



Final report

Profitable Grazing Systems State Coordinator- Western Australia

Project code: L.PGS.2025
Prepared by: Georgia Reid-Smith
AgPro Management
Date published: 12 May 2022

PUBLISHED BY

Meat & Livestock Australia Limited

PO Box 1961

NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

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

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

Abstract

The Profitable Grazing Systems project (PGS) aims to use supported learning methods to develop the skills of red meat producers and support implementation of these new skills into businesses, improving profitability and productivity. The focus is on achieving adoption through high quality delivery underpinned by robust monitoring evaluation and a commercial approach. State coordinators work closely with the national coordinator, being the key contact in their state. The aim is to improve recruitment of deliverers, develop and deliver strategic feeder activities and support current deliverers to deliver their SLPs and M&E materials, as well as develop new SLPs.

Western Australian activities have focused on managing current deliverers and their programs, increasing industry awareness of the PGS project, and recruiting new deliverers. This has focused heavily on local networks and knowledge of the state coordinator and leadership team, resulting in a capacity building workshop and discussions with potential new deliverers about developing SLPs. There has also been a focus on ensuring M&E was collated and submitted for deliverers to ensure consistency and quality while new processes were being developed.

Overall, this contract has resulted in three deliverers successfully delivering three different SLPs to multiple groups (8 completed, 6 in progress) and producers across W.A.

Executive summary

Background

The Profitable Grazing Systems project (PGS) aims to use a supported learning methodology to develop the skills of red meat producers, and support implementation of these new skills into businesses, improving profitability and productivity. The State Coordinator role targets deliverer recruitment and program quality to ensure the new program is successfully delivered across the country, while capturing local insights and recommendations.

Objectives

The main objective of the PGS program is to encourage and support red meat producers to improve their management skills, to increase profit. The state coordinator position is to be the key WA contact for deliverers. This involved:

The key responsibilities of state coordinator were to:

- Identify engagement opportunities
- Recruitment
- Identify and run feeder & capacity building activities
- Manage PGS program quality assurance

Methodology

Based on a 6 month timeframe, state based workplans were produced and implemented, which involved meeting with the national project team, engaging with potential deliverers, managing existing SLPs and deliverers, and running both feeder and capacity building activities. In addition, activities were undertaken to raise the profile of PGS.

Results/key findings

This contract has been successful in continuing to work towards the main PGS objectives. There has been continual communication with the industry, and leadership team, to improve the program and its' profile.

There have not yet been any new deliverers who have completed a PGS, but there has been solid leads and potential programs developed.

Three deliverers have successfully delivered three SLPs, and a capacity building workshop was delivered in 2021.

Benefits to industry

Despite this contract meeting its targets, there is still a lot of work to be done to ensure that the PGS project is successful and continues to benefit red meat producers. These benefits are the skills and knowledge producers gain from the SLPS, as well as the skills of involved deliverers. The flexibility of the program means it is able to meet the needs of producers locally, which is a strength of the project.

Future research and recommendations

PGS programs should tie into existing PDS projects if possible, and be better promoted through MLA networks. It is recommended that there is still someone on the ground in WA to be the PGS contact, actively recruiting and supporting deliverers. The program needs to continue to utilise local networks to recruit and support deliverers and producers, as well as promoting PGS and locally available SLPs. The individual programs need to be better promoted to deliverers and producers, with more detailed information made available.

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Abstract..... | 2 |
| Executive Summary..... | 3 |
| 1. Background..... | 6 |
| 2. Objectives..... | 6 |
| 2.1 Overarching Project Objectives..... | 6 |
| 2.2 State Coordinator Contribution..... | 6 |
| 2.3 Key Performance Indicators..... | 7 |
| 3. Methodology..... | 8 |
| 4. Results..... | 8 |
| 4.1.1 Operational review..... | 8 |
| 4.1.2 Success against key performance indicators..... | 14 |
| 5. Conclusion..... | 17 |
| 6. Future research and recommendations..... | 17 |

1. Background

PGS Vision

A financially sustainable adoption program aligned to the MLA 2020 targets that extends MLA R&D outputs and achieves increased producer skills and capability, practice change and whole farm business improvement through increasing producer understanding of:

Business profit = management capability + evidence + value chain approach

Profitable Grazing Systems (PGS) is MLA's new flagship adoption program which will drive measurable, improved business performance outcomes for participating red meat producers. The program will use a supported learning methodology to develop the skills of red meat producers and support implementation of these new skills into businesses, improving profitability and productivity. Profitable Grazing Systems builds on previous red meat industry extension and adoption programs including Making More from Sheep and More Beef from Pastures and will have a focus on achieving adoption through high quality delivery underpinned by robust monitoring evaluation and a commercial approach.

2. Objectives

2.1 Overarching Project Objectives

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

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

2.2 State Coordinator Contribution

The key responsibilities of state coordinator were to:

- Be the key PGS contact for deliverers within each state. This includes reviewing supported learning projects submitted by deliverers for the eligibility for PGS; developing and delivering strategic feeder activities in collaboration with PGS deliverers; and supporting PGS deliverers in the preparation of their M&E materials for both feeder and SLP activities;
- Identify opportunities across the MLA Adoption plan to promote engagement of service providers and producers in PGS, PDS and EDGE and promote the collaborative benefits of these programs
- Recruit deliverers and producers for the program. Producers to be engaged in collaboration with PGS deliverers. Effective local networks and local knowledge were to be critical in successful recruitment;
- Influence feeder activity design to ensure they were high impact and met producer needs locally;
- Manage PGS program quality assurance:
 - ensuring consistency in messaging and standards of delivery
 - collating monitoring and evaluation data from deliverers & submitting to M&E coordinator (when one existed)
 - providing feedback to deliverers once M&E data was analysed by M&E coordinator (when one existed)

2.3 Key Performance Indicators

Performance metrics for this role included:

- Managing existing PGS projects in WA
- Working with Rebecca Wallis to ensure continuation in the management of PGS projects and proposals
- Reporting to the PGS National Coordinator on opportunities for PGS programs and deliverers in WA
- Providing links to 2 new potential PGS coordinators in WA
- To be involved in the development of the 2019/20 PGS Capability Building workshop in WA (Moved to 2020/2021)
- Liaising between the PGS program and AAAC to determine opportunity for PGS with the AAAC membership
- Working with the National Coordinator to determine PGS Feeder opportunities in WA where relevant

Table 1. Key Performance Indicators

| The table below outlines core activity KPI's for this work KPI's | Year 1 (FY20/21) | Year 2 (FY21/22) |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| Number of SLP Activities promoted and managed | 5 | 4 |
| Number of feeder activities | 1 | 1 |

3. Methodology

State based workplans were produced and implemented, based on a six-month timeframe. The workplans were:

- Delivered using the standard MLA Profitable Grazing Systems workplan template.
- Addressed specific state KPIs which formed the basis of the key deliverables.
- Presented a process for identifying and engaging the delivery network within the state and from other states.
- Presented a clear process for identifying and developing key strategic feeder activities.
- Presented a clear process for engaging producers in the state.

All state-based workplans are attached as Appendix 1, showing that they were successful in assisting the program to meet targets and record activities undertaken. They also meant that all work was done efficiently and effectively, as each plan was adapted to the current timeframe.

The workplan implementation was to:

- Comply with the principles and procedures of Profitable Grazing Systems.
- Be the key point of contact and coordinator in the state for producers and the delivery network.
- Provide effective and constructive guidance to potential Support Learning Program providers.
- Engage the Leadership group in a strategic manner to support deliverer network.
- Maintain a database of PGS participants and provide this to the National and M&E coordinators as agreed.
- Attend regular coordinator teleconferences and face to face meetings as required.
- Source relevant articles and case studies for MLA publications.
- Coordinate and integrate activities with other state based PGS coordinators to avoid duplication.
- Coordinate and integrate state-based activities with other MLA programs where relevant to avoid duplication.
- Comply with MLA's processes for event promotion and use the program brands in accordance with the Profitable Grazing Systems style guidelines.

4. Results

4.1.1 Operational review

Table 2. Operational Review

| Question | Discussion |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Level of service provider engagement</p> <p>a. Are the KPIs set for your State/Territory realistic, and why/why not?</p> | <p>a. KPIs for Feeder activities were not set for the 2019-2021 contract. This was reviewed for the 2021/2022 extension and put in line with other state's targets or recruitment activities and made to be realistic given COVID impacts on the industry.</p> |

| Question | Discussion |
|---|--|
| <p>b. What challenges have you experienced in engaging service providers (e.g. barriers to engagement)?</p> <p>c. For those service providers that have engaged, what have been their key motives?</p> <p>d. What solutions would you suggest to overcoming barriers to engagement in your area?</p> | <p>b. Barriers to engagement include time-poor producers, lack of networks/existing groups for deliverers to easily tap into, and the cost involved with developing a new SLP despite the options of MLA off the shelf options. As with all industry event COVID-19 restrictions and uncertainty has also had an impact, particularly for Ken Hart's intended 2021 groups.</p> <p>c. Using an existing SLP (their own) to service existing and new groups.</p> <p>b. Focusing on the right deliverers- those that have the time and 'cheap labour' to develop new SLP's- eg early career consultants. Engaging these potential deliverers and discussing off the shelf options is another way to better engage deliverers. Often these people are nestled within larger organisations that have existing networks/groups, which would assist with producer recruitment.</p> <p>The reporting requirements and process needs to be clearer, as does contracting. This has been addressed with changes to M&E collection, reporting & analysis in 2022, the outcomes of which remain to be seen.</p> <p>Appropriate feed activities would also assist, ideally working with other MLA activities and projects in the area.</p> |
| <p>2. Support for service providers and capacity development</p> <p>a. Comment on the availability of service providers in your region and their capability relative to participation in PGS</p> <p>b. Give an overview of the nature (type, timing) of support provided to service providers.</p> | <p>c. Most experienced consultants do not have the capacity to engage with PGS as are too busy, and the program is financially demanding, with high delivery costs in WA due to the distance between service providers and participants.</p> <p>Hence targeting of less established deliverers who are under-utilised and have the time to not only to create and deliver SLPs, but also recruit producers.</p> <p>b. Service providers, both those involved in PGS and those not, have been constantly updated about the project, new off the shelf packages, and events. This has usually been via email, roughly every 4 months. In addition, service providers who have previously expressed interest in PGS, are known to be developing workshops, or have taken on new, younger employees have been engaged through phone calls and discussions at industry events.</p> |

| Question | Discussion |
|--|--|
| <p>c. Do you believe that this support could be improved and if so, how?</p> <p>d. In considering the characteristics of interested service providers, can you identify any capacity building priorities that might interest them?</p> | <p>Current service providers have received a lot of individualised support to ensure they remain delivering SLPs and recruit new participants. This has involved assistance with inputting M&E, with registration, pre and post KASA forms. These forms have also been constantly updated with each service provider to ensure the data collected is beneficial to both the deliverer and MLA. Deliverers have also received assistance with contracting, guidance with participant recruitment, and in some cases additional resources they can utilise to improve their SLPs. This is on top of regular phone contact throughout the year to see if there is anything the PGS program can assist with, whether it is future or current SLPs.</p> <p>c. The support for service providers (both potential and current deliverers) can only be improved marginally, as it is already tailored for each provider by the state coordinator. The connection state coordinators provides is essential, and where the PGS program has strength, by utilising local networks to assist, recruit and maintain deliverers, as well as efficiently targeting participants.</p> <p>The support could be improved if the state coordinators had access to the full SLPs for each of their deliverers, including delivery and milestone timing. With their personal relationship and lines of communication with the deliverers, this would ensure more timely 'check ins' and project delivery.</p> <p>Recent successful capacity building workshop, online Train the trainers. Current PGS's showcased at Livestock Advisor Updates, MeatUp and other local events to inform potential deliverers.</p> <p>d. The Capacity Building workshop delivered in 2021 was proven to be successful, aimed at engaging deliverers and setting up potential mentoring. It targeted early to mid-career consultants, focusing on personal development and 'soft' skills. Approaching the larger WA companies such as Elders and Nutrien directly, and having PGS built into their existing PD may be of interest to them, and be highly beneficial to PGS.</p> |
| <p>3. Supported Learning Programs</p> <p>a. Describe your experience of the SLP review process.</p> <p>b. How many of the service providers have incorporated economic analysis into their SLPs and to what level?</p> | <p>d. Not applicable, as have not reviewed a SLP during this contract.</p> <p>b. All involve some level of economic analysis within their SLPs and KASA surveys. The level varies with each program. The quality of the data from producers must be questioned, as often the SLPs' focuses are on improving not only the metrics measured, but also</p> |

| Question | Discussion |
|--|--|
| <p>c. How easy/hard has it been for you to monitor and control the quality of SLPs delivered and why?</p> | <p>the measuring process and accuracy.</p> <p>e. The monitoring process for me has only been from a delivery point, as have not been involved in a full SLP development. If deliverers are open to receiving assistance and feedback, it has been relatively simple. This is particularly true of SLPs with groups relatively close to me, where I can sit in on multiple sessions.</p> <p>The difficulty has been controlling the quality of the pre and post KASA surveys, to ensure they result in data MLA can compare easily with other programs. This has usually been due to changes made to the process, and should be solved by the new Microsoft Forms process.</p> <p>Where multiple financial contributors are involved, additional work has been required to ensure branding is not lost, and the objectives of PGS and the particular SLP is not marginalized.</p> |
| <p>4. Project outcomes In reviewing the Monitoring and Evaluation results relevant for your state, comment on the following:</p> <p>a. Improvement in skills and knowledge (KASA)</p> <p>b. Improvement in business productivity/profitability</p> <p>c. The link between the two points above</p> <p>d. Level of engagement in Feeder activities</p> <p>e. Level of engagement in SLPs</p> | <p>a.</p> <p>b. Statement of Impacts provided to MLA for each SLP run</p> <p>f. Concerns over short time frame of SLP's- can we truly capture change, when skills and knowledge may not yet be put into place to impact business profit or production?</p> <p>g. Feeder activities have been minimal due to COVID-19's impact on event delivery, so the level of engagement cannot be fairly assessed.</p> <p>h. Average. Depending on the program and its deliverer, there can be a lot of work involved in recruiting producers. Deliverers are finding that there is high interest initially, which often does not follow through- ie before payment is required! However, in some areas, there is very strong demand for certain SLPs- this is often due to word of mouth from past participants, and is part of PGS building a reputation.</p> |
| <p>5. Monitoring and Evaluation</p> | <p>i. Frustration over amount of paperwork and the compulsory questions. Dislike the entry system- would prefer a simple</p> |

| Question | Discussion |
|--|---|
| <p>a. What have you found the attitude of service providers to M&E requirements been?</p> <p>b. In your experience have the service providers been prepared and able to effectively use the feedback gathered to engage in continuous improvement?</p> <p>c. Comment on the effectiveness of M&E templates and support resources.</p> | <p>excel version. These attitudes may change now that we have moved to Microsoft Forms, which should provide them with a simple template and easy to use inputting and reporting functions.</p> <p>Providers report that they get value from the questions they are able to add and/or change.</p> <p>b. Yes, often using it as the basis of their presentations, to pitch to the correct knowledge level of the group, and to know who may need additional assistance.</p> <p>c. Could be streamlined.</p> |
| <p>6. Funding model</p> <p>a. What is the appetite for producers in terms of paying to participate?</p> <p>b. What has been the level of interest shown by potential funding partners (non-MLA)?</p> <p>c. Comment on the nature of identified co-funding opportunities.</p> <p>d. Do service providers believe there is adequate financial benefits to motivate participation?</p> <p>e. Can you suggest ways to improve the value proposition for service</p> | <p>j. User pay model is becoming more accepted, but there is still a reluctance to pay for 'unproven' programs. A series of uncertain seasons across WA, combined with COVID-19, may have resulted in more producers withdrawing from the SLP's between commitment and payment.</p> <p>b. This has only been applicable to one program in WA, Grazing Matcher. There has been a high level of interest in a large number of funding partners for the SLP, which has led to a large number of groups being formed, but also more work for the deliverer and sate coordinator in terms of managing more stakeholders, and ensuring the quality of the program is not diminished.</p> <p>c. Above.</p> <p>k. Current deliverers agree, however admit only because they are using existing SLP's. Potential deliverers are often citing lack of financial benefit as the main reason not to be involved, particularly if they are running what could be a new SLP, rather than the off the shelf options. Off the shelf options are attractive to early career service providers, if they fit within their organisation's structure and would suit their current/targeted clients.</p> <p>e. More off the shelf SLPs, providing further financial incentive to develop SLP's, training incorporated into existing events.</p> |

| Question | Discussion |
|--|--|
| providers? | |
| <p>7. Recruitment</p> <p>a. Have you found the recruitment plan template to be useful for you and your service providers?</p> <p>b. Describe the challenges faced in recruiting participants generally.</p> <p>c. How easy/hard has it been to use existing E&A activities (MLA and non-MLA) as feeders for PGS?</p> <p>d. Can you suggest solutions to overcome challenges identified?</p> | <p>l. Was not aware of its existence, still have not been provided with this template.</p> <p>b. Lack of confidence in PGS from producers- it is not a proven program so hard to create new groups, particularly as there is still hesitancy to pay for services. Most effective for deliverers to utilise existing networks/groups, especially as it is such a short project.</p> <p>m. Feeder activity has been limited due to COVID-19, with PGS being added to existing programs within producer presentations. In this way, it has been difficult to use as a full 'feeder' as the focus is on the on-farm impact rather than the program and there is little follow-up or 'next steps' for producers, except at MeatUp in August 2021. This is to be improved now events are nearly back to normal with the easing of WA COVID-19 restrictions.</p> <p>D. Utilise existing networks- eg grower groups and consultants' relationships.</p> <p>Maintain strong industry relationships in order to better utilise existing events as feeders for PGS.</p> |
| <p>8. Communication and promotion</p> <p>n. Comment on the quality, availability and effectiveness of the guidelines and materials/tools used for promoting the project</p> <p>o. Give an overview of the activities/initiatives you have engaged in to promote the project (articles, case studies) including producer interviews and other communications</p> <p>p. Do you have any suggestions of other methods for promoting the project?</p> | <p>q. Were being updated by Elizabeth Thelander 2020-2021. These need to be better tailored to individual SLPs, with more indepth detail, to assist in both deliverer and producer recruitment.</p> <p>b. Approached previous participants about interviews/case studies. 2x case study contacts provided to MLA in 2021. With my work in other areas (AgPro and MeatUp) have heavily promoted the project by discussing individual SLPs, looking at the proven impact on producers. Have ensured past participants of PGS programs mention it during presentations they are doing for other purposes.</p> <p>c. Focus on the producers and the local relationships the state coordinator has developed- this is the best, proven way to recruit both producers and deliverers. This could be through case studies, podcast interviews, presentation from producers at events-</p> |

| Question | Discussion |
|---|--|
| | basically raising the profile of individual SLPs and PGS as a whole. There needs to be that 'go to person' who is local and has a good reputation, to ensure interest converts into involvement. |
| <p>9. Coordination team support</p> <p>a. Describe how you have engaged and collaborated with other coordination team members and comment on how effective this has been.</p> <p>b. Provide details of support received from the Leadership Team members (who, what, when and how) and comment on the value of this support.</p> <p>c. Can you suggest ways to enhance the support provided?</p> <p>d. Have you found the level of support provided by MLA adequate and why/why not?</p> | <p>r. Fantastic support from the national leadership team, despite constant staff change-overs. The program may have been more effective with less disruption; however it was handled well for a majority of operations. Collaboration has been through phone calls, regular meetings, national project team meetings, and emails. The strength here has often come from the national coordinators' hard work and constant communications with the project team.</p> <p>b. Have been working closely with Ashley Herbert continually to coordinate WA approach for PGS delivery recruitment and feeder activities. This resulted in developing the entire WA plan, with direct impact on the SC workplans. This was extremely effective and valuable, particularly when addressing challenges posed by COVID and poor recruitment.</p> <p>s. During this contract, the monitoring and evaluation process became unclear due to the lack of a M&E Coordinator, and took some time to be clarified and resolved. The view is that this, and any other issues, such as slow response times or temporary lack of support, arose due to staff changeover and the consequence lag time in training. Other than maintaining consistency, leadership and support has been exemplary and cannot be improved upon.</p> <p>D. As above.</p> |

4.1.2 Success against key performance indicators

Five deliverers and their SLP's have been managed throughout the contract. This has initially been in liaison with the previous State Coordinator, Rebecca Wallis, in order to ensure a continuation of previous work and relationships. This involved maintaining and expanding the targeted PGS deliverer email list, discussing and promoting PGS at industry events, recruiting deliverers, as well as managing deliverers and reporting requirements. This is outlined in the table below.

Table 3. Key Performance Indicators Discussion

| Key Performance Indicator | Achieved |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| To manage existing PGS projects in WA | Managing the current deliverers and their SLP's through phone and email communications, as well as attending |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>deliverer's sessions once a year where possible. This has also extended to inputting deliverers' M&E data due to the lack of an M&E coordinator.</p> <p>It has also involved piloting the new M&E input system of Microsoft Forms at recent Grazing Matcher meetings, which was highly successful.</p> |
| <p>To report to the PGS National Coordinator on opportunities for PGS programs and deliverers in WA</p> | <p>Milestone 1, 2,3,4 and 5 delivered.</p> <p>Opportunities discussed with Angela Hammond, Elizabeth Thelander, Tamara Biffin and Ashley Herbert as they arose. Minutes of these meetings are held by the national coordinator.</p> <p>New opportunities in WA discussed with Katelyn Lubcke in person on 24/11/21.</p> |
| <p>To provide links to 2 new potential PGS deliverers in WA</p> | <p>Identified several new deliverers, the initial group was approached informally at the Livestock Advisor Updates in October 2020. Formal follow up unsuccessful as their organisation declined to participate, reasons unknown.</p> <p>2021 capacity building workshop developed links with 12 new potential deliverers, and has led to formal approaches from 4 of these attendees, 3 of which would be new deliverers. Have continued to follow up with all attendees personally, as well as with further information emailed to all workshop attendees.</p> <p>In discussion with potential new deliverers about SLP development, or use of off the shelf packages.</p> |
| <p>To be involved in the development of the 2019/20 PGS Capability Building workshop in WA</p> | <p>Capacity building workshop was put on hold for the 2019/2020 period given the impact of COVID-19 and changes in PGS national leadership.</p> <p>COVID-19 travel restrictions and uncertainty reduced ability to travel, and also saw restrictions on face to face events.</p> <p>The workshop was planned for late 2021, and held on October 14 2021, with 14 attendees.</p> <p>This workshop focused on basic consultancy and delivery skills, aimed at early career advisors and consultants.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | The small group format was success in promoting discussion and building strong relationships. This has fed into several attendees being involved with online Train The Trainers, with 4 formal approaches to deliver or create PGS SLPs. |
| To liaise between the PGS program and WA's AAAC (Australian Association of Agricultural Consultants) to determine opportunity for PGS with the AAAC membership | It was decided that AAAC members will be included in the contact list for PGS communications, but we will not be 'presenting' PGS to the AAAC body. As established consultants, members are aware of the program and do not find it enticing, so we are targeting other potential deliverers, while still keeping members 'in the loop' with regular email updates, as well as presenting PGS programs at industry events such as MeatUp and Livestock Advisor Updates. The WA PGS coordinator also ensured to 'touch base' with AAAC members at events to see if there was any interest in being involved. |
| To work with National Coordinator to determine PGS Feeder opportunities in WA where relevant | Feeder activities were decided to go on hold during COVID-19 in 2020/2021 as their reach and impact would have been severely reduced by travel and gathering size restrictions. There is potential for feeder activities in 2022 as COVID restrictions are removed, and the public's appetite and confidence in and for events increases. This could potentially be with the new deliverers and possibly new SLPs. |

Table 4. Number of Activities

| | Year 1 (FY20/21) | Year 2 (FY21/22) |
|---|---------------------|------------------|
| Number of SLP Activities promoted and managed | 4 | 10 |
| Number of feeder activities | 1 | 1 |

Table 5. Status of Supported Learning Packages

| SLP Status January 2022 | Number | Comment |
|----------------------------|--------|--|
| Completed | 8 | Includes Ed Riggall's Benchmarking for Profit and Production, Ken Hart's Lifting Lamb Survival, and Jeisane Accioly's Grazing Matcher. |

| | | |
|----------------|----|---|
| Running | 6 | Jeisane Accioly's Grazing Matcher has 5 groups currently running, and 1 Leading with Certainty is being run. |
| Approved | 1 | Rural Edge's Managing People For Success program. This is beyond the state coordinator role and is sitting with the national coordinator, due to a new approach to delivery. |
| In Development | 0 | |
| In Discussion | 2+ | Caris Cornwall (nee Jones) in discussions regarding Genetics packages, potential for co-delivery of Building Better Breeders being investigated Chris Wyhoon in discussion about possible off the shelf options. |

5. Conclusion

This contract has been successful in continuing to work towards the main PGS objectives. There has been continual communication with the industry, and leadership team, to improve the program and its' profile. This has also involved increasing the PGS network and

While there have not yet been any new deliverers who have completed a PGS, there has been solid leads and potential programs developed. Three deliverers have successfully delivered three SLPs across the state to a large number of groups and producers.

The Capacity building workshop delivered in 2021 was successful in engaging potential deliverers and led to promising discussions that may still develop into new SLPs and new deliverers. It was also successful in that it was identified that Train the Trainers where not yet suitable, and the workshop was adapted to WA's needs.

The program needs to continue to utilise local networks to recruit and support deliverers and producers, as well as promoting PGS and locally available SLPs.

M&E data during this contract was all collected, but poorly managed due to staff changeovers. As discussed in this report, the process has been improved. However, this has led to a lack of M&E data available to include in this report about the impact of the project on the red meat industry.

6. Future research and recommendations

It is recommended that there is still someone on the ground in WA to be the PGS contact, actively recruiting and supporting deliverers. This is due to the difficulty had identifying, recruiting and retaining deliverers. This is partly due to the funding model being inadequate to reduce the cost to participants, with a lower population density resulting in higher travel costs in the west due to spread out groups.

Grazing Matcher is a fantastic example of how to keep participant costs feasible, while delivering a high-quality product. Co-funding such as this should be encouraged, and deliverers assisted to achieve this. However, it can lead to branding issues, and in the case of *Grazing Matcher* was only successfully through the deliverers' passion and networks, with a lot of unpaid work SLPs with co-funding needs to be carefully monitored.

PGS programs should tie into existing PDS projects if possible, and be better promoted through MLA networks. The lack of this is partly due to the inconsistency of delivery, over both regions and topics. The profile of the program needs to be raised through further promotions, which has been severely impacted by COVID-19 restrictions and industry appetite for events.