

interPART and Associates

Investigations into landholder attitudes and the feasibility of
incentive schemes for large-scale restoration of the
State Vulnerable Drooping Sheoak (*Allocasuarina verticillata*)
Grassy Woodland Communities on Eyre Peninsula.

NVC 09/10/16



Barry Lincoln
interPART and Associates
January 2011

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

Acknowledgement

The Native Vegetation Council is acknowledged for funding part of this project through the NVC Research Grants.

The generous support and contributions to this project by Emma Coates DENR and Rob Coventry EP NRMB are valued and acknowledged.

The time and knowledge of the landholders who participated in the interviews is also gratefully acknowledged.

Barry Lincoln
interPART and Associates

January 2011

Prepared by Barry Lincoln, *interPART* and Associates.

Disclaimer. While various people have contributed to preparation of this report responsibility for the final report lies with *interPART* and Associates and may not reflect the views of key partners.

This report was based on information provided to *interPART* and Associates during the course of the project. While attempts have been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, *interPART* and Associates are not responsible for any inaccuracies or omissions of any information provided to them.

interPART and Associates Pty Ltd
PO Box 1775, Macclesfield, South Australia 5153
Email: info@interpart.org.au

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

1. Index	
2. Executive Summary	5
3. Introduction	5
4. Methods	6
5. Results	7
6. Discussion	11
7. Conclusion	13
8. References	13
Annexes	14
A. Survey guide questions	15
B. Table of summary results	18
C. List of landholder interviewed	26

2. Executive Summary

This report covers the project to investigate landholder attitudes and the feasibility of incentive schemes for large-scale restoration of the State Vulnerable Drooping Sheoak (*Allocasuarina verticillata*) Grassy Woodland Communities on Eyre Peninsula. The project has been implemented by WildEyre with the support of *interPART* and Associates.

The WildEyre Working Group has been working on a Conservation Action Plan (or CAP) for this area, which has highlighted several areas of research interest; a key priority being to determine whether the provision of incentives for temporary closure of paddocks will support the restoration of Sheoak (*Allocasuarina verticillata*) Grassy Woodlands in the WildEyre project area, by investigating:

- Landholder attitudes to incentive schemes
- Incentive rates and programs and existing de-stocked properties within the area
- Best practise land management for the implementation of sustainable grazing practices, the targeted temporary protection of regenerating sheoak stands and the maintenance of existing Sheoak seed production areas.

This research will enable the WildEyre working group to develop and implement a unique incentive program through the WildEyre platform that is based upon sound scientific research and a comprehensive understanding of landholder attitudes and capacity in the region.

This report targets WildEyre partners and may be interest to other agencies and interested landholders

A basic survey was designed and carried out as semi-structured, informal face to face 'guided discussions' with key landholders with Sheoak Grassy Woodlands on their properties. Results were analysed by drawing out themes from the interviews and relating these to the feasibility and substance of a potential incentive program.

Findings include that most landholder are interested in conserving Sheoak Grassy Woodlands and would require support to do this. While some landholders were looking for reimbursement of loss of production most were happy with in-kind support of material labour and technical advice. Many landholders were also interested in broader community engagement as part of such a program. However most landholder indicated that an incentive program would need to be flexible and responsive to their land management practice and would need to cater to their specific contexts.

An appropriately designed and implemented incentive program would contribute to the conservation of Sheoak Grassy Woodlands in the Eyre Peninsula.

3. Introduction

Market based instruments (MBIs) are increasingly being used as a tool for supporting landholder participate in conservation. MBIs come in many forms, can be very structured and formal and have various levels of success. The use of MBIs in combination with other tools can add value and engage a broader range of landholders more effectively (Ward and Hatton MacDonald 2009).

The Eyre Peninsula NRM Board, a key partner of WildEyre, is exploring the development a market based instrument approach to targeted revegetation programs and have funding to support such a program.

WildEyre is a partnership between Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board (EPNRM), Wilderness Society, Greening Australia and the Nature Conservation Society of SA.

The 1.2 million hectares that comprise WildEyre is recognised as being of state and national significance in terms of biodiversity conservation and is a focus area for The Wilderness Society's WildCountry Program and the State Government's NatureLinks Program.

The WildEyre (WE) project area includes several large conservation reserves, two large Wilderness Protection Areas and numerous Heritage Agreements. It contains some of the largest, intact and contiguous areas of bushland in the state's agricultural districts and supports nationally threatened plant and animal species.

Landholders play a key role in protecting this bushland and working with them, individually and collectively is essential in achieving large scale outcomes.

An effective incentive program is one that addresses the needs and interests of all stakeholders (Raymond 2009). In this case it is equally important to ensure that any such program is designed to address the landholders' interests as they are the majority landholder of Drooping Sheoak Grassy Woodland (SGW).

This Project has the following objectives:

1. To ascertain landholder attitudes to and the feasibility of incentive schemes for de-stocking existing Sheoak Grassy Woodland areas on Eyre Peninsula.
2. To determine what measures can be taken to support Sheoak recovery or reinstatement in this landscape (for example; years of destocking required, levels of integrated pest animal control required, is active intervention and restoration required or will natural succession be enough?, appropriate sustainable grazing practices, the targeted temporary protection of regenerating sheoak stands and the maintenance of existing Sheoak seed production areas).

This project describes the design, implementation and results of a targeted survey of landholders in the WE project area. A semi-structured 'guided discussion' style of face to face interviews was determined to be the preferred approach. 14 Landholders were interviewed and the results provide valuable information for designing an incentive program for supporting landholders to protect Sheoak Grassy Woodlands in the Eyre Peninsula.

4. Methods

A targeted survey was developed to solicit information required to determine the feasibility, structure and substance of an incentive program to support the conservation of SGW in the WildEyre Program area of Eyre Peninsula.

Preliminary discussions with DENR clarified a desire for a more informal, semi structured, interview style survey which drew out the personal stories of landholders and their interests and willingness to support the protection of SGW on their land. The final set of questions was the result of several discussions to identify what information was required to inform the development of an incentive program. The structure of the interviews allowed for additional questions to be asked during the interviews in response to ideas which arose during the interviews. Draft questions were tested during an interview with one landholder and subsequently refined.

The interviews were designed as 'guided discussions' with *guide questions* (Annex A) to cover the key points. The interviews were not envisaged as being more formal structured question by question surveys. While some quantitative questions were included they were subsequently found to be of limited value and thus mostly not used. A total of 18 to 20 interviews was the target sample size.

Each interview was anticipated to build on preceding interviews to pick up on issues that may have been missed in the original questions and also to clarify and verify emerging ideas and suggestions. In this way the interviews were cumulative and build on each other.

All but one (on the landholder's request) interview were audio recorded using digital recorders. Notes were also taken during the interviews and these were written up. Summary sheets were also written up and all three formats were provided for analysis. The audio files were primarily for 'back-up' purposes.

Summary notes included some assessment and or interpretation of the information gathered during the interviews.

Analysis was carried using thematic analysis i.e. the identification of common themes and threads and these were used as the basis for considerations of the incentive program. 'Outlier ideas' i.e. unusual ideas generally from specific individuals were used to reflect on and test 'the model' of the program for delivery.

Analysis was also informed by previous experience in the Eyre Peninsula, with the Eyre Peninsula NRM Board and incentive programs elsewhere in Australia.

5. Results

This section presents key points resulting of the interviews. For a full collation of the summary sheets of the interviews see Table in Annex A. Statistical assessment of the result was not considered valuable given the small number of interviews.

Interpretation and analysis is presented in the next section.

Drivers for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

In exploring why landholders are interested in protecting SGW the following drivers were identified:

1. There is a strong sense of restoring the land to what it was 'before' and this is expressed as restoring nature, reducing the decline of species, restoring natural assets and returning to the historical context i.e. it used to be 'sheoak country'

"What we've done to this country, we've really made a mess of things"

2. Aesthetic appeal/value and protecting the landscape came up in several interviews
3. There are also strong 'family connections' through e.g. grandparents, *'they have protected it [the land] all their life'*. Others are influenced by other family members and/or have childhood memories including playing with the seed [pods] as 'sheep toys'. Conservation is one persons 'personal interest and passion'

"We've all got a little green in us"

4. There was also some production value of SGW in terms of providing shelterbelts, fodder, shade and windbreaks. Though one person indicated they were 'no good for sheep'
5. A couple of landholders have for some time been protection and revegetating SGW on their own accord. Most landholders were interested in participating in some protection of SGW. Only one person was not too interested in protecting SGW at this time due to other priorities.
6. Most landholders were 'locals' having spent a significant part of their lives in the district. Some all lived all their lives in the property and ownership went back several generations.
7. There is a perception of a new generation of farmers taking over farms who have a production centric focus to their land management than the previous generation.

Incentives

All but one person identified financial incentives as their primary interest for support. In most cases this was for materials for fencing to allow for regeneration and in other cases for lost of productivity resulting from de-stocking or reducing grazing pressure - these were not mutually exclusive.

"It's hard to green if you are in the red"

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

In several cases there was a clear identification of willingness to enter into cost sharing arrangements – i.e. it was seldom indicated that total costs were expected to be covered and that the landholder expected that they would be responsible for some aspect of any protection e.g. providing some labour for fencing and pest species control.

“In-kind support is much more valuable than money”

One interesting suggestion was for financial support for water supply infrastructure to extend the grazing patterns and thereby reducing the overall grazing pressure. (This is common practice with cattle).

The second priority for support was for technical advice and knowledge mostly about sheoak identification, science, propagation including seed collection, storage and planting, provenance (sourcing local seed) and weed and pest animal control.

A number of people indicated that they would be happy with in-kind support in the form of an ‘extra pair of hands’ but preferred skilled and experienced labour for fencing. There were also some suggestions of physical support with weed and pest animal management. Kangaroos were also considered to have a devastating impact on sheoak patches.

A number of people indicated interest in social and/or community aspects including ‘moral support’, a ‘shared vision’, ‘social engagements’, groups sharing and learning, demonstration sites (including mixed conservation and farming), workshops and recognition of their work on protection. Building relationships with agency Officers was also identified as valuable, with recognition that local knowledge is more valuable.

Outlying ideas included project planning within the context of ‘a broader (district) vision’ and follow up monitoring and continuous maintenance support.

Levels of support

In terms of level of support this ranged from potentially destocking the entire property if the ‘incentive was right’ to none at all as they were doing it all themselves. The average seems to be around ensuring that the landholders are not out of pocket too much.

“We are not looking for a profit but just covering our loss of production”

Support was mostly for a combination of financial (loss of production), materials, labour and technical advice/knowledge.

Development and delivery of incentives

Developing and implementing the incentive program is likely to be as important as the incentives themselves. The following points were made here:

1. The incentive needs to be targeted and designed around the specific properties in a way that considers the landholders specific circumstance and their farming systems. The program needs to be flexible and ‘must facilitate them implementing their project on their properties.
2. Associated with this is a strong sense of building relationships with local staff and community members. This includes some consistency/continuity of Officers who

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

have local connections to the community and supporting community champions to share their stories and experiences.

3. There were further comments about enabling 'everyone to participate' and 'coordination with landholder groups', (like Integrated Pest Management) and considering a 'landscape context'.
4. Several people made comments on practical tips on 'how to do it' and sharing technical knowledge. E.g. planting prickly acacia with sheoaks helps keep the animal off. Mesh and netting were also mentioned to keep animals from grazing seedlings. One farmer did not want to restrict the reveg to just sheoaks and believes it's better to diversify the species. Several people mentioned that direct hand seedling (nut chucking) and natural regeneration were most effective in the long run producing stronger trees.
5. One pertinent comment was around raising false expectations and 'actually coming through with what was discussed in practice'.
6. Projects also need to be timed well with the seasons, other management activities (e.g. timing of calici, existing harvest or shearing commitments) and also to capture peoples' current motivation and interest. Native animals (roos and wombats) and SGW condition (single trees being more vulnerable) also impact on management options. There is also a clear relationship between foxes, rabbits, cats and many native species and this impacts on overall farm management.
7. 10 years appeared to be an acceptable period of support and stock exclusion. This will allow the trees to mature enough i.e. past browsing height, to allow cell and/or pulse grazing if needed.
8. A number of people were generally happy with their past experiences with similar projects though some agencies had clearly not gone about things in the right way. Other projects such as the potential wind farms may provide an opportunity to providing additional or alternative support and/or investment.
9. There were also comments on 'making the paperwork easy', effective project management and efficient payment of incentives.
10. An innovative suggestion (as above) of using sheep watering points for reducing grazing pressure was made.
11. 'Learning from nature' and follow up and monitoring were also considered relevant.

[Follow up from interviews](#)

Most landholders wanted to be kept informed about future developments and in some cases referrals were made to other Officers.

Other opportunities for ongoing involvement arose including supporting landholders with plant identification and other advice.

A suggestion in relation to photographs generated the idea of including two additional SGW condition classes.

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

Prioritisation considerations

Some prioritisation was made on the properties as appropriate. This was done based on Officer assessment of, *inter alia*, the condition of the SGW, location of property (e.g. with respect to parks and reserves) and interest of landholder.

Other comments

One landholder identified fire as a potential risk arising from allowing revegetation close to infrastructure - others did not see this as an issue.

6. Discussion

It is important to note that the sample size for this survey was limited to 14 interviews. While there is a risk that not all perspectives are captured through these interviews there is a high degree of consistency amongst the results. This is sufficient to provide some basis for making decisions about if and how some incentive program can be developed and implemented. The representativeness of the results can be checked against other sources including the opinions of WildEyre member organisations.

Generally landholders have strong feelings about protecting and restoring their sheoak woodlands in some way. This is a key basis from which to build a program as this can be the most difficult part of a project. While there may be a need for motivating some farmers this is not seen as a major prerequisite before action and may be integrated into the program as part of core project functions such as landholder engagement, communications and integrated NRM.

Most landholders interviewed are willing to participate in some program to protect the Sheoak Grassy Woodlands they have on their properties. In most cases financial support was the primary incentive but this did not necessarily translate to cash payments for loss of production. Many landholders would accept fencing materials, supporting labour and access to equipment. Some felt that the in-kind support was as much if not more important than the money.

The level of support is likely to be proportional to the impact on the farming. That is the smaller the amount of land and less they need to do, the smaller the incentive needed. Some farmers indicated they would be willing to destock their entire farms 'if the money was right'. Strategic and targeted incentives and support could produce significant outcomes in terms of ongoing practice change resulting in landscape scale SGW community restoration.

A key element expressed in the interviews was the need for and value of individual property specific projects which integrate into the landholder's farming practices. This could and should be linked into a district wide or broader landscape program. That is while individual projects should be negotiated with each landholder on a case by case basis, this should be done within the framework of a coordinated program that facilitates linking activities across all landholders and all tenures. The incentive program would need to be flexible and responsive to landholder specific needs. This may also need to be extended to working differently with 'father and son' situations where the interest and focus may be different. The stronger production focus of younger generations may be driven by tertiary educational institutions and this may present some options for collaborations with these institutions.

There was also a strong social or community interest in working together, learning from each other and sharing experiences. Such an incentive program can be a community building and social activity. This has been successfully demonstrated by the fox baiting program which has worked well across EP. In some cases the Fox Bait Distribution Days are social events – an opportunity for sharing and for hearing about other activities. This model of 'satellite groups' has worked well and could be built upon to include or be replicated with a sheoak program (Thomas and Lincoln 2008).

Effective and meaningful landholder engagement is probably the most important longer term component of such a program. Getting this right will multiply outcomes, reduce costs and open doors. Getting it wrong will close doors, fragment effort and significantly increase costs while minimising outcomes.

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

It will also be important to get 'the right mix' of financial, materials/equipment, technical advice and community engagement.

A number of suggestions from the interviews referred creative ways of thinking about such a program and these could generate some interesting results. The example of providing support for additional water points to improve grazing pressure management and to allow sheoak to survive may be one option that integrates other NRM management activities. In addition coordinating with pest animal and plant control can also be critical.

There are a number of clear pointers which could justify a more integrated and cross agency approach. This could include better integration between the various NRM Board programs, between government agencies e.g. DENR, Department for Water and Primary Industries and Resources South Australia and even discussions with the Department of Education and Children's Services, Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure and Department for Further Education, Employment Science and Technology. The WildEyre partnership provides a good basis for developing and extending such collaborations. This project presents a unique opportunity to explore, *in practice*, a more integrated whole of government approach to conservation

If supported an incentive program like this would benefit from a comprehensive whole of region (i.e. SGW distribution) property level assessment e.g. as a GIS project, to prioritise the properties of interest. This list could then be used as the basis for 'one on one' negotiations with these key landholders in terms of type, extent and duration of support. These negotiations could be prefaced by round table discussions amongst project partners on who could offer what support through what program. This would be particularly relevant in relation to a structured, longer term and coordinated approach to landholder engagement. This could maximise outcomes across a number of assets and investors and delivery better results.

Follow up

There are a number of actions that should be followed up as a result of this part of this project.

If not already done promises of referrals and other provision of services should be finalised. In addition some summary or information resulting from this part of the project should be provided back to interviewees and perhaps other material provided to the broader sheoak community e.g. those people who attended any of the workshops. This could be a simple two page summary of the outcomes/directions for this project even if the whole project is cancelled.

As has already been demonstrated through the interviews there should be an adoption of a 'no survey without service' principle where if landholders donate their time, experience and knowledge they should be rewarded with some service or product as a token of acknowledgement of their contribution. Ideally such support should be built into an ongoing and mutually beneficial partnership between agencies and landholders.

7. Conclusion

An incentive program will clearly be valuable in encouraging and supporting interested landholders conserve Sheoak Grassy Woodland in the WildEyre area.

While direct financial support will be needed for some landholders, most are happy with materials, labour and technical advice. Any such program should be substantially based in a community development approach which engages landholders, allows them to learn from each other and share their knowledge and experiences. This will bring people together, be more cost effective and facilitate landscape level activities.

An incentive program will need to be flexible, adaptive, responsive and address property and farmer specific interests. Such a program will benefit from creative ways of thinking about engaging landholders, project design and management especially in light of the history of community involvement in the Eyre Peninsula. The program will work best if constructed in a practical, continuous, longer term approach that coordinates and integrates related activities.

Prioritisation of properties should be based on comprehensive assessment including condition of SGW, landholder interest and level of incentive.

Given the nature of WildEyre and the reality of landholders having to deal with different agencies, a coordinated and preferably integrated multi agencies approach will generate the best outcomes.

8. References

Raymond 2009. *Engaging the NRM Community in the Management of Water, Land and Coasts*. Enviroconnect. 2009

Thomas and Lincoln 2008. *'Keeping at it': biosecurity for Eyre Peninsula A review of the Vertebrate Pests and Asparagus Weed Management Programs*. Eyre Peninsula NRM Board. 2008

Ward and Hatton MacDonald 2009. *Encouraging landholder participation in natural resource incentive programs on the Eyre Peninsula*. Eyre Peninsula NRM Board. 2009

Annexes

- A. Survey guide questions
- B. Table of summary results
- C. List of landholder interviewed

A. Survey guide questions

Landholder attitudes and feasibility of incentive schemes for restoration of Drooping Sheoak Grassy Woodland Communities on Eyre Peninsula

Landholder Interview Guide Questions

ID No.....

1. Landholder Details Name:..... Ph:.....
Post:..... email:.....
2. Location and type of Property
3. Map of property and location
4. Description of Property and general area..... Rainfall
- Extent and 'perceived condition' of sheoak on property
5. Other native vegetation remaining on property.....
6. Is any of this vegetation voluntarily protected or under Heritage Agreement?
7. Proximity to a Conservation or National Park?
Name of Park.....DistanceDirection.....
8. Attended workshop? Yes/No Which one?.....

Demographics

1. Gender: M / F
 2. Education: (highest level).....
 3. Are you a member of a landcare group or other community/industry organisation?
Yes / No. Which one?.....)
 4. How long have you been on this farm?.....and is this area?.....
-
1. How much Sheoak Grassy Woodland (SGW) do you have on your property (use map)
 2. Do your neighbours/friends/family have SGW on their land?
 3. Where else do you know Sheoak grows? Do you know of any good patches?
 4. How would you rate the condition of your SGW?
 5. How important is SGW to you personally and why?
 6. How important is SGW to your farming and why?
 7. How do you use this part of your property?
 8. Are you interested in looking after it?
8.1. if not why not?
8.2. if yes how much/what part/s are you interested in protecting?
 9. What are you interested in, in protecting your SGW?
 10. What have you been doing to protect SGW?
 11. What do you see as the main threats to SGW (on a scale 1 – 5)
11.1. Rabbit grazing 1 (low) 2 3 4 5(high)

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|----------|---|---------|
| 11.2. Stock grazing | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 11.3. Roos | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 11.4. Weeds | 1 (low) | 2 | <u>3</u> | 4 | 5(high) |
| 11.5. Fragmentation | 1 (low) | 2 | <u>3</u> | 4 | 5(high) |
| 11.6. Other (e.g. Fire)..... | | | | | |
| | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
12. How do you think these areas can best be protected.
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---------|
| 12.1. Fencing off | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 12.2. Reduce grazing | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 12.2.1. To what extent (DSE?) | | | | | |
| 12.2.2. For how long | 1-3yrs, 3-5, 5-10, 10-15, more than 15 | | | | |
| 12.3. Control weeds | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 12.4. Control rabbits | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 12.5. Revegetation | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 12.6. Other (e.g. HA) | | | | | |
| | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
13. What combination of these activities would best suit your land/farming systems?
14. What would make it easier/possible for you (or others) to protect these areas?
15. Under what conditions would you protect this land?
16. What type support would help protect it?
- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------|---|---|---|---------|
| 16.1. Financial | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 16.2. Labour | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 16.3. Technical advice | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 16.4. Equipment material | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 16.5. Education | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 16.6. Other | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
17. How much support would you want/need to help you protect it?
18. Who would you like to help you ?
- 18.1. DENR
 - 18.2. EPNRM Board
 - 18.3. Greening Australia
 - 18.4. Wilderness Society
 - 18.5. Nature Conservation Society SA
 - 18.6. Private contractors
 - 18.7. Landcare group? Name.....
 - 18.8. Industry group? Name.....
19. Who would you not like to help from and why?
20. Who is best able to help you? (Has the best skills and resources)
21. What are the barrier or what limits you from protecting your SGW now?
- | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------|---|---|---|---------|
| 21.1. Time | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 21.2. Money | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 21.3. Education | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 21.4. Logistics | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |
| 21.5. Other | 1 (low) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5(high) |

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

22. For what timeframes would you be willing to protect these areas?
23. Would you be willing to be part of some management trials to determine the best approach to sustainably managing SGW?
24. Have you been involved in an NRM/conservation management project in the past 5 years?
25. If so what programs? Have these provided incentives of some sort? (e.g. free fox baits, financial support for fencing and/or revegetation)
26. How important have these incentives been for you?
27. What has been your experience with these programs?
 - 27.1. How well have these worked?
 - 27.2. What has not worked so well with them?
 - 27.3. How could they be improved?
28. Is there anything else you think may be valuable for us to know about? Anything else you would like to mention?

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

B. Table of summary results

1	What three main types of support would be best for this land manager?
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial support – compensation for lost of productivity, over and above what he would have made on land. (001) • Financial (\$) incld. materials (002) • Financial (\$) cost of destocking, prefer yearly payment (003) • Financial support for removing grazing pressure (004) • Financial – material for fencing and dollars to destock (005) • Financial support (Note: landholder not very interested in sheoak at all) (006) • Financial support – value for \$ jobs matter, match funding for job specifically x km cheap fencing vs. standard incentive rates (007) • Fencing or tree guards (008) • Fencing equipment/materials (for smaller areas & isolated trees & established seeding – netting) (009) • Water infrastructure - \$ for pipe work/extend catchment (010) • \$ /fencing material/cost sharing arrangement (011) • Financial support – not 100% subsidised, cost sharing arrangements, per head not acre (012) • in-kind support – physical labour/put fence up & buy materials, weed control commitment (013)
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing - materials (small areas), equipment contractors (larger areas) (001) • Controll of rabbits and weeds (002) • Biological/ecological science around sheoaks and life history characteristics. Spent all life on farm 5 gens. (003) • Technical advice/knowledge (004) • Knowledge – spp id, tips and hints (005) • technical knowledge (weeds) (006) • Physical/labour support other pair of hands (007) • Technical knowledge – who to go to, when to collect seed, store, sew, spp for local area (008) • \$ lost of production (larger trees, areas) (009) • Labour – farm operations and management (skilled quality labourers only) (010) • Knowledge sharing e.g. chemical composition/salt levels in sheoak & Rob's visit spp id etc (011) • Recognition – visible signage? (Caroline disagrees), community (013)
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moral support/ shared visions landcare groups, NRM Officer (at start) (001) • Labour - Support is good but landholder input equally as important to foster ownership and pride (002) • Oops for social engagement in community(006) • planning for properties broader vision wants to restore property before he dies (007) • weed control – horehound a big issue (009) • information sharing/practical workshops shared group learning (010) • follow up monitoring and continuous support (013)

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

2	<p>What level of support would get the best results with this land manager?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider community champion/education role continue providing support for him to continue to do this (001) • Any and all support (002) • primarily financial support and ongoing maintenance (002)' • yearly cash payments – lost of production not profit (003) • Trials/ sustainable grazing – smaller sites (004) • fencing assistance (004) • Finances (004) • Financial – not to compensate for loss of production but establishment of fencing and management /rotation of stock etc (005) • Combination of \$ and physical labour – not just a lackey per se, (007) • technical knowledge/respect/learn/teach (007) • \$ for the sake of \$s x (008) • but materials, equipment & knowledge - they will do the labour themselves (give them the wire and they'll protect it themselves (three guards should be wider) (008) • cost sharing e.g. fencing materials - WE, labour - landholder (009) • provide mesh and star droppers to protect small seedlings (009) • Combination requires low level of support – need and want not required (010) • fencing & financial support –potentially would consider de-stocking entire property if \$ was right (011) • \$ (012) • in-kind support/physical assistance – fencing, weed control (013) • ongoing maintenance and relationship with local staff (013)
----------	---

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

3	<p>What are the key drivers for them protecting their SGW?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic appeal(001) • resorting nature(001) • aesthetic value (002) • stock shelterbelts shade (002) • spp in decline – want to asst them in landscape aesthetics (003) • Not protecting, it but not too interested either way, no huge motivation/time/\$ to do environmental works, other priorities (004) • Family history and culture – grandparents (005) • Restoring some native/natural assets – historically a sheoak area (005) • Aesthetic value (006) • historically/used to be sheoak country (006) • production sheep fodder, shelter, shade, windbreaks (006) • used sheoak ‘seeds’ as sheep toys as kids (family relevance) (006) • personal vision (007) • historical context (used to be sheoak) / family history – people connected with landscape – father, mother – local characters (007) • Influential family member (008) • Has done all his life – parental interest (009) • knew they would lose sheoak from area if they did not protect it & allow it to regenerate (009) • lifestyle (010) • spp diversity two ticks (010) • leave land in a better condition – inherited overstocked, overgrazed land, want to improve it (011) • restore native spp/ecotourism (011) • sheoak – good fodder (sheep) and shade (011) • landscape thinking vs. small property/patches (012) • some idea of pre-european/indigenous heritage/land management approaches (012) • restore some of what was left (012) • childhood memories –...Arno Bay 1 remaining (012) • aesthetics & to protect some in the landscape (013) • no production benefits – not good shade/shelter for stock (013) • x’s personal interest and passion – done lots of voluntarily (013)
----------	---

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

4	<p>How would you rate their SGW in terms of priority to support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High – aesthetic/nature processes (001) • Low -sheep perspective (001) • Properties landscape value – strategic investment in region between two reserves (002) • high priority due to remnant nature/uncleared stands. Category 2? trees unhealthy (003) • low priority currently – 3yrs on farm – financial viability (004) • open to suggestions – small areas of farm he could do trials. One fenced area excellent condition, scattered trees poor health. (004) • high priority to protect (005) • nice range of condition classes on property (005) • medium might be potential to be involved (006) • Very highly valued to him (007) • previous fenced off areas to allow natural regeneration (007) • High – as seedlings could be protected within grazing systems (008) • adjacent to VB park (008) • veg exclosures (same as park) on their land...monitoring? (008) • Very high – condition/extent and motivation of landholder – done voluntarily all his life (009) • High priority for sheoak – however landholder lower need/want for support (doesn't need help) management allows for sheep and sheoak already (?? share this story?) (010) • High priority - motivation of landholder, voluntarily done destocking, condition classes 1 and 2 (½) across property (011) • ongoing support (011) • Very high – good mix of condition classes – C1 mostly, some locked up paddock trees (012) • medium priority – condition okay, extent okay – western edge of property – potential wind farm area? (013)
----------	--

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

5	<p>What improvement can be made to (incentive) project implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property specific incentives that consider entire farming system (001) • Logic! flexible individually relevant (001) • Local seed collection (provenance) (001) • Pleased with previous exposure to projects (002) • happy with liaison with NRM (002) • Dollars coming immediately no time lag (003) • Available in right season when landholder motivation is still high (003) • none suggested – no exposure to these sorts of programs (004) • good experiences in past with each organisation e.g. NRM, GA etc landcare (005) • sharing of technical knowledge (006) • more contact with local staff (006) • social/community aspects (often unmeasured) (006) • False expectations and managing these carefully by actually coming through with what we discuss in practice (007) • community champions/influences in community telling them info instead of Project Officers (008) • LOCAL TRUSTED LONG TERM (008) • relationship building (008) • happy with concept/models used previously (009) • non traditional aspect to incentives e.g. water infrastructure improvements = increase sheep water/less movement across landscape – sheoak (indirect benefit from improved management systems (??does this work) (010) • Matching any lost income (011) • good quality fencing – perpetuity, stands distance /time (011) • coordinated approaches (like IMP, 90% participation) (012) • get ideas from landholders and facilitate their implementation (012) • consider landscape context – i.e. wind direction and see distribution (012) • continuing in staffing – same faces/develop relationships (013) • more long term outlooks (013) • increase monitoring of project after they've completed (013)
----------	--

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

6	<p>Is there anything which might inform the development and delivery of incentives/support to contribute to Wild Eyre outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple paper work, normal language – support to complete paperwork (001) • Incentives increase participation (001) • flexibility in approach (landholder and property specific) (002) • timing and season (002) • local support available – really good (002) • Water crystals in holes for seedlings (003) • seeding methods (003) • source seed from locally grown sheoaks (003) • Coordination with other landholders/group model has social/motivation/knowledge sharing benefits (as opposed to individual action) (005) • Managing expectations - correctly matching the funding to the specific job (007) • everyone to participate – not just a select view (008) • 10 years minimum! (009) • push seeds into soil, increase germination success – direct seeding (009) • roos nail sheoaks (009) • mesh over small seedlings works well (009) • consider other external/abstract links e.g. water availability in paddocks (010) • specific tailored property specific (010) • 10yrs too long? (010) • info/ send report (011) • as above (013)
----------	---

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

7	<p>Are there any following actions from this interview? e.g. adjustment to future interviews</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary to Bruce – feedback (001) • Keep him informed of further information and potential involvement in trials (002) • keep them informed about possible trials but not too interested in piloting sustainable grazing regime – sheoak and sheep may not be compatible (003) • Keep him in the loop (004) • Maps for landholders (005) • Keep him informed of opportunities (007) • not too long a break in between chats (007) • informed (008) • Paul Simon to talk with Derrick re technical knowledge re seed collection etc (008) • inform landholder of developments (009) • involve landholder (009) • Gave Paul's number (010) • loop/send report (010) • water/weeds (010) • landholder said sheep grazing pressure fairly evenly across spp (not too high grazing pressure in 2 weeks (at low densities) (010) • we've got to put something back/leave land in better condition (011) • would destock entire farm if paid to do so (011) • Bill Jnr – photographs of other condition classes - may include 2 new classes between 1/2 and 3/4 (012) • Keep informed (013)

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

8	<p>Any key quotes or thoughts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once its fences- nature does the rest (001) • hard to be green when you are in the red (002) • Sheoaks burn hot, not much ash (004) • We've all got a little green in us.... (005) • he -oak & she -oak (007) • Scattering the seeds may work very effectively (007) • local knowledge is better (008) • unsure if his sons feel the same way – may not wish to continue supporting sheoak... youngsters interested in <u>production</u> – may need to support him /them in different ways (009) • what we've done to this country, we've really made a mess of things (012) • sheep were introduced in 1849 – country was grazed bare by 1857 (012) • in-kind support much more valuable than \$s (013)
9	<p>Additional comments or notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property on the market may not remain in district (002) • Fire a risks when established bushland nearby – more veg = higher fuel loads. (008) • Fire management implications of reveg (008) • interested in carbon/incentives (011) • possum/grub dynamics – explore further (011) • we've over cleared too much of Australia (012)

Incentives for protecting Sheoak Grassy Woodlands

C. List of landholder interviewed

The following people were interviewed as part of this project.

	First name	Surname	Town
1	Bruce	Agars	Pt Lincoln
2	John	Cash	Port Kenny
3	John	Dinnison	Elliston
4	Jarred and Derrick	Freeman	Port Kenny
5	Kym & Caroline	Gillett	Elliston
6	Daniel and Jodie	Gorzola	Streaky Bay
7	Ian and Margaret	Kelsh	Port Kenny
8	Frank	Kenny	Elliston
9	Nigel & Deb	May	Elliston
10	Ross	McCallum	Streaky Bay via Port Kenny
11	Bill	Nosworthy	Pt Lincoln
12	Darren	Potter	Elliston
13	Keith	Tree	Elliston
14	Darryl	Tree	Wudinna