

**Feedback Form from The Conservation Council of South Australia 080410
Draft State NRM Program Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement Plan (MERI Plan)**

Specific Comments/ Suggestions for Change

| Reference (e.g. page or section number) | Comment | Suggested Changes (where appropriate) |
|--|--|---|
| 1.1.1 | Commend Objective # 4 which is important to have up front in the document | |
| | Important to ensure the difference between the State MER and MERI framework is spelled out | Need to provide clarity around non-commonwealth and non-State investments |
| 1.2 | Adaptive management is not just about methods that are applied it is also about the questions that are being asked. By asking the right questions it means that the right targets can be set in the first place. | |
| 1.5.4 | What is the role of community (sector) in developing the common indicator pool? | |
| 2.1 | | Could this be worded catchment to coast or such? |
| Figure # 2 (interim) | There are no KPIs for Goal 3 or 4. What are the deadlines for Goal 3 and 4? | |
| 2.1.3 NRM Community Grants key objectives | # 1 'empower people...' – how will this be measured? Will the reporting (measurement) be only from the Boards viewpoint? # 3 'build partnerships...' how will this be | |

Please complete and return to Sarah Lewis by email sarah.lewis@sa.gov.au or by fax (08) 8303 9555 by COB 6 April 2010

| | | |
|--------------|--|---|
| | measured? | |
| 3.1.1 | <p>It is to be commended that the information generated through MERI can be utilised in broader reporting such as Water for Good etc. Therefore it is important that the MERI team is positioned at a high enough level to drive NRM across government responsibilities.</p> <p>There is a need for a body as a higher level driver to ensure that the right questions are being asked and making the right connections in order to achieve the fundamental objectives. Important that this body is not a pure agency technical group. The NRM Council may be a suitable body to convene such a group.</p> | |
| 3.1.5 | <p>Clarification is sought as to whether the (recommended) 10% of project funding allocated towards MERI is supposed to also cover the structured evaluation required as a component of multi-year projects?</p> <p>Also it may be that some single year projects or smaller projects would benefit from a more robust evaluation due to the uniqueness of the approach and so forth.</p> | It may be that this is not enough to ensure robust evaluation as that suggested such as 'performance story, case studies etc' |
| 3.4 | Commend the inclusion of 'description of project lessons' and would hope that this information can be shared across the sector | |
| 3.5 | Commend the commitment to keep the MERI requirements for the NRM community grants simple | |

Please complete and return to Sarah Lewis by email sarah.lewis@sa.gov.au or by fax (08) 8303 9555 by COB 6 April 2010

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| 4.4 TBL 8 – evaluation criteria 1 | ‘Appropriate partnerships...’ It is recommended that further thought is required regarding the potential lines of evidence. | |
| 4.4 TBL 8 evaluation criteria 1 | It is suggested that more information is provided (somewhere) on ‘capacity building surveys’. Will these be tailored to suit the regions? Will input be sought from the NGO sector? | |
| 4.4 TBL 8 evaluation criteria 2 | Re- potential lines of evidence. The NRM Council has fallen out of this loop. | Include NRM Council |
| 4.4 TBL 8 evaluation criteria 2 | It is not just the NRM Boards (Plans) that have targets – the State NRM Plan has targets | Include State NRM Plan targets as well |
| 4.8 Capacity building – TBL 11 | Re: memberships of M&E Networks in SA – | Recommended that there be an NGO link on the MENSA network |
| Appendix C | Common Indicator pool – Community Capacity To date the NGO sector has not been engaged in this. The NGO sector would add value to the development of the Community capacity indicator pool | Ensure involvement of the NGO sector in developing aspects of the Common Indicator pool |
| Appendix C | Common Indicator pool What will the process be for adding new indicators and also for reviewing existing indicators? | Include details |

Please complete and return to Sarah Lewis by email sarah.lewis@sa.gov.au or by fax (08) 8303 9555 by COB 6 April 2010

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Glossary | The term 'empowerment' is referred to yet there is no definition of this in the glossary. | Add a definition of empowerment so that it is very clear what is meant. |
|-----------------|---|---|

General Comments:

- We commend the work entailed in developing this Draft MERI Plan. We would encourage on-going review and improvement of that process in conjunction with NRM Boards, Peak Bodies and Agencies. Also it is imperative that the learning's from the experiences of the NRM Boards is fed into the MERI Plan process to ensure continuous improvement over time.
- It is not clear who has had input into the development of this Draft MERI Plan to date (other than DWLBC staff)
- In this framework there is no mention of the commitment of funds to programs IF the point of MERI is to determine how natural systems respond to MERI these programs will (mostly) go beyond the life of the program.
- It is not clear whether this MERI framework is intended for NGO use when funds have not been obtained through State/Federal funding
- Given the broader context proposed for this framework it would be very useful for NGO's (and others) to have access to this information
- Information obtained through this MERI Plan should be used to position NRM in the broader context

Please complete and return to Sarah Lewis by email sarah.lewis@sa.gov.au or by fax (08) 8303 9555 by COB 6 April 2010