	%	
Mutton	%	
Farmed goats	%	IF <u>ANY</u> INCOME, CLASSIFY AS "GOAT". <i>These can also be included in another category.</i>
Feral goats	%	
Dairy	%	IF THESE ADD TO 95% OR MORE OF INCOME, THANK AND CLOSE
Winter cereal crops (Wheat, Barley, Oats, Triticale)	%	
Other crops (SPECIFY)	%	
TOTAL	100%	

(Interviewer & DP note: This filter will determine how the respondent is classified, i.e. as a beef producer or as a sheep producer. The 10% minimum refers to respondents largest farm enterprise, i.e. where no other livestock enterprise contributes greater than 10% to gross farm income then that enterprise is how the respondent is classified for the purpose of this survey. Respondents do not qualify for the survey if Dairy, winter cereal or other crops add to more than 95% of farm income).

IF Q1.1=BEEF Ask Q1.2 and Q1.3, IF Q1.1=SHEEP Go to Q1.4, IF Q1.1 = GOATS Go to Q1.6

Q1.2 WHAT WAS THE MOST NUMBER OF **BEEF CATTLE**, INCLUDING MARKED CALVES, THAT YOU CARRIED ON YOUR PROPERTY DURING **2008-2009**?

Q1.3 AND, HOW MANY OF THOSE WERE BREEDING COWS?
(includes all cows and heifers)

WRITE IN NUMBER OF BEEF CATTLE AND CIRCLE RESPONSE

	Q1.2 Beef Cattle	Q1.3 Breeding Cows
< 100	01	01
100 – 200	02	02
201 – 400	03	03
401 – 800	04	04
801 – 1600	05	05
1601 – 5400	06	06

> 5400	07	07
--------	----	----

(DP note: Create banner based on Property Scale below for Northern & Southern producers – use Q1.3 codes to create banners).

(N=total population – based on breeding cows)

Property Scale	Northern	Q1.3 Codeframe	Southern	Q1.3 Codeframe
<i>Very small</i>	<100 (N=2628)	01	<100 (N=10166)	01
<i>Small</i>	100 – 400 (N=3443)	02, 03	100 – 200 (N=13699)	02
<i>Medium</i>	400 – 1600 (N=2843)	04,05	200 – 400 (incl above)	03
<i>Large</i>	1600 – 5400 (N=1395)	06	400 – 800 (N=4594)	04
<i>Very Large</i>	>5400 (N=398)	07	>800 (N=2075)	05, 06, 07

Q1.4 DURING 2008-2009, CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT WAS THE MOST NUMBER OF SHEEP, INCLUDING MARKED LAMBS, YOU CARRIED ON THE PROPERTY?

Q1.5 AND FROM THAT TOTAL, HOW MANY LAMBS FOR SLAUGHTER (FOR MEAT PURPOSES) WERE ON THE PROPERTY?

ENTER NUMBER IN APPROPRIATE CELL AND CIRCLE RESPONSE

	Q1.4	Q1.5
WRITE IN NOS & CIRCLE CODE	TOTAL SHEEP Nos	LAMBS for SLAUGHTER Nos
< 200	01	01
201 – 500	02	02
501 – 1,000	03	03
1,001 – 2,000	04	04
2,001 – 5,000	05	05
5,001 – 10,000	06	06
> 10,000	07	07

(DP note: Create banner based on Property Scale below – use Q1.5 codes to create banners).

(N=total population – based on lambs for slaughter, Southern only)

Property Scale	Lambs for slaughter	Q1.5 Codeframe
Very small scale farms	<200 (n=5553)	01
Small scale farms	200 – 500 slaughter lambs (n=6516)	02
Medium scale farms	500 – 1000 slaughter lambs (n=6161)	03
Large scale farms	1000 – 2000 slaughter lambs (n=3293)	04
Very large scale farms	More than 2000 slaughter lambs (n=1516)	05, 06, 07

Q1.6 HOW MANY MEAT GOATS WERE ON THE PROPERTY DURING 2008-2009?

ENTER NUMBER IN APPROPRIATE CELL AND CIRCLE RESPONSE

WRITE IN NOS & CIRCLE CODE	TOTAL Goat Nos	
< 30		00
30 – 499		01
500 – 999		02
1,000 – 1,999		03
2,000 – 4,999		04
5,000 – 9,999		05
10,000 – 20,000		06
> 20,000		07

(DP Note: TIER 2 Respondents Skip to Q3.1. TIER 1 Respondents Continue with Q2.1)

AWARENESS OF MLA PROGRAMS

SECTION 2: ASK TIER 1 SAMPLE ONLY (*FARMBASE PRODUCERS n=305*)

Q2.1 MEAT & LIVESTOCK AUSTRALIA (MLA) DEVELOPS AND IN SOME CASES RUNS A RANGE OF ACTIVITIES FOR BEEF, SHEEP, LAMB AND GOAT PRODUCERS. COULD YOU PLEASE TELL ME WHICH MLA ACTIVITIES YOU ARE AWARE OF?

(INTERVIEWER: CHECK ACTUAL COURSE NAME TO CONFIRM COURSE CODE FROM ATTACHED LIST OF MLA COURSES AND PROGRAMS – DO NOT RECORD ACTUAL COURSE OR PROGRAM ONLY CORRESPONDING COURSE CODE.

RECORD FIRST MENTIONED UNDER Q2.1

AND ALL OTHER MENTIONS UNDER Q2.2 DO NOT READ OUT OR PROMPT AT THIS STAGE.

Q2.2 ... ANY OTHERS?

(If not in MLA course and programs list Please Specify)

Q2.3 I AM GOING TO READ OUT SOME OTHER ACTIVITIES, COURSES & PROGRAMS TO YOU, WHICH MLA FUNDS. HAVE YOU HEARD OF...

(INTERVIEWER: READ OUT FULL COURSE CODE DESCRIPTION (IN BRACKETS), FROM TABLE BELOW. READ OUT ONLY THOSE MLA COURSE CODES NOT ALREADY RECALLED IN Q2.1 and Q2.2)?

OR

PROMPT FOR ALL SAMPLE: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT 'PRIME TIME' or 'MAKING MORE FROM SHEEP FORUM'; 'MORE BEEF from PASTURES'; 'PIRD'S or PRODUCER DEMONSTRATION SITES', 'PRODUCER RESEARCH SUPPORT'; 'EDGE' or 'EDGE Network' and 'COST OF PRODUCTION WORKSHOPS', BEEF UP FORUMS , EVERGRAZE, GRAIN & GRAZE, BESTWOOL/BEST LAMB GROUPS (VIC ONLY) , BESTPRAC GROUPS (SA)

AND

Also read out these specific EDGE or EDGE Network courses (code 02) if respondent is from state identified:

PROMPT, IF NSW Southern WA or TAS: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT & 'PROGRAZE' MAKING MORE FROM MERINOS, TERMINAL SIRE SELECTION.

PROMPT, IF VIC or SA: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT, 'PROGRAZE', 'BEEF CHEQUE' & 'LAMB CHEQUE'.

PROMPT, IF QLD, NT, or Northern WA: (read out)

WHAT ABOUT 'GRAZING LAND MANAGEMENT or GLM' and 'NUTRITION EDGE' or 'BREEDING EDGE'.

Awareness:	Unaided		Aided
MLA Course Code	Q2.1 First Mention	Q2.2 Other Mentions	Q2.3 Prompted
PIRDS (PIRDS or Producer Research Support (ALL producers) and PDS or Producer Demonstration Sites North only)	01	01	01
EDGE Network (any EDGE or EDGE Network course) (ALL producers)	02	02	02
PRIME TIME)	03	03	03

(Sheep and Lamb producers only)			
More Beef from Pastures (More Beef from Pastures Manuals and Forums, field days)- Southern Beef producers only	04	04	04
Cost of Production Workshops (excluding Northern Beef)	05	05	05
Beef -Up forums (Northern beef only)	06	06	06
MAKING MORE from SHEEP (Separate sheep program – joint MLA/AWI funded).	07	07	07
Grain and Graze	08	08	08
Evergraze	09	09	09
Bestwool/Bestlamb (Victoria only)	10	10	10
Bestprac (pastoral zone only)	11	11	11
	12	12	12
OTHERS (Please Specify) to be coded	99	99	99

(DP Note: Identify for tables those respondents with first, second and nett unaided mentions then prompted, then nett total aided & unaided awareness. Key piece of information required is to represent % of Tier 1 sample who are aware of at least 1 MLA program).

ASK Q2.4 to Q2.6 ONLY IF Q2.3, Q2.2 or Q2.3 is not null, If Q2.3, Q2.2 or Q2.3 is null Go To Section 5 ??

Q2.4 HAVE YOU ATTENDED ANY OF THESE MLA ACTIVITIES IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, OR PRIOR TO THE LAST 12 MONTHS?

DO NOT READ OUT

Yes (participated in at least 1 course or program in last 12 months)	01
Yes (attended at least 1 program prior to the last 12 months)	02
No (Never attended)	03

(DP Note: Show Nett Yes results for Q2.5 in tables)

IF Q2.4=03 Ask Q2.5

Q2.5 IF YOU DID NOT ATTEND ANY OF THESE MLA ACTIVITIES, WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING?

DO NOT READ OUT

Do not like group activities	01
Did not know about them	02
No time	03
Too expensive	04
Drought	05
Topics of no interest	06
Other (Please Specify)	07
Don't know	99

Q2.6 HOW DO YOU RATE THE **VALUE** OF THE INDIVIDUAL MLA SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES, THAT YOU HAVE HAD EXPERIENCE WITH? ON A **SCALE OF 0 to 3** WHERE 0 EQUALS NO VALUE AT ALL AND 3 EQUALS HIGH VALUE.

DO NOT READ OUT

High Value	03
Good Value	02
Little Value	01
No Value at all	00

(Int note: value refers to whether or not the event met respondents expectations and was worth the time/cost to them attending)

Q2.7 MLA PROGRAMS AND COURSES PROMOTE TOOLS TO ASSIST WITH IMPROVING PRODUCTION, WHICH **KEY MLA TOOLS** ARE YOU AWARE OF ? (**UNPROMPTED**)

Q2.8 ARE YOU AWARE OF (**PROMPTED - READ OUT REMAINING TOOLS NOT ALREADY MENTIONED**)?

MLA TOOLS	Q2.7 Unprompted Awareness		Q2.8 Prompted Awareness	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
MBfP &/or MMFS MANUAL (CD Manual)	01	02	01	02
FEED DEMAND CALCULATOR	01	02	01	02
COST OF PRODUCTION (COP) CALCULATORS (SHEEP/BEEF)	01	02	01	02
RAINFALL TO PASTURE GROWTH OUTLOOK TOOL	01	02	01	02
PASTURE RULER	01	02	01	02
STOCKING RATE CALCULATOR	01	02	01	02
BEEFSPECS TOOL	01	02	01	02
PROGRAZIER (SOUTHERN ONLY)	01	02	01	02
FEEDBACK MAGAZINE	01	02	01	02
FRONTIER MAGAZINE (NORTHERN ONLY)	01	02	01	02
OTHER (Specify)	01	02	01	02

TIER 1: ASK ONLY Q2.9 FOR ALL TIER 1 RESPONDENTS

Q2.9 WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MANAGEMENT **PRACTICES** DO YOU CURRENTLY UNDERTAKE ON YOUR PROPERTY?

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

Management Practice Changes.....prompt only to clarify answer.	Q2.9	Q2.9.1 Evidence Add on Questions.
CALCULATE COST OF PRODUCTION (COP) \$/head, \$/kg or \$/hectare	01	Q. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT COP? (enter as \$/head, \$/kg or \$/hectare)
Measure weaning %	02	Q. WHAT WAS YOUR LATEST RESULT? (%) Q. WHAT WAS YOUR PREVIOUS RESULT? (%)
Measure mortality % (rates)	03	Q. WHAT WAS YOUR LATEST RESULT? (%) Q. WHAT WAS YOUR PREVIOUS RESULT? (%)
Track for a particular market for livestock based on average age at sale time	04	Q. WHAT IS THE AVERAGE AGE AT SALE OF STOCK? (Yrs/Months)
Measure and adjust stocking rate	05	Q. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT STOCKING RATE? (Lsu/Dse?)
PAY FOR THE SERVICES OF A SPECIALIST ADVISOR (OTHER THAN ACCOUNTANT) AT LEAST ONCE PER YEAR	06	Q. IS THE ADVISOR AN AGRONOMIST OR LIVESTOCK ADVISER?
USE EBV'S OR INDEX VALUES IN SIRE SELECTION OR PURCHASE	07	Q. WHAT EBV IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU?
ROUTINELY WEIGH LIVESTOCK TO MONITOR GROWTH/WEIGHT GAIN	08	Q. HOW OFTEN? (..... # TIMES PER YEAR)
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT JOINING	09	
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT LAMBING	10	
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT CALVING	11	
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT SELLING	12	
USE A FORMAL MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUE TO ASSESS PASTURE AVAILABLE TO ANIMALS AT LAMBING / CALVING	13	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT, PASTURE RULER OR PLATE METRE?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING ROTATION LENGTH	14	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING PASTURE RESIDUES (GROUND COVER)	15	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING PASTURE AVAILABILITY	16	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING ANIMAL REQUIREMENTS	17	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

Management Practice Changes.....prompt only to clarify answer.	Q2.9	Q2.9.1 Evidence Add on Questions.
ROUTINELY ASSESS PASTURE QUALITY E.G. DRY MATTER DIGESTIBILITY	18	Q. DO YOU USE VISUAL ASSESSMENT?
CALCULATE A FORAGE OR PASTURE BUDGET	19	Q. DO YOU DO THIS WEEKLY, FORTNIGHTLY, MONTHLY, ANNUALLY?
PREGNANCY TEST COWS ROUTINELY	20	Q. IN THE LAST YEAR, WHEN?
FIRST CALF HEIFERS MANAGED SEPARATELY TO THE MAIN BREEDER HERD	21	
CONDUCT A DRENCH RESISTANCE TEST IN THE LAST 5 YEARS (only ask sheep producers)	22	
MONITOR WORM EGG COUNTS TO PROVIDE A BASIS WHEN TO DRENCH SHEEP	23	Q. DO YOU TEST YOURSELF OR USE LAB SERVICES?
VACCINATE TO PREVENT THREE DAY SICKNESS (NORTH ONLY)	24	
VACCINATE TO PREVENT CLOSTRIDIAL DISEASES	25	
ROTATIONALLY GRAZE (ie REGULARLY MOVE THE SAME MOB/)	26	Q. DO YOU DO THIS WEEKLY, FORTNIGHTLY, MONTHLY, ANNUALLY?
HAVE A WRITTEN/FORMAL FARM MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING A WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN	27	Q. WHEN WAS IT COMPLETED/ REVISED? (date)
INCREASED THE % OF LAND SOWN TO PERENNIAL PASTURES	28	Q. WHAT % IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS? (% of Total Farm Area)
ASSESS LAND CONDITION USING THE ABCD FRAMEWORK (NORTH ONLY)	29	Q. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME? (date) Q. FOR WHAT PURPOSE?
WET SEASON SPELL PADDOCKS ON A ROTATIONAL BASIS (NORTH ONLY)	30	
BURN REGULARLY TO CONTROL WOODY WEEDS AND NATIVES (NORTH ONLY)	31	Q. HOW REGULARLY? Q. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME? (date)
DEVELOP A FORMAL SUCCESSION PLAN	32	Q. DID YOU DEVELOP THIS WITH AN EXTERNAL CONSULTANT? Q. IS THIS A WRITTEN PLAN?
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	99	

(DP Note: TIER 1 Respondents Skip to Q5.1)

ADOPTION

SECTION 3: TIER 2 - PARTICIPANTS OF PIRDS/EDGE/MBfP/PRIME TIME/COST OF PRODUCTION (COP)/BEEF UP, MAKING MORE from SHEEP PROGRAMS AND CHANGE OF MGT PRACTICES: ASK ALL MLA COURSE CONTACTS ONLY (MLA SAMPLE n=280)

Q3.1 MEAT & LIVESTOCK AUSTRALIA (MLA) DEVELOPS AND IN SOME CASES RUNS A NETWORK OF PROGRAMS AND COURSES FOR BEEF, SHEEP AND LAMB PRODUCERS. CAN YOU CONFIRM YOU HAVE PARTICIPATED IN... (PRE POPULATE Q3.1 WITH COURSE NAME FROM CONTACT LIST)?

(DP Note: If Q3.1 is Null, TERMINATE and replace in sample)

Q3.1.1 WAS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LEARNED FROM THIS MLA PROGRAM OR COURSE?

Int Note E.g. knowledge on better grazing and pasture management, using EBVs, etc – try to get what the key message was from the activity

(DP Note: code Q3.1.1 at conclusion of survey)

Q3.2 CAN YOU RECALL ANY OTHER MLA SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES THAT YOU HAVE ATTENDED OR PARTICIPATED IN?

(REFER TO APPENDED COURSE CODE FRAME AND RECORD ALL OTHER COURSES MENTIONED UNDER Q3.2.

ANY OTHERS NOT INCLUDED PLEASE SPECIFY.

Q3.2.1 WAS THERE ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT YOU LEARNED FROM THESE MLA ACTIVITIES?

(DP Note: code at conclusion of survey)

Q3.3 HAVE YOU CHANGED ANY OF YOUR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES OR ADOPTED ANY NEW MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A **DIRECT RESULT OF PARTICIPATING IN THE (INSERT COURSE CODE FROM Q3.1 & THEN Q3. 2) ACTIVITY YOU MENTIONED?**

ASK ONLY FOR THOSE PROGRAMS MENTIONED IN Q3.1 & Q3.2 (ask in succession for each program)

MLA Course Codesee code frame	COURSE CODE	Q3.1 Attended	Q3.2 Other Attended	Q3.3 Changed Yes No
PIRDS (PIRDS or Producer Research Support and PDS or Producer Demonstration Sites North only)	01	01	01	01 02

EDGE Network (any EDGE or EDGE Network course)	02	02	02	01 02
PRIME TIME	03	03	03	01 02
MORE BEEF from PASTURES (More Beef from Pastures Manuals and Forums, Tools for the time challenged expos)	04	04	04	01 02
Cost of Production Workshops	05	05	05	01 02
Beef -Up forums	06	06	06	01 02
MAKING MORE from SHEEP (Separate sheep program – joint MLA/AWI funded).	07	07	07	01 02
Grain and Graze	08	08	08	01 02
Evergraze	09	09	09	01 02
Bestwool/Bestlamb (Victoria only)	10	10	09	01 02
Bestprac (pastoral zone only)	11	11	11	01 02
OTHERS (Please specify		99	99	01 02

(DP Note: for Q3.3 Identify for tables those respondents who made any changes by ACTIVITY mentioned, ie create a nett change field)

ASK Q3.4 ONLY IF Q3.3 is not null, If Q3.3 is null Skip to Q3.5

Q3.4 DO YOU STILL USE THE NEW OR CHANGED PRACTICE OR TECHNOLOGY IN YOUR FARMS MANAGEMENT?

DO NOT READ OUT

Yes	01
No	02
Don't Know / Unsure	03

Q3.5 HOW DO YOU RATE THE VALUE OF THE MLA SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES, THAT YOU HAVE HAD EXPERIENCE WITH? ON A SCALE OF 0 to 3, WHERE 0 EQUALS NO VALUE AND 3 EQUALS HIGH VALUE.

DO NOT READ OUT

High Value	03
Good Value	02
Little Value	01

No Value at all	00
-----------------	----

Q3.6 WOULD YOU PARTICIPATE AGAIN IN A SIMILAR ACTIVITY?

DO NOT READ OUT

Yes	01
No	02
Don't Know / Unsure	03

MANAGEMENT PRACTICE CHANGE

TIER 2: ASK ONLY FOR THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED YES (01) to Q3.3

Q3.8 WHICH PARTICULAR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES HAVE YOU CHANGED AS A RESULT OF ATTENDING THE (*INSERT PROGRAM NAME FROM Q3.1 & THEN Q3.2*) COURSE?

Q3.8.1 Additional Questions

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

Management Practice Changes..... <i>prompt only to clarify answer.</i>	Insert Q3.1 Course Name	Insert Q3.2 Course Name	Q3.8.1 Evidence Add on Questions.
CALCULATE COST OF PRODUCTION (COP) \$/head, \$/kg or \$/hectare	01	01	Q. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT COP? (enter as \$/head, \$/kg or \$/hectare)
Measure weaning %	02	02	Q. WHAT WAS YOUR LATEST RESULT? (%) Q. WHAT WAS YOUR PREVIOUS RESULT? (%)
Measure mortality % (rates)	03	03	Q. WHAT WAS YOUR LATEST RESULT? (%) Q. WHAT WAS YOUR PREVIOUS RESULT? (%)
Track for a particular market for livestock based on average age at sale time	04	04	Q. WHAT IS THE AVERAGE AGE AT SALE OF STOCK? (Yrs/Months)
Measure and adjust stocking rate	05	05	Q. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT STOCKING RATE? (Lsu/Dse?)
PAY FOR THE SERVICES OF A SPECIALIST ADVISOR (OTHER THAN ACCOUNTANT) AT LEAST ONCE PER YEAR	06	06	Q. IS THE ADVISOR AN AGRONOMIST OR LIVESTOCK ADVISER?
USE EBV'S OR INDEX VALUES IN SIRE SELECTION OR PURCHASE	07	07	Q. WHAT EBV IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU?
ROUTINELY WEIGH LIVESTOCK TO MONITOR GROWTH/WEIGHT GAIN	08	08	Q. HOW OFTEN? (..... # TIMES PER YEAR)
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT JOINING	09	09	
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT LAMBING	10	10	
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT CALVING	11	11	
FAT SCORE OR CONDITION SCORE STOCK AT SELLING	12	12	
USE A FORMAL MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUE TO ASSESS PASTURE AVAILABLE TO ANIMALS AT LAMBING / CALVING	13	13	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT, PASTURE RULER OR PLATE METRE?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING ROTATION LENGTH	14	14	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING PASTURE RESIDUES (GROUND COVER)	15	15	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING PASTURE AVAILABILITY	16	16	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?
SET GRAZING TARGETS TO DETERMINE STOCK MOVEMENT USING ANIMAL REQUIREMENTS	17	17	Q. DO YOU USE A VISUAL ASSESSMENT OR SOME SORT OF SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATOR?

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

Management Practice Changes.....prompt only to clarify answer.	Insert Q3.1 Course Name	Insert Q3.2 Course Name	Q3.81 Evidence Add on Questions.
ROUTINELY ASSESS PASTURE QUALITY E.G. DRY MATTER DIGESTIBILITY	18	18	Q. DO YOU USE VISUAL ASSESSMENT?
CALCULATE A FORAGE OR PASTURE BUDGET	19	19	Q. DO YOU DO THIS WEEKLY, FORTNIGHTLY, MONTHLY, ANNUALLY?
PREGNANCY TEST COWS ROUTINELY	20	20	Q. IN THE LAST YEAR, WHEN?
FIRST CALF HEIFERS MANAGED SEPARATELY TO THE MAIN BREEDER HERD	21	21	
CONDUCT A DRENCH RESISTANCE TEST IN THE LAST 5 YEARS (only ask sheep producers)	22	22	
MONITOR WORM EGG COUNTS TO PROVIDE A BASIS WHEN TO DRENCH SHEEP	23	23	Q. DO YOU TEST YOURSELF OR USE LAB SERVICES?
VACCINATE TO PREVENT THREE DAY SICKNESS (NORTH ONLY)	24	24	
VACCINATE TO PREVENT CLOSTRIDIAL DISEASES	25	25	
ROTATIONALLY GRAZE (ie REGULARLY MOVE THE SAME MOB/)	26	26	Q. DO YOU DO THIS WEEKLY, FORTNIGHTLY, MONTHLY, ANNUALLY?
HAVE A WRITTEN/FORMAL FARM MANAGEMENT PLAN INCLUDING A WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN	27	27	Q. WHEN WAS IT COMPLETED/ REVISED? (date)
INCREASED THE % OF LAND SOWN TO PERENNIAL PASTURES	28	28	Q. WHAT % IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS? (% of Total Farm Area)
ASSESS LAND CONDITION USING THE ABCD FRAMEWORK (NORTH ONLY)	29	29	Q. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME? (date) Q. FOR WHAT PURPOSE?
WET SEASON SPELL PADDOCKS ON A ROTATIONAL BASIS (NORTH ONLY)	30	30	
BURN REGULARLY TO CONTROL WOODY WEEDS AND NATIVES (NORTH ONLY)	31	31	Q. HOW REGULARLY? Q. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME? (date)
DEVELOP A FORMAL SUCCESSION PLAN	32	32	Q. DID YOU DEVELOPED THIS WITH AN EXTERNAL CONSULTANT? Q. IS THIS A WRITTEN PLAN?
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	99	99	

Q3.9 AS A RESULT OF IMPLEMENTING (ADOPTING) SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS (MANAGEMENT PRACTICES) THAT **MLA** HAS BEEN PROMOTING IN THE PROGRAM YOU RECENTLY ATTENDED, HAVE THEY HAD A **POSITIVE** OR **NEGATIVE** IMPACT ON YOUR FARM BUSINESS? **DO NOT READ OUT**

A Very Negative Impact	01
Some Negative Impact	02
No Impact at all (Status Quo)	03
Some Positive Impact	04
A Very Positive Impact	05
Don't know	99

IF Q3.9=04 or 05 Ask Q3.10, IF Q3.9=01 to 02 Go to Q3.11, IF Q3.9=03 or 99 Go to Q3.12

Q3.10 WHAT WERE THE **POSITIVE** OUTCOMES FOR YOUR BUSINESS THAT RESULTED FROM ATTENDING THE COURSE OR USING THE INFORMATION?

--

Q3.11 WHAT WERE THE **NEGATIVE** OUTCOMES FOR YOUR BUSINESS THAT RESULTED FROM ATTENDING THE COURSE OR USING THE INFORMATION?

--

DP Note: Q3.10 Q3.11 Code frame

Positive (+ve) or Increase		Negative (-ve) or Decrease	
Profitability (increase)	01	Profitability (decrease)	11
Environment impact (positive)	02	Environment impact (negative)	12
Cost of Production (increase)	03	Cost of Production (decrease)	13
Pasture utilisation (increase)	04	Pasture utilisation (increase/decrease)	14
Lifestyle (improvement)	05	Lifestyle (decline)	15
Labour saving (efficiency)	06	Labour saving (inefficiency)	16
Productivity (increase, gain)	07	Productivity (decrease, decline)	17
Meeting market specs (efficiency)	08	Meeting market specs (inefficiency)	18
Increased weaning rates (increase)	09	Increased weaning rates (decrease)	19
Decreased mortality rates (increase)	10	Decreased mortality rates (decrease)	20
Other (Please Specify)	99	Other (Please Specify)	99

ASK Q3.12 ONLY FOR THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ANSWERED No (02) to Q3.3

Q3.12 WHY HAVE YOU NOT **CHANGED** PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS ACTIVITY?

Still thinking about it	01
Need to talk to someone for further information/advice (if so who - neighbour, consultant, DPI, Stock agent, family other producers, other)	02
Does not suit existing operations	03
Lack of finance to make changes	04
Workload or labour issues	05
Uncertainty regarding outcomes or benefits	06
Drought/poor season	
Lifestyle choice	07
Other	99

SECTION 4: Tier 2 MLA TOOLS SECTION

ASK Q4.1 to Q4.61 for MBfP and MMfS PARTICIPANTS ONLY, OTHERS GO TO Q4.7
(DP note: ensure MBfP & MMfS are asked appropriate questions)

Q4.1 THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS REFER TO THE MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES MANUAL AND MAKING MORE FROM SHEEP MANUAL, HAVE YOU RECEIVED THE MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES OR MAKING MORE FROM SHEEP MANUAL or CD?

Probe to confirm that they do actually have one?

Yes	01	Continue
No	02	Go To Q4.8

Q4.2 WHICH (IF ANY) MODULES IN THE 'MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES' MANUAL AND/OR THE 'MAKING MORE FROM SHEEP' MANUAL YOU HAVE READ?

RECORD FIRST MENTIONED UNDER Q4.2.1

AND ALL OTHER MENTIONS UNDER Q4.2.2 DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE: ... ANY OTHERS?

Q4.3 THERE ARE SOME OTHER MODULES, DO YOU RECALL READING THE FOLLOWING (READ OUT ONLY THOSE NOT ALREADY RECALLED)?

IF Q4.2 &/or Q4.3 is null ask Q4.3.1, IF Q4.2 &/or Q4.3 is not null go to Q4.4.

Q4.3.1 WHY HAVE YOU NOT READ ANY OF THE 'MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES' MANUAL AND/OR MAKING MORE FROM SHEEP?

Still intend to read it	01
Don't understand it/too complicated	02
Does not apply to me	03
Do not agree with course content	04
No time/too busy	05
Not Interested	06
Don't Know	07
Other (Please Specify)	99

ASK ONLY FOR THOSE MODULES READ (ask in succession for each module)

Q4.4 HAVE YOU CARRIED OUT ANY OF THE PROCEDURES FROM THE MODULES YOU'VE READ

INSERT MODULE NAME(S) AND ANSWER FOR EACH MODULE READ?

(if yes ask Q4.4.1)

Q4.4.1 CAN YOU RECALL WHICH PROCEDURES?

(multi - insert answer using attached code frame 6.1 - probe)

Q4.5 HAVE YOU USED ANY OF THE TOOLS OR PRACTICES IN THE MANUAL(S)?

INSERT MODULE NAME(S) AND ANSWER FOR EACH MODULE READ?

(if yes ask Q4.5.1)

Q4.5.1 WHICH TOOLS OR PRACTICES DID YOU USE?

(multi - insert answer using attached code frame 6.2 and 6.3 - probe) Do not prompt or read out.

MLA Note: Q4.5.1 asks respondents to identify which tools or practices (RELATE TO APPENDED TABLE 6.1) they have used from the MBfP &/or MMfS manuals, check code frame at end of survey to ensure ALL possible responses are included.

'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' Manual Modules	Q4.2.1 First Mention Unprompted	Q4.2.2 Other Mentions Unprompted	Q4.3 Prompted	Q4.4 Carried out procedure Yes No	Q4.5 Used any tools Yes No
Setting Directions (Enterprise business planning)	01	01	01	01 02	01 02
Tactical Stock Control (managing stocking rate)	02	02	02	01 02	01 02
Pasture Growth (mapping land class, soil fertility, pasture selection)	03	03	03	01 02	01 02
Pasture Utilisation (developing the grazing plan)	04	04	04	01 02	01 02
Genetics (breeding objective)	05	05	05	01 02	01 02
Weaner Throughput (joining management, reproduction, weaning)	06	06	06	01 02	01 02
Herd Health and Welfare (risk identification,	07	07	07	01 02	01 02

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

preventative management)					
Meeting Market Specifications (knowing markets specifications, managing to meet them)	08	08	08	01 02	01 02
Other (SPECIFY) Other would be if they have only read the introduction only. (DP to code Other) .	09	09		01 02	01 02

‘Making More from Sheep Manual Modules	Q4.2.1 First Mention Unprompted	Q4.2.2 Other Mentions Unprompted	Q4.3 Prompted	Q4.4 Carried out procedure		Q4.5 Used any tools
				Yes	No	Yes No
Module 1: Plan For Success	01	01	01	01	02	01 02
Module 2: Market Focused Wool Production	02	02	02	01	02	01 02
Module 3: Market Focused Lamb And Sheepmeat Production	03	03	03	01	02	01 02
Module 4: Capable And Confident Producers	04	04	04	01	02	01 02

Module 5: Protect Your Farm's Natural Assets	05	05	05	01 02	01 02
Module 6: Healthy Soils	06	06	06	01 02	01 02
Module 7: Grow More Pasture	07	07	07	01 02	01 02
Module 8: Turn Pasture Into Product	08	08	08	01 02	01 02
Module 9: Gain from Genetics	09	09		01 02	01 02
Module 10: Wean More Lambs					
Module 11: Healthy And Contented Sheep					

ASK ALL TIER 2

Q4.6 AS A RESULT OF ATTENDING OR PARTICIPATING IN THE **MLA** PROGRAM, WHICH ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM MOST INFLUENCED YOU TO **CHANGE** MANAGEMENT PRACTICES?

Read out: THE MANUAL or the WORKSHOP?

Prompt with: ANY OTHERS? (*read out remaining options*)

MANUALS	01
WORKSHOPS	02
MANUAL & WORKSHOP (Combination)	03
FEED DEMAND CALCULATOR	04
MORE BEEF FROM PASTURES FIELD DAYS	05
COST OF PRODUCTION (COP) WORKSHOPS	06
RAINFALL TO PASTURE GROWTH OUTLOOK TOOL	07
PASTURE RULER	08

STOCKING RATE CALCULATOR	09
PRODUCER ADVOCATE PRESENTATION	10
PRODUCER DEMONSTRATION SITES	11
BEEFSPECS TOOL	12
PROGRAZIER (SOUTHERN ONLY)	13
FEEDBACK MAGAZINE	14
FRONTIER MAGAZINE (NORTHERN ONLY)	15
OTHER (Specify)	99

DP: Loop Question with Q4.10? (Banner to show results by course ie MBfP v's MMfS)

Q4.10 HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE (INSERT 4.9)?

(read out)

Weekly	01
Monthly	02
Annually	03
Don't Know	04

DEMOGRAPHICS

SECTION 5: ASK ALL (TIER 1 AND TIER 2)

Q5.1 WHAT ARE YOUR CURRENT BUSINESS PRIORITIES OR GOALS?

*(Int: Record **ONLY** the Top 3 mentioned)*

Expansion and increasing scale of production	01
Increasing efficiency	02
Building skills and knowledge to better manage our business	03
Maintain a 'holding pattern' on the current level of production	04
Decrease production/reduce scale	05
Planning for retirement	06
Succession planning	07
Getting out of farming totally	08
Don't Know	09
Other (Please Specify)	99

Q5.2 WHAT DO YOU PERCEIVE AS THE BIGGEST INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL THREATS TO YOUR BUSINESS?

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

(Int: Record ONLY those mentioned, enter others for possible inclusion into codeframe)

Internal		External	
Cash flow	01	Drought	11
Limited or no succession planning	02	Climate Change	12
Capital	03	Price Received	13
Scale	04		14
Labour efficiency	05		15
Costs of production	06		16
Animal production efficiency/performance (e.g. weaning rates)	07		17
Limited skills to capitalise on technology and manage climate variability	08		18
	09		19
	10		20
Other (Please Specify)	99	Other (Please Specify)	99

Q5.3 HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU THAT THERE IS A FUTURE IN BEING A PRODUCER WITHIN THE RED MEAT INDUSTRY OF AUSTRALIA? ON A SCALE OF 1 to 5 (WHERE 1 IS NO CONFIDENCE AND 5 IS EXTREMELY CONFIDENT).

DO NOT READ OUT- MATCH RESPONSE WITH CODEFRAME

Not at all Confident	01
Not Confident	02
Unsure	03
Some Confidence	04
Extremely Confident	05
Don't know	99

AND FINALLY, JUST A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE INTERVIEWED A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF PRODUCERS.

Q5.4 COULD YOU TELL ME INTO WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING AGE GROUPS YOU FALL?

READ OUT

Less than 20 years	1
21 – 30 years	2
31 – 40 years	3
41 – 50 years	4
51 – 60 years	5
Over 60 years	6
REFUSED (DO NOT READ OUT)	0

Q5.5 MLA WOULD LIKE TO SELECT A NUMBER OF BUSINESSES TO MONITOR AND DIRECTLY MEASURE IMPACT OF MLA PROGRAMS. WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN FURTHER DISCUSSIONS WITH MLA TO BE INVOLVED IN THIS PROCESS?

DO NOT READ OUT

Yes	1
No	2

Q5.6 RECORD GENDER OF RESPONDENT

DO NOT READ OUT

Male	1
Female	2

CLOSE:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. GOODBYE

INTERVIEWER REFERENCE MATERIAL – Where specific course names are mentioned please ensure they are recorded under their MLA Course Code, i.e. 02 EDGE Network or 01 PIRDS.

**THE LIST BELOW ARE ALL MLA COURSES and PROGRAMS
INTERVIEWER CHECK LIST FOR Q3.1 – Q3.2**

PIRD's = 01	PIRD's (Producer Initiated Research & Development) or demonstration trials.
	PRS or Producer Research Support
	PDS or Producer Demonstration Sites
EDGE Network = 02	Conflict resolution and negotiation
	Leadership
	Working in Groups® (WIGs)
	Farm Business Meetings
	Time Control
	BizCheck® for Meat.
	Developing the strategy
	Generating Profit and Wealth
	Working Records
	Enterprise Health Check
	Effective Pricing
	Making Business Decisions
	Grazing Land Management or GLM (<i>Nth Producers only</i>)
	Healthy Soils, Healthy Profits (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Profit from Saline Lands (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Managing Living Systems (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Weed Removers, Pasture Improvers (<i>Towards Sustainable Grazing Workshops</i>)
	Grazing Land Management (<i>Nth Producers only</i>)
	PROGRAZE® Update
	Lamb Cheque®
	Better Grazing Decisions®
	PROGRAZE®
	Beef Cheque®
	6.2.1 The Breeding EDGE (<i>Nth Producers only</i>)

	6.2.2 <i>Terminal Sire Selection or Effective Breeding (lambs)</i>
	6.2.3 <i>Wean More Lambs</i>
	6.2.4 <i>The Nutrition EDGE (Nth Producers only)</i>
	6.2.5 <i>Effective Breeding (beef)</i>
	6.2.6 <i>Money Making Mums (sheep)</i>
	NLIS in Your Business
	The Marketing EDGE (Nth Producers only)
	Lean Meat Yield (prime lambs)
	Markets and Customer Needs
	Marketing Performance
	Negotiating the Sale
	Understanding Marketing
	Meat Standards Australia (MSA)
	MSA Beefing Up Business/Performance
	The Selling Edge (Nth Producers only)
	Making the Most of Mutton
	Market Intelligence
	Marketing Strategy and Plan
	Selling Options
	BeefNet Product Knowledge
PRIME TIME = 03	Prime Time or Making More from Merino's, BounceBack from Drought
MBfP = 04	More Beef From Pastures (CD Manual or Forum)
	Cost of production (COP)
	Feed demand calculator
	Rainfall to pasture growth outlook tool
	Tools for time challenged expos
	Stocking rate calculator
COP = 05	Cost of Production Workshops
Beef Up Forums = 06	
Making More from Sheep = 07	(Separate sheep program – joint MLA/AWI funded).
GRAIN AND GRAZE = 08	
EVERGRAZE = 09	

Bestwool/Bestlamb =10 (Victoria only)	
Bestprac =11 (pastoral zone only)	
Non MLA Events = 12 (Courses conducted by organisations other than MLA where MLA contributed either course content or sponsorship, eg. North West Goat Breeders association Field Day)	Sheep updates - WA
	Merino Forums - SA
	Sheepvention seminars - Vic
	Bestwool / Bestlamb groups - Vic
MLA Publications = 13	Any other MLA publications not elsewhere included
Going Into Goats = 14	The Goat manual and associated introductory field days and workshops
Beef Plan = 15	Not part of Edge courses
OTHERS = 99	

APPENDED TABLE CODEFRAMES FOR SECTION 4

TABLE 6.1 - 'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' Pasture Manual Modules - PROCEDURES

Module 1 - Setting directions	Q4.5.1
Determine the enterprise strategy and herd structure most likely to maximise profit.	101
Develop a transition plan from the current enterprise to the preferred position, to achieve beef enterprise targets.	102
Measure and analyse current performance and compare with expected physical and financial targets and periodically review the strategic direction.	103
Cost of Production Calculator	104
Module 2 - Tactical stock control	
Predict pasture availability for a range of weather patterns and compare with stock requirements.	201
Take early corrective action when an excess or shortage of pasture is predicted.	202
Rainfall to Pasture Growth Outlook Tool	203
Module 3 - Pasture growth	
Map farm grazing land into pasture zones based on land class and capability.	301
Characterise the seasonal pattern and variability of rainfall and establish water use efficiency.	302
Build and maintain soil nutrients to improve soil fertility and health in all pasture zones.	303
Manipulate pasture species composition in each pasture zone to give best pasture growth and quality.	304
<i>Feed Demand Calculator</i>	305
Module 4 - Pasture utilisation	

Determine stocking rate, plan paddock sequences and use tactical grazing to maximise conversion of pasture into beef.	401
Select a paddock and determine grazing duration to achieve best utilisation and animal performance targets.	402
Start grazing before pasture energy content and growth starts to decline.	403
Stop grazing before pasture regrowth potential is affected.	404
Determine rest period required to give best regrowth between grazing events.	405
Rainfall to Pasture Growth Outlook Tool	406
Module 5 - Genetics	
Set the breeding objective for the herd by ensuring that the right emphasis is on different animal traits that improve enterprise profit.	501
Select the most profitable breed and/or crossbreeding system to achieve genetic progress.	502
Buy the right bulls (or semen) to maximise progress toward enterprise profit.	503
Allocate bulls to mating groups to reduce risk of inbreeding and dystocia in heifers.	504
Module 6 - Weaner throughput	
Maximise number of live calves per breeding female and minimise infertility in cows and bulls.	601
Control the mating period to reduce calving spread and to maintain selected annual calving date(s).	602
Wean as early as possible, without compromising calf growth rate.	603
Use a female culling and replacement policy to minimise pasture use by breeders and maintain the best herd structure.	604
Module 7 - Herd health and welfare	
Choose the appropriate management practice, corrective treatment or a combination to prevent common diseases or disorders	701
Determine the risk and vaccinate to prevent specific diseases	702
Watch for sporadic diseases and disorders	703
Prevent the introduction of infectious diseases	704
Module 8 - Meeting market specifications	
Manage the nutrition, health and welfare of sale animals to meet target market specifications on time.	801
Manage cattle two to three weeks before sale and during mustering and transport to achieve best carcase dressing percentage and avoid downgraded meat and carcasses.	802
Regularly evaluate market opportunities as feed supply, financial situation or market prices change, and select markets to maximise enterprise profit.	803

TABLE 6.2 - MBFP - 'MORE BEEF from PASTURES' Pasture Manual Modules – **TOOLS or **PRACTICES****

Toolkit	Q4.6.1
Tool 1.1 Specifications for a typical enterprise simulation model	01
Tool 1.2 Template of partial budget calculations for comparing change scenarios	02

Meat & Livestock Australia Awareness & Adoption KPI Evaluation 2009

Tool 1.3 Enterprise audit sample form	03
Tool 2.1 Guidelines for establishing minimum and maximum limits for whole enterprise pasture availability into the future (or days of feed available)	04
Tool 3.1 Guide to mapping pasture zones and developing the capacity for differential land management	05
Tool 3.2 Methodology for assessing soil texture	06
Tool 3.3 Visual indicators for identifying waterlogged and salt affected soils	07
Tool 3.4 List of state departments of agriculture websites for further information	08
Tool 3.5 Establishing the normal pattern and variability of rainfall	09
Tool 3.6 A guide to measuring water use efficiency (WUE) and setting targets for all pasture zones	10
Tool 3.7 Methodology for field-based pasture measurements	11
Tool 3.8 Table of critical limits for soil nutrients and other ratios important to pasture productivity	12
Tool 3.9 Guidelines for pasture nutrient applications	13
Tool 3.10 NATA-accredited soil testing laboratories	14
Tool 3.11 Guidelines to composition measurements	15
Tool 3.12 Sources of information on common pasture species and weeds	16
Tool 4.1 Pasture rulers , sticks and meters	17
Tool 4.2 Methods for setting pasture targets for slow rotations and set stocking	18
Tool 4.3 Daily pasture growth estimates for localities and regions across southern Australia	19
Tool 4.4 Information sources on pasture utilisation	20
Tool 4.5 Grazing management options to convert pastures into beef production	21
Tool 4.6 Plant-based grazing management methods	22
Tool 5.1 BreedObject™ software	23
Tool 5.2 Sources of information for breed and crossbreed averages for important traits	24
Tool 5.3 Guidelines when considering using different breed types	25
Tool 5.4 Generic market-based breeding objectives and selection indexes	26
Tool 5.5 Bull earning capacity calculator will help you predict the estimated earning capacity of each bull based on the dollar index value and estimated number of cows to be mated	27
Tool 5.6 Calving ease EBVs for bulls available from breed society websites	28
Tool 6.1 A guide to minimum liveweights of weaner heifers	29
Tool 6.2 Condition scoring beef cattle	30
Tool 6.3 The Australian Association of Cattle Veterinarians' publication, 'Evaluating and Reporting Bull Fertility'	31
Tool 6.4 Calving histogram calculator	32
Tool 6.5 Weaning age and projected liveweights	33
Tool 6.6 A template for calculating the number of replacement heifers required	34

Tool 7.1 Conditions that exist for the development of common cattle diseases	35
Tool 7.2 Distribution maps showing trace element and mineral deficiencies for southern Australia	36
Tool 7.3 Diagnostic tool for common diseases	37
Tool 7.4 Decision support calculator to determine cost-effectiveness of common preventative treatments	38
Tool 7.5 Management strategies to prevent disease	39
Tool 7.6 Diagnostic tool to detect presence of diseases	40
Tool 7.7 Conditions and vaccines for prevention of common cattle diseases	41
Tool 7.8 Vaccination strategies	42
Tool 7.9 Zoonotic diseases of cattle	43
Tool 7.10 National Vendor Declaration (NVD) Waybill for cattle	44
Tool 7.11 Disease information sources	45
Tool 7.12 References to identification of toxic plants and noxious weeds	46
Tool 7.13 Disease risk assessment protocols	47
Tool 7.14 Diagnostic tools to assess disease status	48
Tool 7.15 Strategies to lessen the impact if disease is introduced	49
Tool 8.1 Beef cattle market specifications	50
Tool 8.2 Graphs indicating liveweight and fat score ranges over which specifications for most prime beef markets are likely to be achieved	51
Tool 8.3 Meat Standards Australia (MSA) tips & tools	52
Tool 8.4 Range of selling options	53
Tool 8.5 Obtaining price and other market information	54

Table 6.3 - MMFS - Making More from Sheep *MODULES/TOOLS*

Module 1: Plan For Success
Tool 1.1 SWOT analysis
Tool 1.2 A simple process for setting goals and objectives
Tool 1.3 How to prepare a business plan
Tool 1.4 Discussion starters for imagining the future
Tool 1.5 Photo Voice
Tool 1.6 MLA cost of production calculator for lamb enterprises
Tool 1.7 AWI cost of production calculator for wool enterprises
Tool 1.8 MLA cost of production calculator for beef enterprises
Tool 1.9 Indicative industry benchmarks
Tool 1.10 A farm business risk assessment template and drought example
Tool 1.11 A partial budget template
Tool 1.12 The SGS one-page planning process
Module 2: Market Focused Wool Production

- Tool 2.1 Simplified flow of the wool pipeline
- Tool 2.2 Influence of physical characteristics on wool price
- Tool 2.3 The Merino Dark and Medullated Fibre Risk scheme
- Tool 2.4 Planning guidelines for shearing, wool preparation and classing
- Tool 2.5 Specifications for environmentally assured wool
- Tool 2.6 Guidelines for reducing chemical residues

Module 3: Market Focused Lamb And Sheepmeat Production

- Tool 3.1 Lamb growth planner
- Tool 3.2 Potential markets and specifications for sheepmeat
- Tool 3.3 Fat scoring lambs and sheep
- Tool 3.4 Lamb production check list
- Tool 3.5 MSA production guidelines for lamb and sheepmeat
- Tool 3.6 MSA Sheepmeat processing guide
- Tool 3.7 Factors affecting carcase quality and value
- Tool 3.8 Selling options for sheep and lambs
- Tool 3.9 Selecting the appropriate marketing option
- Tool 3.10 MLA market information

Module 4: Capable And Confident Producers

- Tool 4.1 Steps for establishing your business agreement
- Tool 4.2 The difference between dialogue and debate
- Tool 4.3 Understanding different communication styles
- Tool 4.4 Developing shared values, personal and business goals
- Tool 4.5 Your preferred learning style
- Tool 4.6 Work–life balance exercise

Module 5: Protect Your Farm's Natural Assets

- Tool 5.1 Indicators of saline land
- Tool 5.2 Stock water requirements
- Tool 5.3 Native bush assessment
- Tool 5.4 Riparian zone assessment
- Tool 5.5 Native pasture assessment
- Tool 5.6 Monitoring birds on farm
- Tool 5.7 The 3D approach to weed management
- Tool 5.8 Weed CRC weed control tactics
- Tool 5.9 Best practice guidelines for saltland
- Tool 5.10 Rabbit control options
- Tool 5.11 Fox control options
- Tool 5.12 Establishing a photopoint
- Tool 5.13 Before and after photographs

Tool 5.14 Species identification resources

Tool 5.15 Monitoring and assessment tools

Module 6: Healthy Soils

Tool 6.1 A guide to assessing land capability

Tool 6.2 Measuring groundcover and litter levels

Tool 6.3 Assessing soil health

Tool 6.4 Taking a soil sample for laboratory testing

Tool 6.5 Soil health benchmarks and guidelines for managing problem soils

Module 7: Grow More Pasture

Tool 7.1 Determining priorities for growing more pasture

Tool 7.2 Fertiliser test strips

Tool 7.3 Interpreting soil tests

Tool 7.4 Guidelines for fertiliser application

Tool 7.5 Grazing management guidelines for individual species

Tool 7.6 Pasture assessment techniques

Module 8: Turn Pasture Into Product

Tool 8.1 MLA rainfall to pasture growth outlook tool

Tool 8.2 Daily pasture growth estimates

Tool 8.3 MLA feed demand calculator

Tool 8.4 Feed budgeting template

Tool 8.5 Feed year plan template

Tool 8.6 Pasture rulers, sticks and meters

Tool 8.7 Getting started in simple rotational grazing

Module 9: Gain from Genetics

Tool 9.1 Sheep CRC wether calculator

Tool 9.2 Sheep CRC Merino versus terminal sire flock model

Tool 9.3 Australian Sheep Breeding Value definitions

Tool 9.4 Breeding values explained

Tool 9.5 Using a percentile band table

Tool 9.6 Understanding Sheep Genetics breeding values

Tool 9.7 Sheep Genetics indexes

Tool 9.8 Valuing genetic merit for fleece weight

Tool 9.9 Valuing genetic merit for growth weight

Tool 9.10 On-farm fibre measurement (OFFM) calculator

Tool 9.11 Simultaneous assortment of sheep into joining flocks

Module 10: Wean More Lambs

Tool 10.1 Condition scoring

Tool 10.2 The lambing planner

Tool 10.3	How the “ram effect” works
Tool 10.4	Recommended condition score and fat score targets for ewes
Tool 10.5	Bodyweight targets for weaners and young ewes
Tool 10.6	Ram check list
Tool 10.7	Pregnancy scanning of ewes
Tool 10.8	Check list for new-born lamb mortalities
Module 11: Healthy And Contented Sheep	
Tool 11.1	Energy and protein requirements of sheep
Tool 11.2	Condition score targets for all sheep classes
Tool 11.3	Template for a management calendar
Tool 11.4	Calculating the cost of energy and protein for common feeds
Tool 11.5	Bodyweight targets for weaners and young ewes
Tool 11.6	Water quality for sheep
Tool 11.7	Diagnosis and management of trace element deficiencies
Tool 11.8	Guidelines for management of worms
Tool 11.9	Detection and management of drench resistance
Tool 11.10	Guidelines for the management of liver fluke
Tool 11.11	Guidelines for the management of flystrike
Tool 11.12	Guidelines for the prevention of clostridial diseases and cheesy gland
Tool 11.13	Diagnosis of important diseases
Tool 11.14	Analysing the risk of potential sources of disease
Tool 11.15	Quarantine periods for important sheep diseases
Tool 11.16	Principles of control and eradication of footrot, lice and OJD
Tool 11.17	Common sheep diseases and predisposing factors
Tool 11.18	Zoonotic diseases of sheep
Tool 11.19	Check list of on-farm animal welfare compliance