

**Final report to National Lippia Working Group steering committee and funding partners for the National Lippia Best Practice manual**



**Prepared by:** Janet Barker, Rod Kerr and Peter Crawford, QMDC trading as Swift NRM.

**Date:** 7<sup>th</sup> October 2008

**Progress report number:** Four and final

Installment	Payment Date	Activity Description	Management Milestone	Progress
1	01/10/07	Signing of contract to implement activities associated with the construction of the Lippia Best Management Practices Manual	<b>Contract signed Inception meeting.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inception meeting took place in Moree Thursday September 13, 2007. Four members of the NLWG steering committee attended and three representatives from Swift NRM</li> <li>▪ Contract signed - start date Monday October 1, 2007.</li> </ul>
		National Lippia Working Group Steering Committee signing off on draft lippia Best Management Practices manual.	<b>NLWG Steering Committee approval of first Draft Lippia BMP manual. Progress report.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ First draft of manual text to be sent out for comment on Thursday December 20, 2007</li> <li>▪ Earlier than outlined in milestones, some case studies will also be sent out for comment on Thursday December 20, 2007</li> </ul>

Installment	Payment Date	Activity Description	Management Milestone	Progress
2	31/01/08	NLWG Steering committee signing off on draft Lippia BMP. Develop case studies. Final draft Lippia BMP manual	<b>Collection of case study data. Final draft Lippia BMP manual submitted. Progress report.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some feedback and sign-off received from NLWG steering committee on first draft</li> <li>▪ All case study data collected</li> <li>▪ Final draft of all Lippia BMP manual text submitted on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> of March.</li> </ul>
3	06/05/08	Changes and editing made to draft text according to NLWG steering committee	<b>Progress meeting between NLWG steering committee &amp; contractor. Contract alterations complete. Suggested changes made to text and layout. Chemical control section rewritten. Updated drafts sent out for comment to revised NLWG steering committee. External editing of document</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Progress meeting in Moree completed 08/04/08</li> <li>▪ Contract alterations made and signed off by 16/06/08</li> <li>▪ Final approval for text content from steering committee and funding bodies obtained June 27, 2008;</li> <li>▪ Professional editing June 30 – July 11, 2008.</li> </ul>
4	01/09/08	Final approval given by NLWG steering committee on final draft	<b>NLWG steering committee approval of final draft. Graphic design submitted and approved. Approval to publish Progress report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Feedback on editors changes and approval to publish text from steering committee and funding bodies obtained July 18, 2008.</li> <li>▪ Graphic design submitted on 14/08/08.</li> <li>▪ Approval to publish obtained from NLWG steering committee and funding partners by 22/08/08</li> <li>▪ Final preparations made and document submitted to printers and binders by September 1, 2008. The printing &amp; binding process is estimated to take four weeks.</li> </ul>

Installment	Payment Date	Activity Description	Management Milestone	Progress
	25/9/08	Completed Lippia Best Practice Manual	<p><b>Completed lippia BMP manual.</b> <b>100 CDs</b></p> <p><b>Final report</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Progress report complete 16/09/08</li> <li>▪ Manuals distributed at Moree or stored at Goodiwindi for collection</li> <li>▪ An additional 50CD's produced</li> <li>▪ Final report submitted to NLWG meeting 08/10/08.</li> </ul>

## General overview of the lippia best practice manual project from Swift NRM's perspective



### *The Process:*

#### **What worked well?**

- There was a variety of skills and knowledge on steering committee ensuring good depth of content & contacts.
- The face – to face meetings provided the best forum for meaningful input to the scope of the project and feedback on progress. After the second face-to- face meeting the content and style of the document was altered considerably and this ensured a much better product.
- The contracts for delivery were comprehensive, particularly regarding procedures for change in timelines and personnel
- The schedule & outputs were clearly outlined in the contracts
- The signing of contracts and amendment documents was an efficient process

- Outsourcing the editing was valuable as it gave both the NLWG and Swift NRM confidence that the document was of an acceptable standard for publication. While the editors changes were minimal, it was reassuring to see how thorough the review had been. The editors comments have been included as Appendix 1 to this report.

### **What areas could be improved?**

- There was a limited geographic spread of members on the steering committee, ie all members were from New South Wales and four out of seven came from Tamworth and Armidale
- At the inception meeting more attention should have been paid to clarifying the role & procedures for the steering committee.as this was one of the areas that became unclear during the process.
- Also at the inception meeting it should have been clarified when the funding bodies became involved and their role regarding providing feedback.
- The process of receiving feedback via e-mail was not effective, even though this was the method of communication identified at the inception meeting. There were many times when little or no feedback was provided, even right at the end when the approval to publish was required. This leaves the contractor in an awkward position if there are complaints later about the final product. Swift NRM would appreciate some discussion with the steering committee and funding partners regarding how to improve this part of the process.
- A more appropriate estimate of timing in the beginning may have avoided delays. Due to the fact that all the steering committee members and funding body representatives had limited time available, more time should have been allocated to the feedback process to ensure that it actually happened.
- The number of copies of the manual each funding partner & contributor receives could have been nominated in the contracts to avoid delays in distribution.

### ***Unexpected costs***

The following costs were accomodated by Swift NRM but not included in the original budget

- The International Standard Book Number, (ISBN) - \$150
- The development of the NLWG logo - \$200

### ***The final product***

Janet Barker, Project Manager, Lippia manual.

QMDC Trading as Swift NRM

PO Box 109, CHINCHILLA QLD 4413; Phone 07 4662 7405; Mob 0411 864 203; E-mail janet\_barker@bigpond.com

## **Strengths**

- The layout & design of the final product gave the document a professional look and makes it attractive to readers
- The range of case studies presented gives real value to the document. A variety of enterprises, land uses and geographic regions are profiled.
- The case studies contain both good and bad news stories. The ones with some economic data send a particularly powerful message.
- The pasture and grazing management sections send a very clear message about the amount of stewardship required to effectively prevent or manage lippia invasion
- The chemical control section is clear & prescriptive
- The document overall provides landholders with a number of options to consider
- Whilst initially we had some concerns about the quality of the photographs, the variety and quality in the final product are of a high standard.
- Feedback about the CDs of the manual being made available has been positive.

## **Gaps**

- There are limited before & after photos available for the case studies.
- The word 'national' does not appear in the title of the document. This may be useful when using the document as a lobbying tool.

## **How does it compare to other national weed management manuals, ie WONS manuals?**

- The range of sectors contributing to the lippia manual is more comprehensive.
- The number of contributors is significantly higher.
- There are more case studies than most of the other manuals.
- The design and layout in general is more eye-catching and modern.
- There is more information on current research in the lippia manual.

## **What could be included in an update?**

- Collation of an updated photo archive with plenty of before and after photos would be beneficial.

- Some case studies on rehabilitation work currently underway on riparian areas and stock routes in the Condamine Catchment would be useful. This work is being done by Cambooya District Landcare. This would include some analysis of native species commonly used in revegetation and their ability to compete with lippia.
- The chemical section may need to be updated more regularly and made available as an insert.

## Appendix 1 – Recommendations made by the editor

- The list (or table) of contents needs only the simple heading 'Contents' rather than 'Table of contents' or 'List of contents'
- Comma usage in a number of situations can become a matter of judgement and personal preference. I have deleted many of the commas to assist with flow of text and a minimum punctuation style allowing the text to remain unambiguous and to still be delivered effectively.
- There is some overuse with the words 'however', 'but', 'at this stage' and 'so'. I have made alternative suggestions i.e. nevertheless and therefore in some instances
- Program/programme. Australian usage is usually program however both are acceptable – choose one and be consistent. Programme chosen.
- Exclosure cages? I couldn't find the word exclosure in the Macquarie Dictionary and thought the word should be exclusion? (later confirmed as an acceptable word due to common usage in the scientific field)
- Choosing words or numerals for numbers: in documents of a general kind use words for numbers up to one hundred. In some instances, we still need to exercise some judgement to ensure that numbers are presented in a clear and natural style in each instance, to avoid distracting or irritating readers. I have amended some numbers to words throughout the text however I have left some numbers in numerals for easier reading.
- Location 'Kialami', Armidale has conflicting kilometres 10 kms or 15kms from Armidale?
- I believe the government style is to write the word percent as opposed to the symbol % however because we use alot of percentages throughout the text, I haven't made any changes for easier reading.
- Depending on the audience/readers, we may need to add an acronym list
- As per instructions, I haven't completed document formatting tasks
- There seems to be a good balance with words –v- photos/diagrams.
- The landholder examples confirm the disastrous outcomes that lippia presents to the land, environment and production.
- Overall, I felt the content was excellent, providing relevant information and control methods used to assist those that wish to manage the rapid spread of lippia.