



CRC for Coastal Zone, Estuary and Waterway Management
Governance and Partnerships Package
Collaborative regional natural resource management symposia

Evaluation Report
Brisbane and Rockhampton October 2005

The Coastal CRC 'Governance and Partnerships' program put together a 2-day symposium for regional body staff, boards and stakeholders, government officers involved in regional natural resource management (NRM), researchers and community groups. Several current Coastal CRC research projects focus on the role of partnerships among stakeholders in NRM while others aim to provide tools to assist NRM managers with decision making and information access.



The aim of the symposium was to bring together researchers and community to discuss collaborative governance partnerships and the role of various stakeholders. The format included:

- Presentations by CRC researchers on Governance and Partnerships research projects;
- Interactive and participatory exercises to relate these findings from these projects to the NRM;
- Challenges, learnings and avenues for application for participants; and
- Networking and opportunities for collaboration.

The symposia took place in Rockhampton and Brisbane and attracted over 60 participants from: regional NRM groups; Community organisations; Local and State Government; and Universities. A full participant list is available.

Program

The Coastal CRC Governance and Partnerships Team developed the structure and content of the symposium through a process of three meetings and a phone link up. The program incorporated local presenters in each location, including Sharon Marks of FBA in Rockhampton and Paul Rees of QNRM in Brisbane. All participants received a participants kit emailed out week prior to workshops, this printed dossier was available for all participants at the workshops and included: powerpoint presentations, papers from all sessions, weblinks and contact information.

Day 1 (0930 -1700)

- Introductions
- Industry – Community – Government Partnerships (Roy Rickson)
- Community involvement in regional environmental governance (Peter Oliver and James Whelan)
- Achieving Sustainable planning outcomes through the implementation process (Darryl Low-Choy)
- Plenary discussion – emerging themes and issues

Day 2 (0915 -1700)

- Re-cap Day 1
- Adaptive management in complex multi-stakeholder environments (Greg Leach and John Bennet)
- Developing and reporting on social and community health indicators (Susan Rockloff, Stewart Lockie, Danielle Helbers)
- Science and communication and NRM (Don Alcock, Sharon Marks, Paul Rees)
- Plenary discussion – themes, issues and actions

The workshops were facilitated and coordinated by James Whelan and Karrina Nolan.

Symposia Evaluation:

Participants were provided with an opportunity to formally evaluate the workshops. A written feedback form was completed at the end of the two days. The feedback sheet provided prompts for an assessment of the content and structure of the program, the facilitation, venue and catering as well as asking participants for the best aspects of the workshop and suggestions for improvements. Most questions were open and invited qualitative (descriptive) responses. Four questions also invited a quantitative assessment on a scale of 1-5, with 5 corresponding to the highest level of satisfaction. A summary of these feedback forms follows. In addition, this document includes whiteboard notes from plenary discussion.



Brisbane 20/21 October

Riverside Receptions – New Farm

1. Facilitation: Were you satisfied with the experience, knowledge and approach of the symposium presenters?

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency			√√√√√	√√√√√√√√	√√√√√√√	4.1

- ⇒ Exceptionally well presented
- ⇒ Approach of presentations with too much text and tables that are hard to read not very good
- ⇒ Very open, approachable and happy to be challenged
- ⇒ It is obvious that their research is very comprehensive with results that can truly inform future practice
- ⇒ Speed of some presenters left me high and dry, so lost point of what they were saying
- ⇒ More practical activities would increase the great workshop

2. Symposium content and structure: Did the two-day symposium cover suitable topics in an effective sequence? Were there adequate opportunities for interaction?

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency			√√√√√√	√√√√√√√√	√√√√√	4

- ⇒ Well designed agenda, very effective
- ⇒ I only came along for parts of each day so difficult to comment on overall structure but thought what I saw flowed well
- ⇒ Sequence not clear and much more interaction would have been good
- ⇒ Good variety in pace and style
- ⇒ Some presenters covered too much about their research projects, rather than how they could help participants
- ⇒ Yes and yes!
- ⇒ Plenty of interaction. Direction, explanation for groups was a little vague

3. Please comment on specific sections of the program (e.g highlights or what could have worked better)

Session 1 – Industry Community Government Partnerships

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency		√√√	√	√√√√√√√√	√√√√√	3.8

- ⇒ Would have liked to learn more about how the application of the Swiss model worked in QLD

- ⇒ I found this a long and drawn out presentation that took a long time to put specific points across. Not totally relevant to NRM as it is to EIA/SA
- ⇒ Perhaps more on a local scale
- ⇒ Info good, easy to understand
- ⇒ Not good introduction/explanation of project. Though interesting material
- ⇒ Interesting to hear/see an international example
- ⇒ Perhaps more interaction on where this might be applied in Australia ✓
- ⇒ Left more questions on why it worked
- ⇒ An excellent case study example that provides a positive view of an industry and community relationship that delivered a 'win win' for all involved
- ⇒ Interesting topic, goods to highlight limitations. Good to see project with positive outcome
- ⇒ Very good
- ⇒ Pictures good – pity about the lack of activity, good to have the session in the morning
- ⇒ Interesting and inspirational

Session 2 – Developing and reporting on social and community health indicators for sustainability in changing coastal environments

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency		√√√	√√√√√√√√	√√√√√√	√√√√√	3.4

- ⇒ Could have been explained a little first
- ⇒ This exercise was useful to make you think about target setting in context of adopting SMART targets
- ⇒ Maybe if it had continued in the latter section with 4-5 agreed upon indicators and all work together in assessment
- ⇒ Very practical – particularly useful for those who weren't immersed in indicators on a daily basis, helped clarify the problems inherent in developing indicators
- ⇒ Interactive exercise was good ✓
- ⇒ Good activities for thinking processes
- ⇒ Limited relevance to me ✓
- ⇒ A little confusing at first, maybe provide an example to guide
- ⇒ There was a lot of learning in our stumbling in the early stages, a very useful conclusion
- ⇒ Bit too detailed on the CQ project
- ⇒ Not having social science background made content hard to understand
- ⇒ Provided an opportunity for discussion, but did not think the exercises greatly productive
- ⇒ Introduction to the indicator tools 'SMART' etc was excellent
- ⇒ Presentation ok, workshop good
- ⇒ Practical activities were good – made us think about the use of indicators and reinforced what was said

Session 3 – Achieving sustainable planning outcomes through the implementation process

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency		√	√√√√	√√√√√√√√√√	√√√√	3.9

- ⇒ Interesting perspectives and highlighted well the challenges of integrating local government into NRM agenda and many institutional constraints
- ⇒ Interesting ✓
- ⇒ excellent well researched/communicated highly relevant
- ⇒ perhaps more on learning from revisiting objectives
- ⇒ well pitched for group, some more practical exercise would help
- ⇒ Very important research ie on the need for renegotiation for 'implementing plans'
- ⇒ Created awareness of some difficulties/limitations. Found activity a little confusing maybe provide an example. Needed good understanding of government to answer
- ⇒ Planning good as I am a local government support officer – not totally applicable where I am though
- ⇒ I didn't have much knowledge of QLD local government, so this was useful information session

Session 4 – Adaptive management in complex multi-stakeholder environments

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency	√	√√√	√√	√√√√√√√√√√	√√√√√	3.7

- ⇒ Very interested to see research on aligning state government activities and targets in regional plan
- ⇒ Interesting session but perhaps not very revolutionary. Various models of adaptive management have been used over the past 20-30 years, not so sure that this was particularly effective, but good session
- ⇒ Whipped through long presentation slide by slide a bit quickly, interesting presentation though

- ⇒ Quite relevant, well presented, found it good to see AM principles laid out. Found activity a little confusing, maybe provide an example
- ⇒ Good stuff but presentation could have been clearer
- ⇒ A bit complex
- ⇒ Nice concepts to share
- ⇒ Too much info – could be cut down, especially powerpoint and simplified
- ⇒ Too much of an ‘academic exercise’ money could have been better spent on getting other government departments and local government involved in NRM
- ⇒ Excellent research where the findings/results/tools are directly applicable
- ⇒ Too many slides
- ⇒ Hard to understand

Session 5 – Community involvement in regional environmental governance

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency		√√	√√	√√√√√√√√	√√√√√√√√√√	4

- ⇒ Great insight in to local/state governance
- ⇒ Entertaining, particularly liked role play. Very pragmatic approach to community involvement. Really enjoyed this session
- ⇒ Great role play to keep audience interested ✓
- ⇒ More community ‘snapshots’, community groups could be involved. Pity no strong community group participation
- ⇒ Slide images that are hard to read supplied as larger printed handouts
- ⇒ Excellent presentation, loved the role play really livened it up ✓
- ⇒ Very interesting discussion very thought provoking. Nice decision trees
- ⇒ Great
- ⇒ Could have had more on this
- ⇒ Excellent research where the findings/results/tools are directly applicable
- ⇒ Keen on the discussion of memes and their unwitting replication
- ⇒ Story well told, entertaining whilst getting the message across, very useful
- ⇒ Engaging approach to presentation, content was good

Session 6 – Science Communication and NRM

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency			√√√√√√	√√	√√√√√√	4

- ⇒ Great information
- ⇒ Good sound advice ✓
- ⇒ Could have been more interesting
- ⇒ Tough on a Friday afternoon – not as relevant to me as other sessions. A bit slow
- ⇒ Good
- ⇒ Excellent research where the findings/results/tools are directly applicable
- ⇒ Good topic, quite relevant to me both personally and in the work place, good use of case study, very useful

4. Application: To what extent do you consider this symposium will influence your approach to partnerships, collaboration, adaptive management and/or communication? How?

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency			√√√	√√√√√√√√√√	√√√√	4

- ⇒ Extremely useable models and information was provided
- ⇒ Application with regard to working with local government and reinforcing the need to be adaptive, we are already reinforcing importance of M & E review strategies, but good to see examples here
- ⇒ To think about in context of creating partnerships and forming collaboration better in future
- ⇒ Not sure need to think about it. The session indicators will certainly influence what I do
- ⇒ I will endeavour to provide opportunities for groundwork to be more easily accessed through education (high school level). Access to data collected – ok some implementation problems
- ⇒ Ideas for better partnerships and communications with local government
- ⇒ I’m a researcher so not applying stuff but useful for informing my research
- ⇒ It will help me communicate about all these things. An opportunity to reflect on and reframe previous thinking
- ⇒ Helped a lot we all agree it’s necessary. A bit more advice on ‘practical ways how to’ is needed
- ⇒ Confirmed some of my thoughts
- ⇒ I would look to these tools for guidance and a place to start and operate – to be better informed to start with

- ⇒ There is a great deal to think about. I will certainly be applying much of what was discussed in my current employ. Also I will be looking at how NRM SEG interacts with its constituents
- ⇒ The workshop created a lot of awareness of regional and government roles, limitations and barriers as well as means to communicate
- ⇒ Good principles which I will use
- ⇒ Reinforces that these things are possible and workable

5. Venue and catering: Did the venue and catering meet your expectations? Were you comfortable?

Response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
Frequency		√		√√√	√√√√√√√√√√√√√√√√	4.7

- ⇒ Lovely
- ⇒ Lots of yummy food, great views √
- ⇒ Great well done, fantastic food √√√
- ⇒ Great food, little cold on first day. Would recommend venue
- ⇒ Food ok, room bit large and staff disturbing
- ⇒ Good vege, good set-up, room comfort pretty good
- ⇒ Excellent √

6. What were the best aspects of the symposium?

- ⇒ Learning about research with regard to regional body plan implementation
- ⇒ Learning about qualitative research
- ⇒ Interaction and size of group√
- ⇒ Company
- ⇒ The role play of course!
- ⇒ Information transfer
- ⇒ Networking √√√
- ⇒ Awareness of practical tools that will be produced from research
- ⇒ Interesting content
- ⇒ The food!
- ⇒ Audience interaction, activities
- ⇒ Lots of exercises, varied pace, exceptional value for money
- ⇒ Interesting people
- ⇒ The papers were of a high standard and makes me think about how one is interacting with other groups
- ⇒ Change to the horseshoe shape. Description of local governments place in regional NRM
- ⇒ Variety of topics, although final presentations were best as they were more relevant to my work. Lovely venue. Great opportunity to hear some relevant and interesting research/outcomes
- ⇒ Very informative and good to interact and meet other people in similar fields

7. How could the symposium have been improved?

- ⇒ I think if more participants had been involved – more people would have come to the workshop
- ⇒ A little more guided in the interaction
- ⇒ More discussion
- ⇒ If more people stayed on for the 2 days
- ⇒ Perhaps a little more group interaction in some of the sessions √√
- ⇒ Maybe by asking regional bodies what they want to know if targeting them specifically
- ⇒ More on application of research findings and less academic speak (or promotion that workshop is the presentation of research)
- ⇒ More ‘hands on’ activities √
- ⇒ Not cramping time for plenary
- ⇒ Less seminar style
- ⇒ More on ground NRM NGO reps
- ⇒ It worked pretty well
- ⇒ All aspects were good

8. Are there other things you would like to let us know?

- ⇒ Great job guys!
- ⇒ Well done – what’s next?!
- ⇒ CRC practice what preach with training team in communication skills (especially presentation skills)
- ⇒ All much appreciated – keep putting this kind of stuff out there in front of people
- ⇒ Case studies and uses of the various tools available, hands on practical workshop. Working through various scenarios and strengths/weaknesses of each tool

9. What future workshops would you like to see the CRC offer?

- ⇒ More on science and communication, in depth
- ⇒ Similar stuff
- ⇒ More along the lines of how community groups schools can participate
- ⇒ More specialist seminars on related topics (1-day) would be great
- ⇒ Field days with regional bodies

How did you hear about the symposium?

CRC communication (email, Flotsam and Jetsam, mailing list) √√√√√√√
 Word of mouth √√√
 Other
 listserve √√, enviro info mailing list, BCC catchments email, research for job application



Rockhampton 17/18 October

North St Annex

1. Facilitation: Were you satisfied with the experience, knowledge and approach of the symposium presenters?

response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
frequency			√	√√√√√√√√	√√√√√√	4.3

- ⇒ Experience and knowledge great, approach needs some work

2. Symposium content and structure: Did the two-day symposium cover suitable topics in an effective sequence? Were there adequate opportunities for interaction?

response	1	2	3	4	5	mean
frequency			√√√√	√√√√√	√√√√√√	3.1

- ⇒ More opportunities for interaction
- ⇒ Yes to both
- ⇒ Workshop was very well coordinated, bringing all “players” ie grassroots group, local government, state government into the mix
- ⇒ Most presenters provided great interaction opportunities and activities

3. Application: To what extent do you consider this symposium will influence your approach to partnerships, collaboration, adaptive management and/or communication? How?

response	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
frequency		√	√√√√√	√√√√√	√√√√	3.8

- ⇒ I will approach things with opinions and ideas of things and integrate them in my NRM dealings
- ⇒ Able to clarify some good info sources, a lot of good work has already been done and this needs to be examined by stakeholders in any NRM region and adapted where necessary
- ⇒ Good to listen to other peoples experiences/knowledge
- ⇒ I'm more aware of these concepts as a result of them workshop
- ⇒ A doorway into how to engage and bring together groups of perceived/real unequal power

- ⇒ The process needs to reach education QLD so that our youngest generation is aware of the concerns raised throughout the workshop
- ⇒ I now have a greater understanding of what this is all about

4. Venue and catering: Did the venue and catering meet your expectations? Were you comfortable?

response	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
frequency			√	√√√√√	√√√√√√√√√	4.5

- ⇒ Excellent
- ⇒ Congratulations
- ⇒ Ideal
- ⇒ Catering first class, noisy air conditioning but comfortable

5. What were the best aspects of the symposium?

- ⇒ Networking √√√
- ⇒ Presentation on local government involvement in NRM √√
- ⇒ Focus on planning/governance
- ⇒ Community planning √
- ⇒ Community involvement in regional governance √√
- ⇒ Interactive parts where ideas were shared √
- ⇒ Talking to individuals in the industry
- ⇒ Information and facilitation
- ⇒ Social indicators √
- ⇒ A large amount of content in a small amount of time, but the conference was not heavy
- ⇒ Enjoyed the role play by Mr Oliver and young jim
- ⇒ Catering – overall organisation, presenters
- ⇒ Update on CRC outputs, useful contribution re-indigenous context of NRM

6. How could the symposium have been improved?

- ⇒ Bit more on application of research rather than background to projects
- ⇒ Microphone
- ⇒ Held at NKIEEC or Great Keppel Island
- ⇒ A little conative more activity
- ⇒ More time for discussion
- ⇒ One presentation didn't provide materials
- ⇒ Perhaps getting more NRM regions to the party
- ⇒ Too many acronyms and too fast (in delivery) for the adaptive management session
- ⇒ Very good – any communication is good communication
- ⇒ One particular presentation needed more interaction
- ⇒ Something that was targeted at stakeholders and community groups – there were noticeable absences
- ⇒ Re-arranging tables worked better – participants worked well together

7. Are there other things you would like to let us know?

- ⇒ One of the best workshops I've been to
- ⇒ 2 days were great and I got a lot out of them
- ⇒ Expected greater interest from Regional NRM bodies, great to see community members present
- ⇒ Would like to see some ideas on collection of local and indigenous knowledge. community versus scientific/government priorities, there are models for collection of traditional knowledge, tried tested and acclaimed
- ⇒ Well worth the trip, thanks for the invite and "free" workshop
- ⇒ academic format would not appeal to community groups, local governments need to be exposed to this but approached differently. NRM regional bodies don't have all the answers and appear to be locked up in their Regional Investment Strategy that adaptive management and a common strategic approach is being ignored
- ⇒ after hours networking both useful and enjoyable

8. What future workshops would you like to see the CRC offer?

- ⇒ Case studies and investigation of what went well
- ⇒ More on planning and implementation
- ⇒ Science communication workshop
- ⇒ How projects finish – final report on findings
- ⇒ Knowledge recording – ensure knowledge providers can control the disclosure process
- ⇒ I have found the CRC's efforts to communicate throughout the six years of activity have been first rate

- ⇒ The further effects to the social fabric of mining/industry development
- ⇒ Similar workshops could be designed to assist with developing a program to help promote the F.R.B
- ⇒ Wrap up of Fitzroy CRC findings at completion of projects
- ⇒ A hands on field day to appeal to more people who are not keen on government workshops, academic language

How did you hear about the symposium?

- CRC communication (email, Flotsam and Jetsam, mailing list) ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓
- Coastcare network ✓
- Word of mouth ✓
- Other
- 2005 CRC workshop

Group Evaluation:

Day 1

Emerging questions

- Limited local govt powers//choice of actions
- Resource base influencing local govt actions and programs
- Drivers: 'statutory responsibility'; incentives; politics; environmental pressures (eg.H2O) relationship between state and local government
- Local govt focus on services (R,R,R)
- Evolution of governance and institutional arrangements and uncertainties (funding inadequacies)
- Availability of incentives
- Parallel processes (eg community engagement, NRM planning)
- Reporting back to constituency/sector to genuinely represent
- High level linkage between LGAQ and JSC
- Duplications, competition, understanding motivations

Themes

- Complexity – lack of clarity
- Power sharing? By Govt?
- Trust and reciprocity//risk
- Importance of time (>5years) and certainty to learn, experiment
- Shifting ground, uncertain future (change takes time) forced change
- Importance of relationships

Day 2

Issues and Actions

- Challenge of setting indicators/goals
- Scale?
- Devolution of land and sea management
- Renegotiation processes of planning time frame (optimum = 5yrs)
- Communication plans needed
- Incorporate existing info (don't reinvent the wheel) – networking
- Behavioural Change – what mix of tools (including communication)
 - Relationship Management
 - More than regional arrangements eg. industry/community
 - Other networks?
 - Reduction in QG extension?
- Ethics in communication