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WS008 Continuous Improvement & Innovation Workshop
Executive Summary

Reports and programs associated with the sugar industry have highlighted significant needs and opportunities for the industry including:

- The need for significant performance improvement across all sectors
- Effective transfer and implementation of best practices in relation to farm performance, harvesting and mill performance
- Commitment to implementing best practice extension methods
- Increasing the efficiency of industry bodies
- Adoption of "whole-of-system" solutions, to enhance revenue and cost efficiency, and to facilitate environmental and social sustainability across the industry chain.

These needs and opportunities pose a significant challenge to sugar industry R&D and extension (RD&E) service providers to improve their own performance, while also supporting their clients to achieve improved performance.

A 12 month Continuous Improvement and Innovation (CI&I) program was proposed for people involved in sugar industry RD&E. The aim of the program was to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of R&D and extension services in the sugar industry through building the capacity of participants in continuous improvement and innovation (CI&I). The objective was to deliver a workshop on the principles, processes and tools of continuous improvement and innovation (CI&I) to up to 20 sugar industry service providers, with support over a 12 month period for participants to apply the skills and knowledge learnt in the workshop.

Overall, the program achieved its aim and objective, but was less successful in achieving some of the higher leverage benefits targeted at the beginning of the project such as:

- The involvement of the right proportion of practitioners, leaders and managers
- The implementation of an effective and efficient R&D and extension service system. A system design was documented, but no action was taken to purposefully use it to implement a more effective and efficient service system.
- The design of services to equip and support customers to continuously improve and innovate their thinking, and their on-farm practices, processes and systems. Program participants focused on improving existing services or successfully implementing new projects, rather than on leading the design and implementation of CI&I services for/with customers.

Participants in the CI&I program achieved improvements in the performance of R&D and extension projects, services, systems and processes. Some also achieved improved impact for clients from these projects and services. The program also achieved improvements in understanding and application of CI&I concepts, principles, processes and tools.

It is expected that more than half the participants who completed the CI&I program will continue to use at least some CI&I concepts, principles and tools in their work. The application of these concepts, principles and tools can lead, as had already occurred, to:

- More focused and targeted RD&E projects, services and products
- Improved needs analysis and better prioritisation of opportunities and issues to be addressed by RD&E projects and services
- Improved performance of RD&E project and service teams due to improved shared understanding of focus, priorities and targets.

As part of the CI&I Program, the "Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum" was conducted in Townsville in December 2004. Participants in the forum identified twelve opportunities they considered would have most impact on improving sugar industry RD&E at this time. If action is taken on these opportunities the performance of the current sugar industry RD&E system can be expected to improve. The greater the concerted effort put into these opportunities, the greater the expected benefit to the RD&E system and the sugar industry. Managerial commitment to CI&I is required for sustainability.
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Background

Reports and programs associated with the sugar industry have highlighted significant needs and opportunities for the industry including:

- The need for significant performance improvement across all sectors
- Effective transfer and implementation of best practices in relation to farm performance, harvesting and mill performance
- Commitment to implementing best practice extension methods
- Increasing the efficiency of industry bodies
- Adoption of "whole-of-system" solutions, to enhance revenue and cost efficiency, and to facilitate environmental and social sustainability across the industry chain.

These needs and opportunities pose a significant challenge to sugar industry R&D and extension (RD&E) service providers to improve their own methods and performance, while also supporting their clients to achieve improved performance.

A 12 month Continuous Improvement and Innovation (CI&I) program was proposed for people involved in sugar industry RD&E. The program commenced in December 2003 and was designed to achieve:

- Increased capacity, confidence and motivation of service providers to continuously improve and innovate
- Improved methods and performance of RD&E services
- Increased customer and client satisfaction with services.

In other industries and contexts where there has been commitment to CI&I, and the concerted application of CI&I concepts, principles, processes and tools, measurable performance improvements have been achieved by RD&E service providers. For example:

- An extension agent developed and equipped beef farmers to use a framework that enabled them to focus their efforts on improving practices that would significantly increase price and throughput, or reduce costs
- A technical specialist developed and equipped pig farmers to use, an environmental systems map that enabled them to more effectively choose waste management technologies that were appropriate to their situations.

If similar levels of commitment and application were achieved in this project, participants could also achieve significant improvements in the performance of RD&E services.

In addition, if program participants used the concepts, principles, processes and tools presented in the program to design CI&I services for/with clients, then additional achievements would include:

- Customers continuously improving and innovating their thinking, and on-farm practices, processes and systems
- Customers achieving continuous improvement of profit, efficiency and/or environment
- Increased capacity, confidence and motivation of customers and clients to continuously improve and innovate.

In other industries and contexts where primary producers have been committed to, and been equipped and supported to practice CI&I, significant improvements in on-farm performance have been achieved. For example:

- The owners of a beef enterprise significantly increased operating profit by changing the focus of their efforts from improving reproduction rate to improving growth rate
- The owners of dairy enterprise significantly increased milk production, and increased feed utilisation over a large area.
Objectives

The aim of the project was to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of R&D and extension services in the sugar industry through building the capacity of participants in continuous improvement and innovation (CI&I). The objective was to deliver a workshop on the principles, processes and tools of continuous improvement and innovation (CI&I) to up to 20 sugar industry service providers, with support over a 12 month period for participants to apply the skills and knowledge learnt in the workshop.

The workshop and support sessions were conducted, and every participant designed an individual improvement and innovation plan focused on improving R&D or extension service performance. Of the 18 participants who began the program, 17 took action to implement their plans, and of these, three left BSES during the program. The remaining 14 participants reported on the implementation of their improvement plans and the impacts they achieved. It is expected that more than half the participants who completed the program will continue to use at least some CI&I concepts, principles or tools in their work.

In addition to improved R&D and extension services, other benefits targeted by the project included:

- The design and implementation of an effective and efficient R&D and extension service system (with associated key processes and best practices)
- Customers continuously improving and innovating their thinking, and their on-farm practices, processes and systems.

While a system to achieve continuous improvement and innovation of RD&E services was designed, no significant action was taken by participants to implement this system or the associated key process and practices. This is probably a result of less than desirable involvement of managers in proportion to leaders and practitioners. Also, while many participants improved their existing services or focused on successful implementation of new projects, no participants chose to design CI&I services for clients focusing on improving profit, efficiency and/or environment through the improvement of on-farm practices, processes and systems.

Both these issues are understandable given the "type" of people participating in the program, and the reported lack of organisational or managerial awareness of, and therefore support for, the program and participants to improve systems. Implementation of a new system, or significantly improving an existing service system, requires commitment and action by "managers". Only one RD&E "manager" and no "managers" from RD&E service organisations were involved in the program.

Only a small number of the people involved in the program had the responsibility, expertise and organisational imprimatur to lead the design and implementation of new services (as compared to expansion or adaptation of current/traditional services and approaches). The participants with these attributes seemed to have high workloads and limited resources to explore the design and implementation of CI&I services for/with clients.

Overall, the program achieved its aim and objective, but was less successful in achieving some of the higher leverage benefits targeted at the beginning of the project.
Methodology

Overall Project Design

The focus for the capacity building program was to:

- Improve knowledge and skills in using a range of tools to achieve continuous improvement and innovation of R&D and extension services in the sugar industry
- Explore their application in participants' work and projects.

The structure of the program was based around four different types of sessions which are described below.

Focusing and Equipping Workshop

The focus of this 5-day workshop was to:

- Understand, experience and explore the use of the key principles, processes and tools of CI&I and how these can be applied to achieving improvements and innovation in R&D and extension services in the sugar industry
- Develop individual or team improvement and innovation plans focused on R&D and extension services in the sugar industry.

The specific workshop process is documented in the attached “Focusing and Equipping Workshop Outputs” (Appendix 5).

30-day Support Sessions

The focus for the 30-day sessions was to support individuals in implementing action on their CI&I projects. This could include improving the design of their actions. The target outcomes for these sessions were:

- Improved understanding of individual thinking and action
- Creation of new observations, question and ideas
- Increased confidence and enthusiasm for action
- Individuals synthesise opportunities for improving their CI&I projects
- Improved action design and action implementation
- Improved skills in continuous improvement and innovation.

180-day Assessment, Celebration and Re-Focus Workshop

The focus of this 2-day workshop was to celebrate the progress made by each person in implementing their improvement projects, and to stimulate thinking, questioning and the synthesis of high impact opportunities on which individuals could focus to achieve further improvements and innovations of RD&E services in the sugar industry over the next 6 months. The process used in this workshop is documented in the attached “180-day Workshop Outputs” (Appendix 6).

Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum

The intent of the Forum was to provide people from across the sugar industry an opportunity to share and build-on their own and others' experiences in relation to achieving RD&E outcomes more effectively and improving RD&E systems. Both CI&I program participants and others were involved in the Forum. The target outcomes of the Forum were:

- Sharing of experience, knowledge and innovative methods used to achieve outcomes
- New thinking about improving RD&E delivery
- Identification of high impact opportunities and methods to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of sugar industry RD&E systems.
The process used in the Forum is documented in the attached "Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems – Forum Outputs" (Appendix 7).

The diagram below shows how these different types of sessions were scheduled over 12 months to ensure project participants were well supported in their application of CI&I principles, processes and tools to their own work.

**Structured Evaluation and Feedback**

Structured evaluation and feedback forms were used to gather data in all sessions. The results of feedback for the "Focusing and Equipping Workshop" and "180-day Workshop" are included in the outputs from these workshops (Appendices 5 and 6). The results of the feedback for the "Improving RD&E Systems Forum" are compiled in a separate document (Appendix 8). The structured evaluation and feedback form for the "Focusing and Equipping Workshop" included a benchmark of the tools participants already had to support continuous improvement and innovation.

In addition to the structured evaluation and feedback forms, participant reports and presentations for the "30-day Support Sessions", "180-day Workshop" and "Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum", and the results of the "Improvement and Innovation Stacker" at the 180-day workshop were used to assess participant achievements and progress.

**Underpinning Process**

The project methodology was underpinned by a process known as the Continuous Improvement and Innovation (CI&I) Process. Below is brief information about, and the current representation of, the CI&I Process.

CI&I was first documented by Richard Clark and Janice Timms in 1998. In developing the process they have drawn from their own experience and the world literature in fields such as Action Research, Action Learning, Benchmarking, Innovation, Total Quality Management, System Dynamics, Adaptive Management and Experiential Learning.

Since 1998 the process itself has been improved through contributions from many other people including clients, partners, peers and CI&I Unit members. Improvements in the process have come about as a result of experience in applying it with many different clients in a range of contexts, and active research and development of the theory and practice of CI&I.
The six steps of the CI&I process

Consecutive cycles fit together to form an upwardly spiralling process of continuous improvement and innovation.

Tools recommended for use in each part of the CI&I Process are shown below. Some of these tools have been designed and developed specifically for this process. Tools from other sources are also used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI&amp;I Process</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>SMARTT Focus Tool, Focusing frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 - Situation Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Focusing frameworks, Focusing questions, System design and analysis, Process design and analysis, Practice design and analysis, Timelines, Specialist questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2 - Impact Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Impact criteria, Impact and influence tool, Force field analysis, Systems modelling, Sensitivity analysis, Specialist questioning, Eight dimensions tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3 - Action Design</strong></td>
<td>SMARTT Focus Tool, Critical Success Factors (CSFs) framework, How-How technique, Timelines, Gantt charts, PERT diagrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4 - Action Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Action checks, Reporting frameworks, Recording frameworks, Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5 - Performance Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), Repetitive why technique, Performance management framework, Reporting frameworks, Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6 - Creation &amp; Synthesis</strong></td>
<td>Observations, Questions, Ideas &amp; Opportunities tool (OQIO), Why-Why diagram, Six thinking hats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five stages of engagement to support continuous improvement and innovation of performance, now and in the future are:

1. Achieving a clear need and focus for action
2. Involving the appropriate people (in groups, teams, partnerships, networks and organisations)
3. Enabling people to decide whether they are committed to achieving CI&I
4. Enabling individuals to understand and implement the principles, steps and tools of CI&I
5. Ensuring a flexible, user-friendly and motivating use of the process.

The methodology for the project involved the design and conduct of the sessions outlined earlier in this section. The project team was not involved in selecting or recruiting participants for the capacity building program, although they did specify the commitment that would be required of participants for the program to have most impact. Some of the participants who attended the initial Focusing and Equipping Workshop assumed they were coming to one workshop and did not know what the full capacity building program entitled and the commitment that it required. Also, some did not have the full support and commitment of their organisations or managers to be involved in the 12 month program. In any future projects, these problems could be overcome or limited by adjusting the methodology to include additional steps and partners.

### Outcomes and Outputs

Both outcomes and outputs are reported in this section. Outcomes in the context of this project include improvements in the performance of R&D and extension projects, services, systems or processes, and the impact these have with clients. Information on the improvements achieved by each program participant over the 12-month period as reported or documented by the participant, or recognised and documented by others, is shown in Appendix 1.

Outputs in the context of this project include improvements in understanding and application of CI&I concepts, principles, processes and tools. Evidence of outputs documented in evaluations of the capacity building program sessions are shown in Appendix 2. A list of specific outputs produced in capacity building program sessions are shown in Appendix 3. In addition to the outputs produced in the sessions, a table identifying different options for building capacity in, and achieving and sustaining CI&I across the sugar industry is included as Appendix 4.

### Intellectual Property

All outputs produced during the project are included in the documents attached to this report. The following items were developed during the project using pre-existing tools and expertise, and the experience of project participants:

- The design of a system to achieve continuous improvement and innovation of R&D&E services for a 5% improvement in profit and environmental sustainability per region per year.
- A process to design, deliver and improve a service that achieves target outcomes in partnership with customers.
- Documentation of "best practices" for establishing effective partnerships with customers to achieve target outcomes.

None of these items require protection with regard to intellectual property.
Environmental and Social Impacts

No environmental impacts have resulted or are expected to result directly from this project. Feedback from participants suggests a form of beneficial social impact was experienced because of the opportunities the project provided for collegiate support and communication which was not necessarily available within existing organisational arrangements or within the existing RD&E system.

Expected Flow-On Outcomes

It is expected that more than half the participants who completed the program will continue to use at least some CI&I concepts, principles and tools in their work. In particular the following concepts, principles and tools appear to have become part of common practice for some participants:

- The concepts of Focus and SMARTT Focus, and the SMARTT Focus Tool
- Shared mental models
- Targeting and measuring outcomes
- Assessing opportunities or issues using rigorous criteria, and associated with this the use of the Impact and Influence Tool and 8 Dimensions Tool or some variants of these tools
- Critical Success Factors Framework and/or the individual concepts within this framework of Critical Success Factors, Key Performance Indicators and Key Practices.

The application of these concepts, principles and tools can lead, as had already occurred, to:

- More focused and targeted RD&E projects, services and products
- Improved needs analysis and better prioritisation of opportunities and issues to be addressed by RD&E projects and services
- Improved performance of teams due to improved shared understanding of focus, priorities and targets.

If action is taken on any of the "High Impact Opportunities" developed at the "Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum", then the performance of the current sugar industry RD&E system can be expected to be improved to some extent. The greater the concerted effort put into these opportunities, the greater the expected benefit to the RD&E system and the sugar industry.

Future Needs and Opportunities

Several needs and opportunities for action have been identified as a result of the project. These include:

1. The opportunity to use the system designed in the project to target specific improvements in the Sugar Industry RD&E system so as to achieve improvement of RD&E services

2. The opportunity to use the process designed in the project to improve the design, delivery and on-going management of services that achieve target outcomes in partnership with customers

3. The opportunity to use the documented “best practices” for establishing effective partnerships with customers to improve existing projects, services and partnerships and to improve the design of future projects

4. The need for industry commitment to design and manage systems for sustainable improvement and innovation
5. The opportunity for RD&E system and service organisation managers to increase their level of capacity in relation to achieving, leading and managing organisational and industry improvement and innovation

6. The opportunity for RD&E system and service organisation managers to increase their level of capacity in system design, leadership and management

7. The opportunity to provide “follow-on” CI&I programs or networks for interested people. These could be “advanced” programs or a network for people involved in the 2004 CI&I Program, or “starting” programs for people who have no experience with CI&I.

8. The need to improve collegiate support and communication between people involved in sugar industry RD&E services to improve effectiveness and efficiency

9. The opportunity to improve communication within the RD&E system and with the broader community

10. The opportunity to streamline SRDC and Regional Strategic Planning systems to create shared understanding of sugar RD&E priorities

11. The opportunity to embrace the principles of continuous improvement and innovation in sugar industry RD&E planning

12. The opportunity to form R&D steering groups in each region

13. The opportunity to develop regional R&D strategic plans, and use these accepted as the basis for prioritising project funding

14. The opportunity to set industry profitability targets and target R&D strategies and projects to achieve these targets

15. The opportunity to consider the “model farm” concept

16. The opportunity for BSES to develop R&D plans linked to regional plans developed by Regional Advisory Groups

17. The opportunity for BSES to deliver agreed packages under contract to growers, mills and commercial bodies

18. The opportunity for BSES to redefine, reinvigorate and maintain a skilled body of field staff/scientists.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered to leverage further impact and benefits from the outputs and outcomes of the project.

1. Package and promote the Process Design and Best Practice Design developed in the project for use by people involved in sugar industry RD&E

The specific process and practices developed in the project were: “A process to design, deliver and improve a service that achieves target outcomes in partnership with customers”; and “Best practices to establish effective partnerships with customers to achieve target outcomes”. When packaged, the process and practices would be effective ready reference tools for people already involved in partnerships with customers, and those intending to develop new partnerships.
2. Develop relevant partnerships to action the highest priority opportunities identified at
the “Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum”

The impact and benefits from the “Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum” can be
greatly enhanced by targeting action on the highest priority opportunities. Targeting
opportunities to improve the performance of specific organisations/roles, with one or two
opportunities targeting whole-of-system/cross-organisational improvements would be
beneficial. In this way improvement of the system would happen at the same time as
improvement in the system. Coordinating implementation of these different opportunities would
promote synergy and momentum.

3. Establish a sustainable “Sugar Improvement and Innovation Network”

The purpose of the network is to equip and support interested and committed people to
practice and achieve on-going improvement and innovation of sugar industry RD&E systems,
projects and services. The network would involve regular collegiate and specialist support
sessions for network members, CI&I refresher/upgrade sessions targeted to member needs,
and annual network forums to share and celebrate achievements, and target further
improvements.

Network membership would initially be targeted to interested and committed people from the
2003-2004 CI&I Program, the 1-day Improvement and Innovation Quick Start Workshop in
Mackay, and the “Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum”.

4. Implement a capacity building program on “Leading and Managing Sustainable
Improvement and Innovation in the Sugar Industry”

The purpose of the program is to equip and support key people with the responsibility and
imprimatur to achieve whole-of-system and organisational improvement in the sugar industry,
to fulfil their responsibilities more effectively, confidently and creatively. Since these key
people work with and in dynamic systems the program would include concepts and tools for
designing, managing and improving systems and processes.

---
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Appendices
## Appendix 1  
CI&I Program participants, their history during the program and their achievements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Steve Attard, CSIRO, Home Hill | **Initial Focus:**  
To develop a shared vision of natural resource management between stakeholders in the Lower Burdekin for a viable and healthy region.  
**180-day Focus:**  
Develop and implement in partnership, a framework for engagement with key natural resource managers in the Mackay region by December 2004.  
Steve was unavailable to attend the Forum.                                                                 | By February Steve had begun to develop the framework of industry structure and stakeholders, was submitting a joint project proposal, had opened dialogue with DNR&M and was setting up the framework for economic modelling which was part of the situation analysis.  
At the 180-day Workshop Steve presented a report which indicated the following achievements and unexpected results in relation to his initial focus:  
- Four-year project, based in the Burdekin, that aims to improve the interaction and learning between researchers and farmers in the RD&E process.  
- Regional economic models for the Burdekin developed  
- Constructive dialogue with organisations (QDNRM&E and IF CRC) on the issue of community involvement and capacity building  
- Communication channels created in the Mackay region  
- Identified some of the stakeholders and their roles (both regions)  
- Encouragement from stakeholders in the Mackay region to focus efforts there.  
He reported that communication channels had dried up in the Burdekin and would require new efforts, and that the outcome of effective regional partnerships had not been achieved. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
<th>SRDC Project WS008 Final Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chris Aylward, BSES, Mackay | Initial Focus:  
To achieve 1000Ha of land planted to new cropping system & 50% grower involvement in project extension activities in the central district by 2008.  
Early in the program Chris became involved in a large, new project and his Focus significantly changed.  
180 Day Focus:  
To build the project team's understanding of trial operation issues and the technical issues of the new farming system (harvesting, planting, bed preparation, weed control, irrigation and varieties), and get consensus on the technical application of the new farming system prior to the commencement of the trials (late 2004).  
Due to work commitments Chris was unable to attend the Forum. | By May, Chris had achieved the following against his initial focus:  
- 3 focus groups establishing and growing  
- Project staff identified  
- In relation to developing a shared mental model of what the "new cropping system" is – Cropping system tours conducted and brainstorming sessions with focus groups  
At the 180-day Workshop Chris presented a report and the following achievements were recognised:  
- Established needs  
- Improved practice of Action Design, including using CSFs and KPs in a planning exercise, and developing clear KPIs to assess future project achievements  
- Improved project team  
- New focus groups established  
Chris also reported that the 30-day Support Sessions had helped him to review the project focus and timeframes and to revise performance indicators. |                                                    |
| Mark Craig, BSES, Mackay    | Initial Focus:  
To achieve an increase in the number of meetings held by growers by 2005, to improve attitude and farm practices that will contribute to a sustainable industry by 2005. Start 3 new groups by June 2004.  
Participated in 30-day Support Sessions until left BSES. | Specific feedback from Mark about the 30-day Support Sessions indicated he believed he improved her action design and action implementation, created new observations, questions and ideas, improved her thinking, action and skills in continuous improvement and innovation, and increased her confidence to take action on her CI&I project.  
By February 2004, Mark had established 2 new groups and restarted an old group. |                                                    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yvette Everingham, JCU, Townsville | Initial Focus: By the end of 2005 have documented evidence that 10% of farmers, harvesters and millers in Tully have improved the integration of climate forecast information with planning practices to improve risk management.  
180-day Focus: To have identified at least one person willing to deliver climate forecasting information to Tully cell groups by March 2005. | At the 180-day Workshop Yvette presented a report and the following achievements were recognised:  
• Benchmark calendar of decisions related to needs for forecasts, time of practices and impact  
• A person trained to do climate forecasting presentation  
• Improved climate forecasting acceptance (reliability of data)  
• Modelling growers achieving practice change  
At the Forum Yvette reported the following outcomes/results:  
• A shared mental model of "integrating seasonal climate forecasting with decision making" achieved using the SMARTT Focus tool and the Action Design Framework  
• Good attendance at consultative group meetings and group members using seasonal climate forecasting. |
| Steven Garrad, BSES, Innisfail | Initial Focus: To develop 3 Innisfail-Babinda grower groups on a pilot specialist focus documenting changes in delivery of services, information & group processes and producing a detailed BMP package by end of 2004 crush.  
In the first several months Steve’s focus sharpened to: To develop a Wet Tropics Progressive Grower group as a pilot with a specialist focus on the development of a Farm Management System producing an FMS framework by beginning of 2005 crush. | At the Forum Steve reported the following outcomes/results:  
• A regional network with progressive growers  
• A common understanding of FMS  
• A core group (3-5) prepared to pay to do EMS  
• $15,000 of funding  
• Document of industry issues relevant to FMS  
• Draft review of nutrition management practices commenced. |
Initial Focus: To work with willing CI&I course participants and others to achieve the Key Outcomes of the SRDC R&D Plan 2003-2008 by facilitating the development of at least two highly attractive and highly feasible SRDC Preliminary Project Proposals (PPPs) by September 30, 2004.

This focus was refined and improved to:
To develop an attractive activity in the latter half of 2004 to achieve increased understanding among stakeholders in the Australian sugar industry of the scope of SRDC Program D “Industry Capacity” and to encourage innovative thinking in the development of at least 2 attractive and feasible SRDC Program D proposals for the 2005/06 funding round.

Additional 180-day Focus:
To participatively design, develop and implement by December 2005 an innovative attractive and feasible capacity building program for “leaders” in the Australian sugar industry to understand and apply systems and process thinking for impact on performance of individuals, teams, organisations and industry.

At the 180-day Workshop Tracy reported the following achievements:
- Support from SRDC Management
- Outcomes clearly defined
- Support from 30-day workshop participants
- 15 attractive and feasible Travel and Learning Opportunity Project Proposals approved by SRDC Working Parties and SRDC Board for 2004/05. Approximately 8 proposals included investigators involved in the CI&I Workshop or the CSR Industry Capacity Building Program.

At the Forum Tracy reported that she had used several CI&I tools including: SMARTT Focus Tool, Impact and Influence Tool, Focusing Frameworks, and systems thinking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Geoff Kent, SRI, Mackay | Initial Focus: To increase SRI income from northern sugar milling companies by 5% per year through the provision of high quality services targeted at their prioritised needs. Two of the outputs Geoff had identified for this Focus were:  
- A process to identify and rank RD&E needs from the northern sugar milling companies  
- A list of prioritised RD&E needs for the northern sugar milling companies.  
180-day Focus: For SRI’s northern milling company accounts collectively to achieve one of the top two increases in account income growth of all SRI’s Australian milling company accounts each year through the proposal of high quality services targeted at the northern milling company’s prioritised needs. | At the 180-day Workshop Geoff presented a report in which he identified that much of the work he had conducted in the first 180 days involved obtaining support from SRI management to continue in the CI&I program, and in obtaining the necessary funding for his improvement project.  
At the Forum Geoff reported that he had developed a needs identification and prioritisation process and used this in workshops with each milling company. The process involved tools covered in the CI&I program including brainstorming combined with pinboarding, Impact and Influence and the 8 Dimensions Tool.  
He reported the following outcomes/results:  
- Each workshop produced a prioritised list of RD&E needs  
- Median scores in re: "How satisfied are you with the identified priorities for RD&E?" – 4/5  
- Median scores in re: "How satisfied are you with the process used?" – 3.5/5  
- Most people liked the structured, quantitative approach  
Geoff reported:  
- He believed that the new method is better than just a discussion method  
- Asking for individual input has advantage of getting input from all participants, not just the louder ones  
- Most companies were receptive to this different approach (but it isn’t for everyone). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tony Linedale, BSES, Bundaberg | Initial Focus: To coordinate the development of farm management service packages (10, including fee-for-service units) to achieve 50% of packages operative with 25% of client base within 12 months. 180-day Focus: Make applications to three funding bodies by December 2004 for the conduct of a workshop series (6) twice by June 30, 2005. | At the 180-day Workshop Ryan presented a report and the following achievements were recognised:  - Planned milestones and outcomes were essentially being met but not in the ordered manner first envisaged. The CI&I process has provided a good means to modify the program while maintaining focus  - A needs analysis and impact analysis had been conducted and establishing project linkages during this initial phase improved understanding of factors involved and gave a sharpened focus to the project. Proper linkages of CSFs, KPIs and KPs is the lynchpin to the success of the process and deserves appropriate design time. The 30-day Support sessions were good for prompting a review of work.  - Four extension packages ready for delivery and specialist workshops (short courses) available  
At the Forum Tony reported the following outcomes/results:  - Board and industry support gained  - Staff cooperation and ownership achieved  - 4 workshops developed to operational level  - Additional 2 workshops commenced  - Pilot workshops conducted  - Integration with discussion groups  - Improved staff knowledge  - Additional needs identified. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Matthews, BSES, Ayr</td>
<td><strong>Initial Focus:</strong> To develop relevant, timely and accurate information and training relating to crop nutrition to a target group of growers three times over 18 months leading to an improvement by aligning with industry best practice with regards to crop nutrition/fertiliser management. <strong>180-day Focus:</strong> By the end of August 2004, to have enrolled, completed and passed the Incitec Nutrient Advantage course for agronomic advisors.</td>
<td>At the 180-day Workshop Ryan presented a report and the following achievements were recognised: - Extension staff had attended 2 group facilitation workshops as well as becoming Workplace Training Certificate IV accredited - Pilot group selected and the project and processes had been explained clearly to each grower - Soils tests were analysed and recommendations given to growers - In some cases growers had applied the recommended fertiliser - Improved timing of extension activities so that the growers' decision points and growing schedule determine the &quot;service&quot; schedule - Improved understanding of why growers fertilise as they do - Realisation that adoption is not just about good information. At the Forum Ryan presented a report (for himself and Rob Millia) which detailed the following outcomes/results: - Participated in a nutrient advantage introductory workshop and aim to be accredited by May 2005 - Nutrient workbook being revised - Demonstration sites set up and harvested. Ryan and Rob's presentation showed they had not had much success with getting growers to use recommended levels of fertiliser because the growers were not convinced the recommendations were accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>History Throughout Program</td>
<td>Improvements Reported/Documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Duncan McGregor, BSES, Maryborough | **Initial Focus:** To use all key people in the region who are involved with herbicide recommendations to assist with grower education of spray equipment and have at least 10% of farmers willing to change their nozzles to suit the herbicide and conditions of spraying by July 2004.  
**180-day Focus:** To generate funds from Agricultural Pesticide Companies for trial work conducted with their products. This is an ongoing process and is expected to raise $10,000 in 2004 and be maintained at 20% of my total cost in future years.  
In the second half of 2004 Duncan moved from Bundaberg to take up responsibility for the Maryborough and Rocky Point districts which is a very significant workload. Duncan did not attend the Forum. | At the 180-day Workshop Duncan presented a report and the following achievements were recognised:  
- Improved communication with new and established networks  
- New BMP fact sheet  
- Group oriented services  
- Best management practices for weed management  
- Interface with commercial industry |
| Peter McGuire, BSES, Condon  | **Initial Focus:** To conduct and promote 3 farming systems trials to achieve a 40% adoption rate in Condon (by area planted) of controlled traffic and break cropping by December 2007.  
**180-day Focus:** Negotiate, write and verify a code of practice for the NSW Sugar Industry by 30 April 2005. | At the Forum Peter reported the following outcomes/results:  
- Improved needs assessment & objectives  
- 2 more farmers using controlled traffic system based on 1.9-1.9 m spacing, fallow planted, after a break crop  
- Controlled traffic trials and demonstrations sites to evaluate row configurations under local conditions, and to promote and fine tune system  
- Trials run by Steering Committee  
- Site meeting newsletter.  
He reported that in achieving his results his methods included: developing a SMARTT Focus; using prioritisation criteria; devising a "Critical Success Factors" framework; and identifying "Key Practices". |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rob Millia, BSES, Ayr| Initial Focus (in collaboration with Ryan Matthews): To develop relevant, timely and accurate information and training relating to crop nutrition to a target group of growers three times over 18 months leading to an improvement by aligning with industry best practice with regards to crop nutrition/fertiliser management.  
180-day Focus (in collaboration with Ryan Matthews): By the end of August 2004, to have enrolled, completed and passed the Incitec Nutrient Advantage course for agronomic advisors.  
Rob came to the Forum but had to leave unexpectedly. Ryan Matthews presented a combined report. | At the 180-day Workshop Rob presented a report and the following achievements were recognised:  
• Extension staff attended 2 group facilitation workshops and received Workplace Training Certificate IV accreditation  
• Soils tests were analysed and recommendations given to growers  
• In some cases growers had applied the recommended fertiliser.  
At the Forum Ryan presented a joint report which detailed the following outcomes/results:  
• Participated in a nutrient advantage introductory workshop  
• Nutrient workbook being revised  
• Demonstration sites set up and harvested.  
Ryan and Rob’s presentation showed they had little success growers to use recommended levels of fertiliser because growers were not convinced the recommendations were accurate. |
| Joe Muscat, BSES, Mackay | Initial Focus: To enhance the “current” BMP Grower Group extension program, in order to “grow” the program in the Mackay Region over the next 12 months.  
180-day Focus: To build the capacity of grower hosts, growers and BMP officers to achieve better decision making process of the farmer enterprise in the areas of productivity, profitability and sustainability in the next 6 months.  
Due to work commitments Joe was not able to attend the Forum. | At the 180-day Workshop Joe presented a report and the following achievements were recognised:  
• Reducing grower discussion group size to enhance discussion and “activeness”  
• Use of grower hosts to arrange topics  
• Use of paid coordinator to arrange meetings  
• Increased number of active groups  
• Increased frequency of meetings  
• Increased grower involvement in groups  
• Obvious local ownership  
• Increased capacity of "hosts"  
• Increased skill in identifying attitudes change  
• Mapping changes in groups over time. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>History Throughout Program</th>
<th>Improvements Reported/Documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vince Papale, Area Productivity</td>
<td>Initial Focus: To achieve an increased utilisation of productivity services in the Burdekin</td>
<td>Vince was not involved in any reporting sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Ayr</td>
<td>District by identifying customer's needs and retain customer numbers over the next 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vince participated in the initial workshop but did not participate in any other program activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Peterson, BSES, Ayr</td>
<td>Initial Focus: To work in partnership with a team of interested industry members (growers, harvesters) to convert 10% of the grower members' land to new farming systems to evaluate and demonstrate the profitability, sustainability and commercial application of these systems by June 2006.</td>
<td>Specific feedback from Christine about the 30-day Support Sessions indicated she believed she improved her action design and action implementation, created new observations, questions and ideas, improved her thinking, action and skills in continuous improvement and innovation, and increased her confidence to take action on her CI&amp;I project. By February Christine had compiled benefits/problems of controlled traffic, HDP and fallow crops as described by growers across the district, and was assisting in updating/improving cost calculators so that grower costs could be calculated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in 30-day Support Sessions until left BSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Poggio, BSES, Ingham</td>
<td>Initial Focus: To formalize and assess the frequency/range of one-to-one extension provided by BSES Limited in the Herbert River region through continual monitoring and recording over a six month period to develop a benchmark for further analysis.</td>
<td>At the Forum Mark reported the following outcomes/results:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark participated in 30-day sessions, and went to the US on a Rotary Exchange so was not available for the 180-day workshop but did make a presentation to the Forum.</td>
<td>- A Professional Recording System (PRS) developed and piloted, along with printed materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- PRS proposal supported by management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improvement in service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- System provides easy identification of products/services delivered to industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Advanced system proposed for pilot trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>History Throughout Program</td>
<td>Improvements Reported/Documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| John Reghenzani, BSES, Ingham | Initial Focus:  
To review three major projects (1. NurtiSmart glasshouse, 2. drainage manual and 3. N fixation) for opportunities to apply CI&I principles and implement three improvements for each within 12 months  
180-day Focus:  
To follow up on N fixation delivery to funding agencies and confirm funding support for RD&E commencing June 2005.  
This focus was made more specific and became:  
To establish a new funded project to research and practically implement nitrogen fixation by sugarcane.  
John initially chose three of his projects for improvement by application of the CI&I principles to demonstrate to himself how well CI&I principles worked for different project types and different customers. However he only had time to apply it to one project (new scientific research) and his target outcome was to obtain sufficient funding by July 2005 for additional research and commercialisation within 5 years.  
At the 180-day Workshop John presented a report and the following achievements were recognised:  
- The use of interactive “discovery” tools to gain recognition of concepts, and the effective presentation of proof of concept  
- The use of focusing questions and concept/product design.  
At the Forum John reported that CI&I is a good concept, but that extra time needs to be allocated for implementation. He received outstanding response from industry and environmental group in relation to his new project. He indicated industry responded well to the techniques he used, and the modification of delivery to suit the audience worked well. He concluded CI&I techniques have a place in sugar industry R&D, and the support he received from other people involved in the program had been beneficial to overcome professional isolation. He also concluded that more than encouraging results are required for success of external funding and this is where CI&I techniques may help. |
### Appendix 2

**Improvements in understanding and application of CI&I concepts, principles, processes and tools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improved understanding of CI&I concepts, principles and tools. | Average score: 7.5/10  
Range of scores: 5 – 10  
Comments:  
- Had zero knowledge and understanding of CI&I now 7/10  
- Had very little knowledge of CI&I before this week, and have learnt a lot  
- Had no idea before. Now have starting point to growth with  
- Much better understanding of language and sequences  
- Helped to understand new words and processes for achieving CI&I  
- Put some clear logical steps into what would normally be common sense |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved range of tools available to achieve CI&amp;I:</th>
<th>Tools experienced in initial 5-day workshop:</th>
<th>No previous experience of tool</th>
<th>Tool will be of use in work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Design and Analysis Tool</td>
<td>14/18</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Design and Analysis Tool</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>14/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice Design and Analysis Tool</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>14/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact and Influence Tool</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dimensions Tool</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMARTT Focus Tool</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Success Factors Framework</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting for Support</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Friend</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Questioning Technique</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverse Thinking (using pictures)</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations, Questions, Ideas &amp; Opportunities</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>16/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools experienced in 180-day workshop:</th>
<th>Value of Tool – Av. Score</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting for Support</td>
<td>8.0/10</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OQIO Framework for Support and Focus</td>
<td>8.1/10</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and Innovation Stacker</td>
<td>3.9/10</td>
<td>1 - 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3

Specific outputs produced from program sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Focusing and Equipping Workshop**             | • The design of a system to achieve continuous improvement and innovation of R&D&E services for a 5% improvement in profit and environmental sustainability per region per year  
• A process to design, deliver and improve a service that achieves target outcomes in partnership with customers  
• Documentation of “best practices” for establishing effective partnerships with customers to achieve target outcomes  
• Data on tools participants already had in their “tool kits” to support situation analysis, impact analysis, action design/planning, providing support for improvement, and stimulating and challenging thinking  
• “Focusing & Equipping Workshop Outputs” booklet |
| **180-day Assessment, Celebration & Re-Focus Workshop** | • “180-day Workshop Outputs” booklet  
• Documented 180-day reports from seven participants.                                                                                                                                                 |
| **Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum** | • 22 presentations describing situations where participants have been involved in improving some aspect of sugar industry RD&E  
• 2 presentations from participants who offered experiences from other industries and contexts  
• 77 lessons and insights in relation to designing RD&E projects and systems  
• 56 lessons and insights in relation to leadership and management of RD&E projects and systems  
• 53 lessons and insights in relation to assessing the performance of RD&E projects and systems  
• 58 lessons and insights in relation to roles and relationships in RD&E projects and systems  
• 72 lessons and insights in relation to methods for achieving RD&E outcomes  
• 37 opportunities for improving sugar industry RD&E systems and projects  
• Identification of short and longer term actions that could be taken to implement 12 opportunities which participants considered would have most impact on improving sugar industry RD&E at this time  
• CD of the Forum presentations  
• “Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems – Forum Outputs” booklet  
• “Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems – Forum Evaluation and Feedback” booklet |
### Appendix 4 Options for building capacity in, and achieving and sustaining CI&I across the sugar industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Brief Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Industry Tools Workshops                    | - Workshops for up to 30 people from across a sugar producing community and different sectors involved in sugar production. Up to 5 workshops can be conducted in different centres in a region in a week  
- People experience a range of practical tools that help to focus thinking and action on achieving targets, to get more effect for effort, and to work more effectively together  
- Enable people to meet and interact with people from other sectors  
Benefit: Large number of people with powerful tools and some similar tools in their toolkits so they can work more effectively together.                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Skills Workshops/Programs                  | 1 to 3 day skills training (or 3 to 6 month programs including more practice and support) for up to 20 people in key skill areas, including:  
- Design and Management of Dynamic Systems  
- Best Practices Design and Management  
- Methods and Tools for Leverage Analysis  
- Designing and Managing Effective Partnerships  
- Adaptive Management and Continuous Improvement Processes  
- Designing Effective Action  
- Leading and Managing Sustainable Improvement and Innovation Projects  
- Process Design and Management  
Benefit: Concepts, principles, tools and practice in key skill areas.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Best Practice Partnerships                  | 2 to 3 year partnerships that achieve improvements in specific focus areas (eg sectoral improvements such as on-farm improvement in water use efficiency or organisational/project/service improvements)  
- Teams of people focusing on similar areas work together to achieve measurable improvements at the practices level. Teams also share their achievements and experiences with other teams and interested people.  
- Combines on-ground action, hitting and measuring targets, and capacity building  
Benefit: On-ground improvements in practices and the development of capacity to be able to work together and achieve improved practices in other areas in the future.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Regional Sugar Improvement & Innovation Network |  
- Sustainable network of teams & partnerships established over 3 years achieving measurable & sustainable improvements across all aspects, & at all levels of leverage – systems, processes, practices, projects, products, services, organisations  
- Combines on-ground action, hitting and measuring targets, capacity building and strengthening of social capital  
Benefit: Sustainable improvement & innovation at all levels from on-ground to whole-of-region, with an effective network & institutional infrastructure to maintain involvement & ensure momentum for on-going impact.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
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Program and Workshop Focus

Focus of the Program
- Improve knowledge and skills in using a range of tools to achieve continuous improvement and innovation of R&D and extension services in the sugar industry
- Explore their application in your work and projects.

Logic of the program
Starting with the end in mind:
- A stimulating, enjoyable and rewarding improvement and innovation forum in late 2004. This is an opportunity to share with colleagues and partners your experiences with CI&I and improvements and innovations you have achieved
- Support to take action and keep focused. This includes Action Support Sessions every 30 days and a 2-day Re-focusing and Capacity Enhancement Workshop in June 2004.

Focus for the Focusing and Equipping Workshop
- Understanding, experiencing and exploring the use of the key principles, processes and tools of CI&I and how these can be applied to achieving improvements and innovation in R&D and extension services in the sugar industry
- Developing individual or team improvement and innovation plans focused on R&D and extension services in the sugar industry.

Workshop Participants
Steve Attard, Chris Aylward, Mark Craig, Yvette Everingham, Steven Garrad, Tracy Henderson, Geoff Kent, Tony Linedale, Ryan Matthews, Duncan McGregor, Peter McGuire, Rob Milla, Joe Muscat, Vince Papale, Christine Peterson, Mark Poggio, John Regenhzani, Errol Sander. CI&I Team: Janice Timms, Richard Clark and Paul Stewart.
Contact details for program participants are shown in Appendix 8 (p.30)

Workshop Outputs
1. Diagrams created during the "CI&I Game" (Appendix 1 – p. 15-16)
2. Outputs from System Design and Analysis Tool session (system map, thinking, scores) – “A system to continuously improve and innovate RD&E services for a 5% improvement in profit and environmental sustainability per region per year”. (p.4-6 , and Appendix 2 – p. 17-19)
3. Outputs from Process Design and Analysis Tool session (process design, thinking) – “A process to design, deliver and improve a service that achieves target outcomes in partnership with customers”. (p. 7-10)
4. Outputs from Best Practice Design and Analysis Tool session (practices design) – “Best practices to establish effective partnerships with customers to achieve target outcomes”. (p. 11-13)

5. Inverse thinking diagrams. (Appendix 3 - p. 20-21)

6. Questions asked during the Specialist Questioning Technique session – “Achieving CI&I in a regional R&D&E&P/Industry system”. (p. 14)

7. Session on establishing a sustainable industry/regional improvement and innovation initiative (Appendix 4 – p. 22).


9. Schedule for 30 day support sessions. (p. 14)


**Workshop Layout and Sessions**

 Broad roadmap for the workshop

---

**Re-Focus**

**Situation Analysis**
- System Design & Analysis Tool
- Process Design & Analysis Tool
- Best Practice Design & Analysis Tool

**Impact Analysis**
- Impact & Influence Tool
- Other criteria
- 8 Dimensions Tool

**Action Design**
- SMARTT Tool
- CSF Framework Tool
- Critical Friend (using OQIO Tool)

---

WS008 – SRDC Continuous Improvement and Innovation Workshop
How the workshop fits with on-going Improvement and Innovation

Workshop Sessions

Monday
- Welcome and Introductions
- Key concepts of CI&I
- The CI&I Game
- Situation Analysis – Using the System Design and Analysis Tool

Tuesday
- Drawing opportunities for improvement and innovation from the Systems Map
- Situation Analysis – Using the Process Design and Analysis Tool
- Drawing opportunities for improvement and innovation from the Process Design
- Situation Analysis – Using the Best Practices Design and Analysis Tool
- Drawing opportunities for improvement and innovation from the Practices Design

Wednesday
- Impact Analysis – Using the Impact and Influence Tool, and 8 Dimensions Tool
- Action Design – Using the SMARTT Focus Tool, and CSF Framework Tool
- Critical Friend support for SMARTT Focuses and Action Designs
- Inverse Thinking Tool

Thursday
- Specialist Questioning Technique
- Critical Friend support to further improve Action Designs
- Presentation of Action Designs and support in small groups

Friday
- Presentation of Action Designs and support in small groups
- Scheduling of support sessions
- Wrap-up and feedback
Key Concepts and Principles of CI&I

In this session participants were asked to order a series of cards into a logical set and sequence of steps to achieve continuous improvement and innovation. They also had another set of cards relating to possible tools to use to support the steps.

The diagrams generated during the “CI&I Game” are shown in Appendix 1.

Step 1 Situation Analysis - System Design & Analysis Tool

Focus

The Focus for the System Design and Analysis tool session was: *A system to continuously improve and innovate RD&E services for a 5% improvement in profit and environmental sustainability per region per year.*

Participants generated elements they thought would be essential to this system. All the contributions were then grouped into the following nine elements:

1. Quality of RD&E program design, leadership and support
2. Quality of culture and motivation
3. Quality of performance measurement, assessment and improvement
4. Quality of products and services
5. Quality of knowledge, skills and tools
6. Quality of partnerships
7. Quality of marketing and promotion
8. Demand for products and services
9. Quality and quantity of resources

Participant contributions to these elements are shown in Appendix 2. The systems map developed with these elements is shown on the next page.

Thinking generated during the systems mapping is shown below:

• Why going in the order going in?
• Trying to leave any contentious ones to the last. Just going with the really logical ones first. (Richard).
• What is Number 3 referring to? RD&E or industry practices? Thought it referred to industry practices rather than RD&E practices.
• Interpretation from the cards was that it was both. But this is very important because need to make sure we are all talking about the same issues.
• If partnerships break down they could give bad-word-of-mouth that would impact on marketing and promotion.
• Relationship between partnerships and marketing would depend on whether the partnerships were about marketing.
• Does quality of resources include quantity? Needs to include quantity as well. One quality person can’t do the job for 700 farmers. "Quality and Quantity of Resources".
• Isn’t demand really an outcome? Can’t really invest money in “demand”. So maybe take this out of the investment option.
• In different companies, do you find out what the demand is first. Or do you go from the bottom, like we have, to create demand. Maybe information about demand needs to be closer to the bottom in the systems map. Or maybe if have better quality partnerships which include customers, they would be able to contribute information to improve design and leadership.
• Part of marketing is marketing research to see whether there is demand.
A system to achieve continuous improvement and innovation of R&D&E services for a 5% improvement in profit and environmental sustainability per region per year
Participants were asked to "invest $100,000" in those elements they thought would have the most impact on the Focus in their own situation, at this point in time. The individual and total scores are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1 Situation Analysis - Process Design & Analysis Tool

Focus
The Focus for the Process Design and Analysis tool session was: A process to design, deliver and improve a service that achieves target outcomes in partnership with customers.

Need/Reason for the Focus
1. Customers are the ones to achieve the benefits so they have to have a stake in the services – has to be relevant, they need a sense of ownership
2. Lack of focus at the outcomes and needs level – services not focussed on needs
3. Variability amongst customers needs to be addressed – one service may not fit all
4. Sustainability issues not always addressed – quick fixes with no long term benefits
5. More effort needed in picking key customers – milliers & farmers may want different outcomes
6. Target the outcome you want to achieve – e.g. industry benefit

Target Outcomes
1. Service will address needs of customers (determined in a rigorous way)
2. Meet demand relative to resources
3. Makes a % change to what you are targeting – achieves target outcomes of service
4. People involved have a shared understanding of the service, their role in it, outcomes & benefits
5. High level of satisfaction with the service by all involved.

Principles
- Partnership
- Work ethics
- Communication
- Accountability
- Realism/urgency/priority
- Ownership
- "Profitable"
- Simplicity and ease
- Continuous focused
- Beneficial
- Relevant

Thinking generated during the Process Design and Analysis Tool session is shown below.
- The target outcomes are the outcomes of the service that we are designing, may be negotiated in partnership with customers
- The focus is semi-generic so that it can apply to everyone
- Customer – multiple customers may exist – customers benefit from the service – the end user, clients or investor invests in the outcomes for other people
- Partnerships – a business like relationship that have common purpose and processes, there are benefits to all partners, all partners contribute to resourcing, there is strong leadership and continuous improvement
- Partnerships may be difficult to achieve – examples of processes for partnership exists
- The emphasis of the focus is element 1 and up through element 3 – to design, deliver and improve a service
- The proposed focus assumes that it would be valuable to work in partnership
- There are some activities that may be generic for all of the steps
- Incentives may form part of service design
- Step one is more about the needs, and step to is more about designing a service to meet those needs
- Feedback is included in step 6 – to ensure that feedback is being received during delivery so that it can be used in step 7
- Control in step 3 – means control in the planning the delivery in the context of the broad range of needs and wants from customers
- First three steps develop ownership with customers which will help the delivery of the service in the later steps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of a mission statement</td>
<td>Formal commitment of all players (MOU)</td>
<td>1. Priority needs identification with customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate(s) engaged</td>
<td>Shared understanding of needs</td>
<td>2. Service specification and design with customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of players</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Plan and test the delivery of the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with stakeholders</td>
<td>Identify and prioritise issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of delivery program (content and did it happen or not)</td>
<td>Ranking by test group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dry run of delivery program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Think outside the square eg get some outside perspectives</td>
<td>• Agreement with stakeholders (principle and targets)</td>
<td>• Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Situation analysis (opportunities)</td>
<td>• Determine who partners are</td>
<td>• Testing models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define skills/resources available to system</td>
<td>• Determine who customers are</td>
<td>• Development of plan with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs analysis</td>
<td>• Prioritise outcomes</td>
<td>• Plan delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine needs of customers</td>
<td>• Set realistic targets</td>
<td>• Appropriate methodology for plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate needs</td>
<td>• Benefit/cost analysis</td>
<td>• Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priority setting</td>
<td>• Reach agreement with partners eg goals, targets, processes</td>
<td>• Plan evaluation at key points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree on target outcomes</td>
<td>• Appropriate resources</td>
<td>• Determine work outputs – match to outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation</td>
<td>• Identify key outcomes that are agreed to by all</td>
<td>• Building models/capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs survey and analysis</td>
<td>• Identify outcomes</td>
<td>• Identify what data/resources exist to enhance decision making capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine level of understanding/knowledge of customers</td>
<td>• Identify decision(s) in partnership with customers</td>
<td>• Establish timeline and achievement criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Form communication channels with customers and partners</td>
<td>• Incentives to drive process</td>
<td>• Define work program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation between partners and customers</td>
<td>• $ + sense</td>
<td>• Adequate resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree on key focus</td>
<td>• Explain reasons for targeting different outcomes</td>
<td>• Confirm demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication of situation information</td>
<td>• Identify service levels</td>
<td>• Develop budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify players</td>
<td>• Identify service required</td>
<td>• Cost/benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs analysis workshop</td>
<td>• Information meetings and seminars</td>
<td>• Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High priority need identified</td>
<td>• Facilitated priority setting</td>
<td>• Consult with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Signing off</td>
<td>• Determining adequate resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of needs analysis workshop</td>
<td>Facilitator; partners; customers; investors</td>
<td>Venue(s); seed funding; previous surveys (background info)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation; knowledge and background; effective presentation; communication across all stakeholders</td>
<td>Information; facilitation; analysis; support; program/project manager; achieve agreement</td>
<td>Where and what?; $; men; contribution from stakeholders, grants and subsidies; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate selection; knowing client relevance</td>
<td>Coordinate; administer; deliver program; design assessment tools; evaluate and review</td>
<td>Assessment tools; personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 months (in December)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Early; appropriate; complete before forming plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>KPIs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Service equipping</td>
<td>• Build a team – develop skills&lt;br&gt;• Appropriate staff&lt;br&gt;• Appropriate skills and knowledge to address issue&lt;br&gt;• Implement training&lt;br&gt;• Find the gaps in skills/knowledge and fill them&lt;br&gt;• Adequate staffing&lt;br&gt;• Physical resources&lt;br&gt;• Incentives for staff&lt;br&gt;• Funding&lt;br&gt;• Evaluate/increase/assign resource to meet needs&lt;br&gt;• Good data product&lt;br&gt;• Consultation&lt;br&gt;• Training&lt;br&gt;• Recruitment (internal/external)&lt;br&gt;• Purchasing/maintenance</td>
<td>Funding secured&lt;br&gt;Trained staff and resources match planned requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Customer engagement/marketing and promotion</td>
<td>• Rules to be established/agreed to by all participants&lt;br&gt;• Engaging growers&lt;br&gt;• Dedicated staff/growers&lt;br&gt;• Delivery mechanisms&lt;br&gt;• Formal partnership relationships (form groups)&lt;br&gt;• Formal links with customers&lt;br&gt;• Strong communication between all participants&lt;br&gt;• Design and produce promotional material&lt;br&gt;• Understanding of service/product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Service delivery and feedback</td>
<td>• Delivering&lt;br&gt;• Make it happen&lt;br&gt;• Action&lt;br&gt;• Take action&lt;br&gt;• Support from others&lt;br&gt;• Records/document progress&lt;br&gt;• Maintain momentum and enthusiasm (make it fun)&lt;br&gt;• One carton per person – chilled&lt;br&gt;• Frequent meeting/communication&lt;br&gt;• Quality of communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills**
- Human resourcing; leadership/management; selling concept to investors (gain funding)
- Understanding of market

**Roles**
- Trainers; Investors
- Coordinator and doer
- Facilitator; coordinator/contact; partners/participant; tech adviser familiar with subject

**Resources**
- Training materials; time
- Staff, $, co-operators
- Good knowledge base/data; experienced/credible staff; trial/demo sites; cold esky/hot barby

**Timing**
- After completion of planning and before 5.
- Product and work cycle dependent
- Formal gatherings quarterly; at least a year (crop cycle) for feedback; as required by participants
| KPIs | Quantitative and qualitative measure of change (positive)  
|      | Increased skills/knowledge/ability  
|      | Measure of satisfaction by stakeholders |
| Outcomes | Continual improvement  
|          | Improved outputs  
|          | Change system/need design |
| Outputs |  
| Steps 7. | Service improvement |
| Activities | Review  
|          | Impact assessment  
|          | Accept criticism and fine tune  
|          | Can process be applied elsewhere (Is there the opportunity)  
|          | to apply process elsewhere  
|          | Evaluate progress and performance throughout process  
|          | Evaluation and review – periodic, final  
|          | Ongoing evaluation  
|          | Progress reviews  
|          | Evaluation  
|          | Stop and reflect  
|          | Identify new ways of doing business  
|          | Refine models  
|          | Customer input  
|          | Cost-benefit analysis  
|          | Survey design  
|          | Interpretation/analysis  
|          | Evaluate what was good/bad  
|          | Act on key findings of evaluation |
| Skills | Open-minded and receptive; clear communication skills;  
|        | technical skills/know how |
| Roles | Users/testers |
| Resources | Independent perspective |
| Timing |  

Focusing & Equipping Workshop Outputs, 1-5 December, 2003
Step 1 Situation Analysis – Best Practice Design & Analysis Tool

Focus
The Focus for the Best Practices Design and Analysis tool session was: *Best practices to establish effective partnerships with customers to achieve target outcomes.*

Need/Reason for the Focus
- Helps get the results in the end
- Profit for everyone
- Understand their needs
- Effective communication
- Better range of ideas and inputs
- Establish ownership
- Understanding from both directions
- Ensure and keep product relevant to customers (stay in touch with what they need)

Target Outcomes
1. Regular communication
2. More business and improved quality of business
3. More in touch with relevant needs
4. Satisfied customers
5. Satisfied service deliverers
6. More efficient business – less cost and bigger benefits
7. Level of interaction goes to a higher position to previously
8. Increased trust

Principles
- Openness
- Honesty
- Respect
- Understanding/empathetic
- Good communication
- Outcome-focused
- Confidentiality
- Being available
- Efficiency – don’t waste time
- Ensure best practices for the locality & the situation – ensure best practices are best

Inverse Thinking Tool
Participants broke into small groups to consider: *The key elements to ensure we don’t achieve CI&I in a regional RDE&P/Industry system – not now, not ever!* The pictures the groups created in response to this are shown in Appendix 3.
## Focus: Best practices to establish effective partnerships with customers to achieve target outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Success Factors</th>
<th>Key Practices</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Skills and ability to work in an effective partnership (eg good communication, team, negotiation skills & people skills) | - List the skills needed to work in an effective partnership  
- Conduct an audit of skills available  
- Fill the gaps by conducting training or outsourcing  
- Measure and monitor performance  | - Evidence of training  
- List of skills with appropriate person allocated  
- Improvement in ability and skills - measure against specific criteria  
- Demonstrated ability to work effectively in partnership  |
| 2. Code of ethics (including trust, credibility) | - Clearly define and state guidelines, expected behaviour and standard operating procedures  
- Check and ensure compliance with the code  
- Expect the behaviour will be abided by  | - Signed-off code of ethics  
- High measures for trust and credibility  
- Level of positive feedback  
- Level of negative feedback  |
| 3. Appropriate parties for the partnership (both sides) | - Ensure the parties have the skills and abilities (including association with policy)  
- Select people to handle situations based on criteria  
- Meet criteria for membership  
- Ensure appropriate representation  
- Ensure parties are aligned with the target outcomes  | - Even representation of the appropriate parties in the partnership  
- Demonstrated knowledge and ability aligned with the outcomes  
- Successful allocation of all roles – no gaps  |
| 4. Product or service that is wanted by the customer | - Ask and understand the customer  
- Market the products and services (including highlight the need and benefits from the service)  
- Market the products and services options  
- Price the service so that it is appropriate to the market  
- Clarify understanding of customers about what is deliverable  | - Customer satisfaction  
- Number of enquiries and sales  
- Flow on activities  
- Number of lost sales  
- % of market share  
- Demand for the product and service  
- Willingness to pay  |
| 5. Willingness, and organisational and industry support to be involved in the partnership | - Ensure agreement of policy makers about the target outcomes  
- Define and communicate the benefits of the partnership to all parties  
- Gauge industry support for the target outcomes and partnership  
- Maintain ownership continuously  
- Keep partnership relevant all the time  
- Keep people up to the game  
- Keep people in support roles to their responsibilities  | - Participation and attendance from all parties  
- Level of funding and other support  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Success Factors</th>
<th>Key Practices</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6. Appropriate resources (time, $ etc) for the scale of partnership** | • Implement a monitoring and evaluation strategy to keep track of whether need more or less resources as partnership progresses  
• Communicate the findings of the strategy within the team and to potential decision makers  
• Conduct an economic evaluation of the success or failure of the partnership  
• Align resources with the outcomes  
• Secure funding  
• Get a corporate box at the footy | • Outputs achieved  
• Ability to do the job in a timely manner  
• Satisfaction of demand – level of unmet demand  
• Cost-benefit ratio – return on investment |
| **7. Shared purpose and target outcomes for the partnership** | • Get contributions from all parties  
• Negotiate and agree on purpose and target outcomes  
• Document the purpose and the outcomes | • Secured funding from various parties  
• Signing-off of purpose and outcomes  
• Alignment of activities of all parties with outcomes |
| **8. Agreed process, roles and rules for managing the partnership (including form of partnership eg MOU, legal document, when and where meetings conducted)** | • Investigate and define possible process, roles and rules that suit the partnership  
• Ensure someone takes the lead for the partnership  
• Identify roles and allocate  
• Develop and implement a code of conduct  
• Sign-off on agreed process, roles and rules  
• Monitor and enforce them and feedback to re-enforce | • Signed-off documents  
• All parties satisfied with process, rules and roles  
• Reporting on performance of partnerships by coordinator/leader  
• Level of conflict  
• Ease of addressing conflict and issues as they arise |
Specialist Questioning Technique

Participants were asked to consider the thinking generated during the Inverse Thinking session and other sessions throughout the week and to develop the key questions they would like to ask a CI&I specialist in relation to achieving CI&I in a regional RDEP/industry system.

The key questions asked are shown below:
1. What 'tools' are best used for opening and maintaining effective communication throughout the industry?
2. How do you fit CI&I processes into a full schedule?
3. Can you explain how CI&I process has benefited other agricultural RD&E industries, giving practical examples?
4. How can CI&I be implemented into a complete system when we are only a small part of the system?
5. How does it help us get people to important meetings?
6. How do we identify the influential minority?
7. What strategies could be useful for people at the coalface to influence leaders (Element 3 to Element 1)
8. How do you contain (manage) an overwhelming influence that is a singular (part) component of a system?
9. How do you expose a hidden agenda to achieve the objective.

Participants made their own notes about the responses to these and any follow-up questions.

Establishing a sustainable industry/regional CI&I initiative

Several people took part in this discussion with Richard Clark about establishing a sustainable industry/regional CI&I initiative. The information Richard presented, and the issues and opportunities discussed are shown in Appendix 4.

Observations, Questions and Ideas

During the Action Design support sessions on Thursday afternoon and Friday, at the end of each session participants were asked to consider new observations, questions and ideas in relation to achieving CI&I. The thinking generated is shown in Appendix 5.

Schedule for 30-day Support Sessions

Below is the schedule for the 30-day support sessions. The 6 month return workshop and Forum are not included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group 1 (Richard)</th>
<th>Group 2 (Paul)</th>
<th>Group 3 (Janice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 8 January</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 12 February</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 11 March</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 8 April</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 13 May</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 8 July</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 12 August</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 9 September</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 7 October</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 11 November</td>
<td>9.00 - 11.00</td>
<td>11.30 - 1.30</td>
<td>2.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 – “CI&I Game” diagrams
Appendix 2 – Grouping into Systems Elements

1. Quality of R&DE program design, leadership and support
   - Delivery systems
   - RD&E program definition
   - Relevant people included in processes ie both environmental people and production people
   - Audit inputs and outputs (balance)
   - Measures of profit and environmental sustainability
   - Quality products – equipment and research results
   - Outward looking perspective by people in system
   - Implementation of strategies to redress limits
   - Low complexity
   - Leadership
   - Communication between and within regions
   - Diversify products from cane ie not just sugar
   - Needs analysis
   - Opportunity
   - Identify the best opportunity
   - Support
   - Achievable goal
   - Desired outcomes/measurable
   - List areas for improvement (develop goals)
   - Business plan
   - Production orientation
   - List strategies to redress limits
   - Ranking of components limiting profit and sustainability
   - RD&E institute
   - Recognition of the complexity of the region/system
   - Maximise efficiency of each practice
   - Implement solutions based on economics and benefits to environment etc
   - RD&E program
   - Communication with other R&D areas
   - Regional sugar industry
   - Know input costs - training

2. Quality of culture and motivation
   - Incentives, financial incentives
   - Reward and incentives to deliver 5% improvement
   - Positive motivation to change
   - Honesty
   - Engagement of stakeholders
   - Incentives for R&D personnel
   - Incentive to improve
   - Openness
   - Multidisciplinary skills in RD&E sector – economist, agronomist, social scientist
   - People who enjoy being in the system
   - Include all stakeholders (growers, harvesting contractors, millers)
   - Ownership at operative level

3. Quality of performance measurement, assessment and improvement
   - Analyse current system
   - Knowledge of current practices and costs
   - Benchmarking
   - Current benchmark standards
   - Measurability (to benchmarks)
   - Measuring sticks
   - Review
   - Measure benefits (have we achieved our goal)
   - Forum to assess performance
   - Assessment of adoption of strategies and develop ways to overcome limited adoption
   - Good/efficient/effective measurement/evaluation (sub) system
   - Monitoring
   - Performance assessments
   - Measuring results
   - Environmental monitoring
   - Re-evaluate new system
   - Evaluate systems in other regions (overseas/local). New ideas!
   - Measures of profitability and environmental sustainability → trends
   - Statistical techniques if regional targets met

4. Quality of products and services
   - Reliability of information
   - Efficient farm layout
   - Develop regional specific techniques
   - Adoption of BMP
   - Define profit
   - Define targets
   - Sustainable practices
   - Plant breeding
   - Minimum tillage
   - Optimal variety selection
   - Fallow crops/break monoculture
   - Opportunity costs and financials
   - GCTB
   - NIR at sugar mills
   - Accurate cane consignments
   - Reduce off-farm impacts – keep resources on farm
   - Versatility (alternatives)
   - Implement BMP.

5. Quality of knowledge, skills and tools
   - Training
• Support
• Skilled people
• Communication skills
• Communication

5. Quality of knowledge, skills and tools cont.
• Good training
• Tools to enhance decision making capability
• IPM (skills) and risk management
• Experience – know how
• Good technical skills
• SWAT
• Knowledge of current profit and environmental levels.

6. Quality of partnerships
• Willing participants
• Targeted groups/growers
• Structured group
• Non-antagonistic
• Ability to recognise/accept other people's position
• Effective communication
• Excellent negotiation skills
• Good co-operators
• List of economic and environmental components.

The thinking generated during the grouping of the elements.

Thinking developed during the grouping of the elements

• Plant breeding etc are specific actions that can deliver the 5% improvement. But before we consider whether they are the best actions to take shouldn't we go through Focus, Situation Analysis, Impact Analysis, etc etc.

• In the process of CI&I we are in Situation Analysis – looking a R&D&E system for a whole region – at the regional systems level in which elements like minimum tillage are at the grass roots practices level. Once we look at the whole system go onto Impact Analysis and look at what will have real impact/make a real difference. This will probably be at a broad level. (Richard)

• “Quality” – what does this mean for each element?
• Use the word quality because it immediately indicates you would need to come up with criteria for quality. The heading card at the moment don’t give enough detail re quality. But the cards do give some indicators of criteria for quality. (Richard)

• Would “training” be a tool rather than an element?

• Question to ask is “what is the most useful thing for you to call it?” Personally think this is a useful element, but if we don’t agree enough on it we would negotiate further to get it better. I would ask you to hold off until we get the framework together and see whether the element name is OK after the framework has been put together. Need to judge how far you negotiate about the names at this point, or whether you do it after you have some outputs. (Richard)

• “To improve by 5%” are we identifying the process we will go through, or are we looking at which elements to improve?

• At this time we are focusing on the elements, how they fit together, and then focus on those elements that will make the most difference to the focus. We are working at a high level before we come down to the detail of processes and practices (Richard).

• Big gap from the aspect of the client? We haven’t really asked what our clients think. Which is really important.
If you were responsible for designing a really effective regional R&D&E service system you would need to have a balance of all the key people involved including clients (Richard).

Is CI&I the purpose or is “5% improvement ....” the purpose of the system?

When we come up with focus statements there are usually levels. You could just include the level of CI&I. We have included the next level which is about 5% improvement..... If I was managing the system I would measure both levels. CI&I of the services could be an output, and the 5% improvement could be considered as the industry outcome. Levels thing. (Richard)

How realistic is it to look for 5% each year? Can you keep going?

Through innovation it appears to be possible to sustain this level of improvement (Richard).

You may get the easy improvements first, but then it gets harder and harder. So could put a longer term timeframe for the harder ones.

If you were really serious about this you would need to ask about the impact the easier things will have in the longer term (Richard). At the systems level you are talking about a mission.

Is it possible that some of these elements are about service improvement and some are specifically about 5% improvement?
Appendix 3 – Inverse Thinking Pictures
Appendix 4 – Sustainable Industry/Regional CI&I

People involved in the discussion
Steve A, Steve G, Duncan, Geoff, Peter, Tracy, Richard, Janice

Issues raised
- Contracts – build in security
- Continuity need in communities
- Project time frames
- Contracts in sugar industry. Too short – crop cycle = 5 years
- Long term R&D required
- Refocussing should be, allowed and endorsed
- Project designed for sustained outcomes & improvement & innovation
- Short-term contracts – sequenced to build on one another
- Involvement of management
- Incorporate 30, 90, 180 days in project management
- Focus on outcomes – Tailor inputs to meet outcomes
- Ask question “are we talking”
- We have limited resources
- Build capacity at all levels- Regional focus, management focus, industry focus
- Hierarchy of outcomes is useful
- Support for outcomes is important
- Need baseline to start form
- Some people say “There is nothing to improve”

Opportunities
1. Keep people informed about similar initiatives CI&I team is involved in
2. People in this program keep others in the program informed of initiatives they are involved in
3. Develop one or more initiatives collaboratively – people in this program and the CI&I team and others
4. Report on outcomes of this workshop.

Other discussion
- Forum will be an opportunity to get others involved in a broader industry or regional initiative
- Need to identify partners for the forum
- Terminology is an issue
- Develop KPIs for a CI&I network
- Manage your managers.
### Appendix 5 – Observations, Questions and Ideas about achieving CI&I

**Focus:** Achieving CI&I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richard’s Group in the Dungeon (Geoff, John, Errol, Tracy, Joe, Rob)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In doing work improvements best to involve partners early as possible</td>
<td>• How to measure time &amp; effort sayings from using good tools?</td>
<td>• Look at value adding to milling process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Models can be transportable to other contexts eg. Processes to identify &amp;</td>
<td>• Please explain de Bono’s hats!</td>
<td>• Look at the concept of “high value” services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritise customer needs</td>
<td>• How do you use focusing framework when some effects are unknown?</td>
<td>• Think of how to actively involve people &amp; their brains in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Systems analysis is critical to identify what the best opportunities are</td>
<td></td>
<td>achieving improvements &amp; innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action design framework can be applied at many levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Think of the key practices &amp; key tools to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easier to identify missing CSFs if CSFs are ordered in a logical sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add the “words quickly &amp; easily” to end of every focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus support is valuable &amp; interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify others that are seeking to achieve similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is important to consider NEW, better, more innovative processes that</td>
<td></td>
<td>objectives (eg. in other regions/organisations.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will deliver outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessing &amp; finding items &amp; subjects in manual &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An outcome — focus is CRITICAL to success</td>
<td></td>
<td>workbook would be enhanced by addition of subject on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is important to state clearly whether the “principle of participation”</td>
<td></td>
<td>key word/s ideas at back (near glossary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be used/applied, as this will influence your CSFs KPs, &amp; KPs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Building on the existing group structure to form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is limited understanding of the economies of the sugar system</td>
<td></td>
<td>sustainable networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Equip all industry people with tools other than discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Janice’s Group in the room next to the main room (Mark, Chris, Steve G,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine, Ryan, Duncan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group brainstorming to improve “Action” design is good</td>
<td>• What ways can we test the original focus as we invest more time &amp;</td>
<td>• Differentiate achievements using CI&amp;I from other processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value of checking back to assumptions &amp; principles at the “end” of an</td>
<td>effort?</td>
<td>• Differentiate milestones as to whatever they are actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Design Support session — highlighted more assumptions</td>
<td>• What is too small &amp; what is too big for an individual focus?</td>
<td>inputs, activities, outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Milestones shouldn’t drive things</td>
<td>• Do you have to put targets &amp; measures in focus if you have them in the</td>
<td>• Print off “Which comes first – information or a question?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Still got a long way to go to fully “do” CI&amp;I</td>
<td>targeted outcomes</td>
<td>paper in case it would be of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small group = greater participation</td>
<td>• Is there a clear cut/user friendly guide for what goes under what</td>
<td>• We could benefit form a “everyday” example of what fits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vast level of experience helps out the younger generation continue to</td>
<td>heading</td>
<td>under each category meaning – a easy to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve &amp; innovate</td>
<td>• What is the difference between a “Work Plan” and “Actin Design”?</td>
<td>model, that will shoe us what a CSF can be or can’t be, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion on focus gets good ideas for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>what a targeted outcomes can or can’t be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Document the Philippines pig farmers using CI&amp;I as a case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>study to introduce concept (To growers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Focusing & Equipping Workshop Outputs, 1-5 December, 2003

WS008 – SRDC Continuous Improvement and Innovation Workshop
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul's Group in the main room</strong> (Vince, Steve A, Mark, Tony, Yvette, Peter)</td>
<td><strong>How much consultation do you do about your action design before getting on and doing it?</strong></td>
<td>Set specific timeframes &amp; targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It helps to have friends</td>
<td><strong>How much “work” detail required to achieve meaningful CI&amp;I?</strong></td>
<td>Timeframes not too long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be measurable</td>
<td><strong>Is there direct relationship between stakeholder groups &amp; time taken to achieve focus?</strong></td>
<td>Use solid measures as KPIs eg no of levy payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sequence of CI&amp;I powerful</td>
<td><strong>Do people continue to use CI&amp;I after 1 year of help from CI&amp;I team?</strong></td>
<td>When time is short apply deadlines to each step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many different perspectives are extremely useful</td>
<td><strong>How do you measure reaction</strong></td>
<td>Should you appeal to stakeholders self interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Know how to accept criticism</td>
<td><strong>Is it better to join objectives in a simple plan or segregate into separate plans?</strong></td>
<td>Set timeframes within timeframes regular reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is easy to overlook the smaller steps required to achieve the focus</td>
<td><strong>How do we make CI&amp;I work at home?</strong></td>
<td>Keep KPIs action orientated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Process heightens focus in all areas</td>
<td><strong>How do we convert the masses?</strong></td>
<td>Other groups have been successful with CI&amp;I so we can too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Important to clarify jargon &amp; assumptions</td>
<td><strong>How do we present ideas so they sell easily without baggage?</strong></td>
<td>Start with small rather than large aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is difficult to be too specific or prescriptive</td>
<td><strong>With “Action” projects, how much does it matter if CSFs, KPIs &amp; KPIs are mixed?</strong></td>
<td>A few drinks help this process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Everyone has something useful to contribute</td>
<td><strong>Is not sure in action design framework how the regular “meetings” eg, every 30 days, will be incorporated effectively?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is harder to measure those more intangible KPIs</td>
<td><strong>How do you get traditional growers to take on new concepts</strong></td>
<td>Don’t be afraid of what’s out there – move out of you comfort zone &amp; meet more people!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive attitude is an excellent precursor to planning and easy to build upon</td>
<td><strong>Not sure in action design framework how the regular “meetings” eg, every 30 days, will be incorporated effectively?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Don’t be too ambitious with focus/aim</td>
<td><strong>You can introduce support mechanisms early</strong></td>
<td>Your focus should state exactly what you want to achieve within your timeframe – be specific &amp; achievable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dedicating time for this process is rewarding</td>
<td><strong>Simple (short &amp; clear) focuses can be good</strong></td>
<td>Consider timing of delivery of outcomes in relation to farm activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This process works well “here”</td>
<td><strong>Establish ownership early</strong></td>
<td>Brainstorming helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- While some people (those who wear dresses to shed meetings?) are naturally gifted with the ability to achieve or set goals we can all learn to do better if there is a willingness</td>
<td><strong>Important to introduce support mechanisms early</strong></td>
<td>KPIs should show evidence of CSF not just KPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Always good to discuss ideas</td>
<td><strong>Many people have the same idea but only when one of them says it out loud do they realise how much in common they are!</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many people have the same idea but only when one of them says it out loud do they realise how much in common they are!</td>
<td><strong>Important to introduce support mechanisms early</strong></td>
<td>Aim for the true objective, not just the end of each stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Important to introduce support mechanisms early</td>
<td><strong>Establish ownership early</strong></td>
<td>A lot of time is needed to get support &amp; understanding from the grass roots level (+ all levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Simple (short &amp; clear) focuses can be good</td>
<td><strong>Make sure goals are high enough</strong></td>
<td>Be clearly focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Make sure goals are high enough</td>
<td><strong>Wording CSFs &amp; KPs can help with being clear &amp; help with implementation</strong></td>
<td>Care needed in characterisation of components of CI&amp;I plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projects that work with clients are more likely to succeed</td>
<td><strong>Projects that work with clients are more likely to succeed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Early intro of extension component in development phase strengthens outcomes &amp; makes them effective for end users</td>
<td><strong>Early intro of extension component in development phase strengthens outcomes &amp; makes them effective for end users</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Words can mean different things to different people</td>
<td><strong>Wording CSFs &amp; KPs can help with being clear &amp; help with implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valuable to bring in experience from other industries</td>
<td><strong>Projects that work with clients are more likely to succeed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It’s easy to let important issues slip when you’re pre-occupied!</td>
<td><strong>The action design framework is good for introducing rigour into the planning process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The action design framework is good for introducing rigour into the planning process</td>
<td><strong>Other people’s interpretations of your words are enlightening</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other people’s interpretations of your words are enlightening</td>
<td><strong>Opportunities for publicity/promotion evolve from CI&amp;I process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- KPIs demonstrate that CSF achieved</td>
<td><strong>KPIs demonstrate that CSF achieved</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6 – Daily Feedback for Improvement

#### Monday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Useful and Why</th>
<th>Ideas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Showed the process</td>
<td>• Explanation of blue cards in CI&amp;I Game (maybe refer to resources to explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting ideas from group – pinboard exercise</td>
<td>• Clear definition of terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linkages in system analysis</td>
<td>• Group work after lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeing others’ perspectives</td>
<td>• Use of concrete examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hands-on activities</td>
<td>• Debrief of tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roadmap of the week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flagging facilitator tips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tuesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Useful and Why</th>
<th>Ideas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Good going through 3 different Situation Analysis tools but could have been more lively</td>
<td>• More on when to use what tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Logical sequence of things today</td>
<td>• Get to practical stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patterns became apparent – now feel in familiar territory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pairing off good for above and below the line components in the Process Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summary outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Wednesday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Useful and Why</th>
<th>Ideas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Impact assessment – decision making, consensus, influence, transportable</td>
<td>• Feedback on individual action designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working on chosen opportunities – practical applications</td>
<td>• Involve people with experience in OQIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dynamics was successful</td>
<td>• Time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting different perspectives</td>
<td>• Case studies (eg restaurant example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The fun things – stimulates involvement and interest</td>
<td>• Keep flow and reference to concrete example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less time sitting and listening = more lively</td>
<td>• Describe what we will experience on each day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Star ratings for tools etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Puzzlement factor”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 – Workshop Evaluation & Feedback

1. Understanding (knowledge and skills)

How much has the workshop contributed to an improvement in:

1.1 Understanding of key concepts and principles of achieving CI&I
    9 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 6 6 6 6 6 6 5
    Av. 7.1

1.2 Understanding of the importance of focusing thinking and action
    1 0 1 0 9 9 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 8 7 7 7 7 7
    Av. 8.2

1.3 Understanding and use of specific tools to achieve CI&I
    9 8 8 8 8 7 7 7 7 6 6 6 6 6 6 5 5 5
    Av. 6.7

1.4 The value of support and a supportive infrastructure (network) for achieving CI&I
    1 0 1 0 9 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 5 5
    Av. 7.8

Please comment on how the workshop has contributed to improving your understanding and use of CI&I concepts, principles and tools.

- Had zero knowledge and understanding of CI&I now have 7/10 knowledge and understanding
  (The missing 3/10 represents my lack on understanding, not your lack of teaching)
- I had very little knowledge of CI&I before this week, and I have learnt a lot
- Challenge current ways of working to achieve an outcome
- Had no idea before. Now I have a starting point to grow with
- Helped me to understand new words and processes for achieving CI&I
- Was not previously aware of CI&I
- Allowed us to “think” more about how we go about tasks and why
- Marked down because of difficulty with situation analysis concepts on Monday and Tuesday. Looking forward to application of CI&I processes in work
- It put some clear logical steps into what would normally be common sense
- Understanding the “big picture” plus receiving some good tools had been very useful
- Much better understanding of languages and sequences
- Better appreciation of group dynamics.

2. Application

How much has the workshop contributed to exploring the use of CI&I concepts, principles and tools in your work to:

2.1 Achieve a shared and SMARTT focus
    9 9 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 7 7 7 5 4
    Av. 7.8

2.2 Analyse and improve situations (systems, processes and practices)
    9 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 7 6 6 6 6 5 5 5 4
    Av. 6.8

2.3 Assess opportunities for impact
    9 9 9 9 9 8 8 7 7 7 6 6 6 6 6 5 5
    Av. 6.9

2.4 Design high impact action
    1 0 9 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 7 7 6 6 6 6 5 5 5
    Av. 7.3

2.5 Achieve support for focused thinking and action
    9 9 9 9 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 7 7 6 6 5
    Av. 7.8

2.6 Stimulate and challenge thinking
    1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 9 9 8 8 8 8 7 7 7 6 5
    Av. 8.3
Please comment on how the workshop has contributed to exploring the use of CI&I concepts, principles and tools in your work.

- Did little in the past eg brainstorm only. Now have more tools, but will need practice and more knowledge before I can use them confidently
- It introduced me to a whole new way of thinking through my work and given me valuable tools to help
- Was a humbling yet exciting experience to show how my effectiveness has been compromised by my limited thinking
- Provides me with a structure (a starting point) to follow each time I want to focus on an issue
- Give me an idea of where to begin a process like this and where to go from there
- Increased awareness of the opportunities to apply CI&I principles to achieve improved outcomes
- Was lost first few days but glad I did workshop
- Very well done
- Hands-on experience extremely valuable
- Certain aspects of meeting procedures and group activities

3. Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools Used During the Workshop</th>
<th>Had you experienced this tool before the workshop?</th>
<th>Do you think tool will be of use to you in your work, now or in the future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. System Design and Analysis Tool</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Process Design and Analysis Tool</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Best Practice Design and Analysis Tool</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact and Influence Tool</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 8 Dimensions Tool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SMARTTT Focus Tool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CSF Framework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reporting for Support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Critical Friend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CI&amp;I Game</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Specialist Questioning Technique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Inverse thinking using pictures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Observations, Ideas, Questions and Opportunities (OQIO) Tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What tools did you already have in your tool kit to support situation analysis, impact analysis, action design/planning, providing support for improvement and stimulating and challenging thinking?

- Very basic brainstorming, opportunity cost
- Discussion, argument
- Lens workshop technique, RRA (a PRA) – Rapid Rural Appraisal, ORID discussion technique, structured meetings (Agenda), 6 hats, active questions, personal styles
- I had tools but would not be able to tell you what name they would fit under (not a formal title)
- Hats
- Throw in a good jog question to a group to get discussion moving
- BCA, attractive feasibly framework
• Discussion, argument
• Specialist questioning technique
• Short process/analyses tools such as SWOT, force field analysis
• Many of these activities conducted intuitively particularly practical demonstration and implementation learning – found this very useful

4. Enjoyment of the workshop

How much did you enjoy the following aspects of the workshop?

4.1 Quality of support from CI&I team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Av. 7.6

4.2 Quality of support from participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Av. 9.5

4.3 Quality of materials (folders, handouts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Av. 8.4

4.4 Quality of games and social activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Av. 7.3

4.5 Quality of organisation (timing, equipment and resources, meals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Av. 7.6

4.6 Overall enjoyment of the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Av. 7.9

Please tell us the things you enjoyed most at the workshop:

• Staff interaction, new ideas, new ways of dealing with our issues
• The last 3 days “after the penny dropped”
• Challenges, upbeat, supportive
• Drawing of all the techniques together, interactions and networks formed between people from different organisations
• Working together on the action design framework
• Zulu Tractor
• The sense of common goals/team, the sense of common problems, the relevance of activities, lunch was average
• Wednesday when I finally understood what was going on
• Applying your own situation to CI&I
• Everything Wed – Fri
• Program
• Practical applications of CI&I procedures
• Interaction with peers/understanding of issues, SMM
• Bad timing, February would have been more appropriate. Power point slides need to be more refined – less words. First two days needs more energizers or jokes etc. It would be more relevant if you focused on the end result you wanted rather than technical jargon
• Communication with other work people

Any other comments about the workshop?

• Would be better with AC in room, refer to OQIO
• Very eye opening and informative, learnt heaps, thank you
• The ‘flow’ of the week required us to have trust (faith) in our course organisers it was earned and just fine in the end!
• I think you have been made aware of the group's sentiment over the first 2 days, generally very well done
• 8 till 5 is really long – can see that you need this time but if things could be rigged for a slightly later start time that would be good. Overall I have valued immensely and have welcomed the new tools to help me analyse more carefully what I have done.
• Prepare people for the shock of days 1 an 2. Give them hope that things improve and become quite useful
• Congratulations
• Rooms had no air-conditioning
• A most enjoyable workshop. Thoroughly presented
• Maybe presentations in the first 2 days need to be more lively, with more "stimulating" type movement and energy activities. Sometimes breaks we were given were a little long – I would prefer to finish earlier – time was made up very well this last day
• Very enjoyable, thanks to all
• The first couple of days lost me. It was good to get to the part that was relevant
• When we start to get lost on day 2 remind us where we are in the process and where we are going
• Very interesting and quite enjoyable
• The first two days were a real struggle – need to cut down on jargon
• The 1st couple of days were difficult. A diagram of what everything was, where it fits in and when it would be covered would be useful. E.g. Start to finish of the process and what tools were used
• Day 1 and day 2 very poor, better on Day 3, even better on day 4. Too long. A shorter course would be better.
## Appendix 8 – Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Attard</td>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>PO Box 512, Home Hill 4806</td>
<td>07 47822914</td>
<td>0418155844</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.csro@bigpond.com">steve.csro@bigpond.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Aylward</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PMB 57, Mackay Mail Centre 4741</td>
<td>07 49545100</td>
<td>0419789700</td>
<td>07 49545167</td>
<td><a href="mailto:caylward@bses.org.au">caylward@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Clark</td>
<td>CI&amp;I</td>
<td>GPO Box 46, Brisbane 4001</td>
<td>07 32393688</td>
<td>0418730005</td>
<td>07 32396292</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.clark@dpi.qld.gov.au">richard.clark@dpi.qld.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Craig</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PMB 57, Mackay Mail Centre 4741</td>
<td>07 49545100</td>
<td>0418730005</td>
<td>07 49545167</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcraig@bses.org.au">mcraig@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Everingham</td>
<td>JCU/CSIRO</td>
<td>School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, JCU 4811</td>
<td>07 47814237</td>
<td>0419177815</td>
<td>07 47815880</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yvette.everingham@jcu.edu.au">yvette.everingham@jcu.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Garrad</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PO Box 630, Innisfail 4860</td>
<td>07 40611707</td>
<td>0419739398</td>
<td>07 40614414</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sparrad@bses.org.au">sparrad@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Henderson</td>
<td>SRDC</td>
<td>PO Box 12050, George St, Brisbane 4003</td>
<td>07 321000495</td>
<td>040702680</td>
<td>07 32100506</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thenderson@srdc.gov.au">thenderson@srdc.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Kent</td>
<td>SRI</td>
<td>Box 5611, Mackay Mail Centre 4741</td>
<td>07 49527664</td>
<td>0418708593</td>
<td>07 49527699</td>
<td><a href="mailto:g.kent@sri.org">g.kent@sri.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Lindedale</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PTE Bag 4, Bundaberg DC 4670</td>
<td>07 41325200</td>
<td>041325253</td>
<td>07 41325253</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tlinedale@bses.org.au">tlinedale@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Matthews</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PO Box 117, Ayr 4807</td>
<td>07 47825455</td>
<td>0419739398</td>
<td>07 47825487</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmattews@bses.org.au">rmattews@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McGregor</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>Ashfield Road, Bundaberg 4670</td>
<td>07 41325200</td>
<td>0428773791</td>
<td>07 41325253</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmcgregor@bses.org.au">dmcgregor@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter McGuire</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>C/- Condong Mill, Condong NSW 2484</td>
<td>02 66701745</td>
<td>0405674742</td>
<td>02 66724655</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmcguair@bses.org.au">pmcguair@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Mills</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PO Box 117, Ayr 4807</td>
<td>07 47825455</td>
<td>0427585419</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmills@bses.org.au">rmills@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Muscat</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>Oakenden School Road, MS 509 Oakenden 4737</td>
<td>07 49597270</td>
<td>0429377162</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmuscat@bses.org.au">jmuscat@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince Papale</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PO Box 90, Home Hill 4806</td>
<td>07 47822088</td>
<td>0427166378</td>
<td>07 47821982</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vincpapale@bigpond.com.au">vincpapale@bigpond.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Peterson</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PO Box 117, Ayr 4807</td>
<td>07 47825455</td>
<td>0429677957</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cpeterson@bses.org.au">cpeterson@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Poggo</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PO Box 41, Ingham 4850</td>
<td>07 47762500</td>
<td>0427771845</td>
<td>07 47763468</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpoggo@bses.org.au">mpoggo@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reghinzani</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PO Box 41, Ingham 4850</td>
<td>07 47762500</td>
<td>0429023406</td>
<td>07 47763468</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jregnanzani@bses.org.au">jregnanzani@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errol Sander</td>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>PMB 57, Mackay Mail Centre 4741</td>
<td>07 49545100</td>
<td>0419739398</td>
<td>07 49545167</td>
<td><a href="mailto:esander@bses.org.au">esander@bses.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Stewart</td>
<td>CI&amp;I</td>
<td>PO Box 1143, Bundaberg 4670</td>
<td>07 41315723</td>
<td>0417780740</td>
<td>07 41315895</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.stewart@dpi.qld.gov.au">paul.stewart@dpi.qld.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Timms</td>
<td>CI&amp;I</td>
<td>GPO Box 46, Brisbane 4001</td>
<td>07 32396541</td>
<td>07 32396292</td>
<td>07 32396292</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janice.timms@dpi.qld.gov.au">janice.timms@dpi.qld.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 6

2003-2004 SRDC CI&I Program

180-day Workshop Outputs

8-9 July 2004
Sugar Research Institute, Mackay
SRDC 180-day CI&I Workshop
Outputs of Workshop in Mackay, 8-9 July 2004

In this report:
• Workshop context and focus
• Workshop program
• Workshop participants

WORKSHOP CONTEXT & FOCUS

Context of CI&I 180-day Workshops
Every 180 days teams meet to report on and celebrate their achievements, develop new questions and ideas for further improvement and innovation, and synthesize new opportunities to focus their thinking and action for the next cycle. The diagram below and the one at the top of the next page represent the context of 180-day workshops.
Focus of this CI&I 180-day Workshop

To celebrate the progress made by each person, and stimulate thinking and questioning, and the synthesis of high impact opportunities on which individuals can focus so that they achieve further improvements and innovations of RD&E services in the sugar industry over the next 6 months.

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Thursday, 8 July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Welcome and context of the workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Refresher on key concepts of CI&amp;I and where 180-day workshops fit in CI&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Break and refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Modelling the Way – CI&amp;I Team Reporting and Support Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; Support Session 1* – time for each person to share their report &amp; receive support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Break and refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; Support Session 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; Support Session 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>People who have reported &amp; received support report back on the support they received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Stacking Improvements and Innovations – Acknowledging &amp; recording improvements &amp; innovations in thinking, systems, processes, tools, products &amp; services, &amp; outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Observations, Questions and Ideas about Key CI&amp;I Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Additional concepts relevant to sustainable industry improvement and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reporting & Support Sessions happen in 3 groups of 5. These groupings will be different to those we have had for the 30-day teleconferences.
Friday, 9 July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; Support Session 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; Support Session 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Break and refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>People who have reported &amp; received support report back on the support they received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>Stacking Improvements and Innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Observations, Questions and Ideas about Key CI&amp;I Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Synthesis of Opportunities for Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Individuals develop their own list of opportunities and choose 1 to take forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Turning the chosen opportunity into a SMARTT Focus for Action with Target Outcomes &amp; Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Critical Friend Support for improving your Focus (includes Afternoon Tea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Collecting a list of the Draft Focuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Drawing it all together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Feedback on the Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPROVEMENTS & INNOVATIONS STACKER

Each participant to a small group of colleagues and a member of the CI&I team on how their improvement and innovation projects have been progressing and performing. At the end of each report participants notes improvements and innovations they had identified from the report and discussions. These improvements and innovations were grouped into different types:

- New or improved thinking
- New or improved practices
- New or improved processes
- New or improved systems
- New or improved tools and use of tools
- New or improved products and services
- Outputs
- Outcomes

The improvements and innovations reported on or stimulated by the reports are shown on the following pages.

New or improved thinking (thinking reported or stimulated by the reports)

- Common focus teams are probably better way to go (CI&I)
- Performance Management Framework of CSFs to outcomes gives clear links to impact (CI&I)
- Making success measurable (CI&I)
- Better feedback methods needed
- Distinguish between use of concepts and tools (CI&I)
- Change of emphasis from Action Design to Content over time in support sessions (CI&I)
- KPIs of improvement and innovation (CI&I)
- Outcome based performance management goals versus activity based goals (Peter Maguire)
• CI&I of sugar industry projects (Peter Maguire)
• Design and develop adoption processes and systems (Peter Maguire)
• Always thinking of better ways (John Reghenzani)
• Use of interactive “discovery” tools to gain recognition of concepts (John Reghenzani)
• Avoid “defensive” thinking and attitudes (John Reghenzani)
• Concept recognition is a need and a skill (John Reghenzani)
• Important to get specialist input early (Tony Linedale)
• Prioritise funding to top of list. Include from outset (Tony Linedale)
• CI&I process provides good insight into issues and identified opportunities (Tony Linedale)
• Funding needs greater focus (Tony Linedale)
• Staff and resource restrictions have been identified, as has the impact on workplan (Tony Linedale)
• Need more detail in KPs to ensure KPIs are met (Chris Aylward)
• 30 day sessions helped revise performance indicators (Chris Aylward)
• 30 day sessions helped review “Focus” and project timeframes (Chris Aylward)
• Reducing number of growers per group increases effectiveness (Steve Garrad)
• Growers contributing detail to policy (industry) (Steve Garrad)
• Understanding that current extension principles constrained thinking about alternative approaches (Steve Garrad)
• Changed direction to improve outcomes (Steve Garrad)
• Probabilities are the best we can work with – no guarantees (Yvette Everingham)
• That climate forecasting is of value in risk assessment (Yvette Everingham)
• Change of thinking away from recipes and “swallowing information” to acquiring and using information in decision making (Yvette Everingham)
• Timeliness of preparation etc – the growers’ decision points and growing schedule determine the “service” schedule (Ryan Matthews)
• Get funding bodies to see benefit in investing in systems thinking and outcomes (Ryan Matthews)
• Be fed information or think and discover new ways (Ryan Matthews)
• Advanced understanding of what has not worked (Ryan Matthews)
• Adoption is not just on good information (Ryan Matthews)
• Recurrent issues/problems = symptom of system problem (Ryan Matthews)
• Develop and use a “myth search and destroy game” (Ryan Matthews)
• Good to at least get people talking – aware of the issues (Steve Attard)
• The “WWH” tool to identify if you/we are talking about what, why or how (Steve Attard)
• Thinking “for” or “with” people (Steve Attard)
• Designing necessary infrastructure/organisation and functions/roles for the system (Steve Attard)
• Need to assess stakeholder attitude accurately right at the start (Steve Attard)
• Need to assess stakeholder attitude accurately right at the start (Steve Attard)
• Identify necessary functions/roles to achieve system outcomes (Steve Attard)
• Think regionally and act locally (Steve Attard)
• Working on common points of agreement (Steve Attard)
• Need to do something new and innovative just to maintain the status quo (Geoff Kent)
• Capacity building may sometimes be the removal of impediments (Tracy Henderson)
• Social engagement and consultation (Tracy Henderson)
• Whole new way of doing things – fantastic (Tracy Henderson)
• Thinking about the application of “achieving”, “leading” and “managing” to the sugar industry (Tracy Henderson)
• Fed information or enabled to think (Tracy Henderson)
• No team/partnership – no goals (Tracy Henderson)
Outputs of SRDC 180-Day CI&I Workshop

New or improved practices (reported or stimulated by the reports)

- 30 day support and leadership best practices (CI&I Team)
- Active involvement (Peter Maguire)
- Sharing ideas – experimenting with partnerships (Peter Maguire)
- Lobbying (John Reghenzani)
- Communication (John Reghenzani)
- Concept of product design (John Reghenzani)
- Conceptualisation (John Reghenzani)
- 30 day sessions good for discussing issue with like minded people (Tony Linedale)
- 30 days sessions good for prompting review of work (Tony Linedale)
- Established needs (Chris Aylward)
- Improved practice of designing action (Chris Aylward)
- Using CSFs, KPs etc good for a planning exercise (Chris Aylward)
- "User" development groups (Chris Aylward)
- Pilot group good start for larger objective (Ryan Matthews)
- KISS principle, keep it simple (Ryan Matthews)
- The importance of timeliness of activities has been identified (Ryan Matthews)
- Getting the working group to do a lot of the work (Steve Garrad)
- Reshaped Focus from 10 to 1. Still need sharper process/focus/goal (Steve Garrad)
- More inline with current situation (Steve Garrad)
- Reducing grower discussion group size to enhance discussion and "activeness" of groups (Joe Muscat)
- Realise importance of evaluation (Joe Muscat)
- Value of "local guru" (Joe Muscat)
- Value of local advocates/coordinators (Yvette Everingham)
- Development of reference groups – industry and science – interaction (Yvette Everingham)
- Best management practices for weed management (Duncan McGregor)
- Awareness phase with clients/cooperators requires specific input (Geoff Kent)
- Bring senior mill staff and SRI staff together (Geoff Kent)
- Use of time management tool (Tracy Henderson)
- Use of other organisations to gain information (Tracy Henderson)
- Traditional and familiar practices
- Best practices for CPI identification

New or improved processes

- Service partnership process (CI&I team)
- Diffusion process (Peter Maguire)
- Strategy (John Reghenzani)
- Brainstorming (Chris Aylward)
- "Integrated" systems (Chris Aylward)
- Use of grower hosts to arrange meetings/topics (Joe Muscat)
- Use of paid coordinator to arrange grower group meetings (Joe Muscat)
- Use of fact sheets to transfer information (Duncan McGregor)
- Targeting problems and opportunities (Duncan McGregor)
- Reflect and evaluate progress
- Interface with commercial industry (Duncan McGregor)
- Consensus if laid over politics/compliance is difficult (Steve Attard)
- Building personal contacts with participants (Steve Attard)
- Improving project prioritisation/construction process (Geoff Kent)
- Needs well defined (Tracy Henderson)
- Workshop/support sessions – successful process (Tracy Henderson)
- Soft systems, systems mapping (Tracy Henderson)
New or improved systems

- RD&E of improvement and innovation systems (CI&I Team)
- Systems approach (Chris Aylward)
- Improved farming systems for Burdekin growers (Ryan Matthews)
- CUCB consult with other industries (Tracy Henderson)

New or improved tools or use of tools

- Use systems and processes thinking (CI&I Team)
- Draft Best Practices for Leading CI&I 30 Day Sessions (Checklist) (CI&I Team)
- 10 Domains of Group Processes (CI&I Team)
- Shed meetings and bus trips (Peter Maguire)
- Needs identification (Peter Maguire)
- Site meeting newsletter (Peter Maguire)
- SMARTTT Focus (Peter Maguire)
- Visits to specialists (Peter Maguire)
- CSFs (Peter Maguire)
- Posing questions – focusing questions (John Reghenzani)
- Proof of concept (John Reghenzani)
- Concept demonstrations and examples (John Reghenzani)
- Feedback on performance (John Reghenzani)
- Concept design (John Reghenzani)
- Prioritize
- New tools addressing high priority issues will be developed (5)
- Impact analysis
- Survey: feedback opportunity (Ryan Matthews)
- Map change in groups over time (Joe Muscat)
- Increased skill in identifying change in attitudes (Joe Muscat)
- Benchmark calendar of decisions, related to needs for forecasts, times of practices and impact (Yvette Everingham)
- CPI tests
- Tools for specific problems (Duncan McGregor)
- Demonstration – results of change shown (Ryan Matthews)
- Ownership by use of farmers own soil sample – overcome the myth “it won’t work on my farm” (Ryan Matthews)
- Identify which nozzles for different applications (Duncan McGregor)
- Need to try different tools to engage different stakeholders (Steve Attard)
- Barrier identification
- Concept distinction

New or improved products and services

- Concept of new “regional sugar project” (CI&I team)
- Four extension packages ready for delivery (Tony Linedale)
- Specialist workshops (short courses) (Tony Linedale)
- Specialised machinery developed for project (Chris Aylward)
- New BMP fact sheet (Duncan McGregor)
- CI&I support services (CI&I team)
- A number of high priority services will be developed and these have been agreed upon by industry (Tony Linedale)
- Education/information packages developed (Tony Linedale)
- Improved project team (Chris Aylward)
- New focus groups established (Chris Aylward)
- Pilot extension service established (Rob Milla)
- Coordinated fertiliser advisory service (Rob Milla)
Outputs of SRDC 180-Day CI&I Workshop

- Targeting a service option to "progressive" growers because they feel their needs are not being met by existing options (Steve Garrad)
- A person trained to do climate forecasting presentation (Yvette Everingham)
- Improved/acknowledged knowledge and skills of service providers from Incitec training (Ryan)
- Improved training design and implementation knowledge and skills from Workplace IV training (Ryan Matthews)
- Identified areas to improve services and prioritised to achieve results (Geoff Kent)
- Group oriented services (Duncan McGregor)
- Service opportunities from problems/priorities (Geoff Kent)
- Interest levels different for individual clients (Geoff Kent)

Outputs

- R&D data and records (CI&I team)
- Reports and data of improvements and innovations achieved and not achieved (CI&I team)
- Controlled traffic trials and demonstration sites (Peter Maguire)
- New concept of N fixation (John Reghenzani)
- Effective presentations of proof of concept (John Reghenzani)
- Clear KPls to assess future project achievements (Chris Aylward)
- Clear, detailed and documented plan (Tony Linedale)
- Formation of a working group (Steve Garrad)
- Increased number of active groups (Joe Muscat)
- Increased frequency of meetings (Joe Muscat)
- Group selected (Rob Mills)
- Samples collected (Rob Mills)
- Records of new issues about NRM (Steve Attard)
- Regional economic models for the Burdekin (Steve Attard)
- Barriers identified

Outcomes

- High levels of use of some CI&I tools (CI&I team)
- Changes in practices of CI&I (CI&I team)
- Knowing groups are not homogenous – group types (CI&I team)
- Medium levels of participant in CI&I (CI&I team)
- Good trials (Peter Maguire)
- Data on controlled traffic results (Peter Maguire)
- Recognition and understanding of new concept (John Reghenzani)
- Tangible industry and external support (John Reghenzani)
- Improved John Reghenzani’s understanding of funding system and commercialisation
- Increased grower involvement (Joe Muscat)
- Enthusiastic staff involved in project (Chris Aylward)
- Successful access to funds for project (Chris Aylward)
- Improved extension skills and knowledge (Rob Mills)
- Increased extension officer knowledge (Rob Mills)
- Improved timing of extension activities (Ryan Matthews)
- Improved on the ground actions (Joe Muscat)
- Understanding of why growers fertilise as they do (Ryan Matthews)
- Improved climate forecasting acceptance (reliability of data) (Yvette Everingham)
- Modelling growers achieving practice change (Yvette Everingham)
- Obvious local ownership (Joe Muscat)
- Increased capacity of "hosts" (Joe Muscat)
- Some growers applying more appropriate fertiliser applications (Ryan Matthews)
- Improved service provider knowledge and skills (Rob Mills)
- New systems thinking about stakeholder involvement (Steve Attard)
- Improved communication within new established networks (Duncan McGregor)
**OBSERVATIONS, QUESTIONS AND IDEAS**

After all the reports and stacking of outputs and outcomes, participants formed to threes to use the Round Robin version of the Observations, Questions and Ideas tool. The focus for the session and the contributions made are shown below.

**Focus**
Achieving continuous improvement and innovation of sugar R,D&E (thinking, practices, processes, systems, products, services and projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Need to identify relevant partners (especially leaders)</td>
<td>• How to make CI&amp;I enjoyable and interesting?</td>
<td>• Step process – progression upwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More difficult to promote a concept than something you can see, feel and touch</td>
<td>• Can we/how do we turn a “can’t/won’t/doesn’t work” attitude into a “could/should/does work” attitude?</td>
<td>• Group activity more successful than individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Myths constrain focus and thinking</td>
<td>• How to get manager/policy support for CI&amp;I?</td>
<td>• Makes the process of improvement and innovation more logical and efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduction needs improvement – first impression counts</td>
<td>• Is it OK not to have lots of “products” as outputs if individuals are not focusing on developing a product?</td>
<td>• Work at management and policy level for most leverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further clarification of various tools</td>
<td>• Are intuition and intuitive ways of working good enough?</td>
<td>• Tackle myths and paradigms early on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A measure of improvement is essential for the process</td>
<td>• Do we need to separate daily work from improvement work?</td>
<td>• Develop a package that leaders and achievers can use to sell CI&amp;I to managers to get support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CI&amp;I is liked or disliked</td>
<td>• How to get different organisations collaborating?</td>
<td>• Offer different CI&amp;I opportunities/programs for people who want to get into innovation and others who only want to get into improvement for now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CI&amp;I is better experienced rather than tried to be explained</td>
<td>• How do you sell CI&amp;I to colleagues, clients and</td>
<td>• Use inverse thinking to think of and sell the positives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Just do it</td>
<td>organisations?</td>
<td>• Contrast/distinguish CI&amp;I from passive dependency-based activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rigour is required to achieve benefits</td>
<td>• What are ways to get others to take on leadership roles?</td>
<td>• Need a simple definition of CI&amp;I (sales pitch) along with real life examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People need to distinguish between “daily work” and “improvement work” – focus CI&amp;I efforts on “improvement work” or/and improving how you do your daily work</td>
<td>• Does CI&amp;I stimulate optimism or pessimism? – glass ½ full or glass ½ empty</td>
<td>• Need greater emphasis on planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The sugar industry is more difficult to implement CI&amp;I (change in general)</td>
<td>• Does CI&amp;I really change people?</td>
<td>• Need to promote the economic and other benefits of RD&amp;E and CI&amp;I improved RD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Little use of system and process thinking and design and analysis tools</td>
<td>• Why is there little use of system and process tools?</td>
<td>• Include higher and lower levels within organisation for support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is difficult</td>
<td>• Will CI&amp;I increase our remuneration?</td>
<td>• Better effort to understand needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easy to be distracted by agripolitics</td>
<td>• How do we achieve a shared understanding of CI&amp;I (among industry)?</td>
<td>• Greater awareness of issues arising from needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solutions are there</td>
<td>• How to tap the potential for CI&amp;I from the pressures/crisis facing the industry?</td>
<td>• Clarify the targets of CI&amp;I effort (eg management) not top down approach/select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Importance of critical mass and recognising it</td>
<td>• How do we build skills and capacity in systems thinking?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to revert to old and familiar/comfortable processes etc that aren't aligned with CI&amp;I</td>
<td>Are the industry participants all starting from the same point?</td>
<td>Establish a CI&amp;I network – get away from acting in isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lot of potential to achieve the focus</td>
<td>Can we identify incentives that are attractive to all players? Have we identified common goals across industry?</td>
<td>Define terms and get common understanding of CI&amp;I terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very time consuming – preparation time requires increase to what has been done in past</td>
<td>How do we transfer the CI&amp;I concept across the whole industry?</td>
<td>Encourage CI&amp;I “projects” to follow on from this one so it doesn’t die an “end of project” death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different interpretations exist: (i) External → internal stakeholders; (ii) Internal → internal; (iii) External → external</td>
<td>How do you simplify exchange of information between R, D &amp; E?</td>
<td>CI&amp;I for all company people for continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term commitment required to reap full benefits</td>
<td>How can continuous improvement be achieved if the majority of the industry don’t have the tools/knowledge to achieve this?</td>
<td>Work how to fit this in with everything else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding has huge influence</td>
<td>Can the CI&amp;I tools/methods be made more user-friendly e.g. terminology?</td>
<td>New terminology for CI&amp;I so that everyone can understand and use CI&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated system – because used infrequently</td>
<td>How balance measuring the improvement versus doing the improving?</td>
<td>Build on the linkages (exposure to all sectors for a common understanding) that come from these get togethers to achieve more CI&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System not always useful in my work therefore low priority and not used</td>
<td>Is there a basic version of CI&amp;I that people could start with – and then build onto the more complex processes?</td>
<td>Would like to learn about more tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has helped to improve thinking about thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Groups work better when people have similar goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t afford to miss session</td>
<td></td>
<td>CI&amp;I could be built in as a requirement of future SRDC funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback valued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology/use of tools/processes not user friendly therefore large scale adoption will be difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot lunch would be better (Are we feeding your hangover?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay a very cold place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar industry needs a shared mental model of CI&amp;I concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK RECEIVED ABOUT THE WORKSHOP

Participants were asked to complete a feedback and assessment form about the workshop. The results are shown below.

Progress of projects understood, supported & celebrated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much has the workshop contributed to:</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the progress made by other participants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for each of the participants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration of the progress &amp; achievements of the projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on how the workshop contributed to understanding, support and celebration of the projects:

- Sharing of progress toward focuses was very valuable and achieved improved understanding for me (appeared to deliver improved understanding for others). Support: orally via simple OQIO forms, cycling around the CI&I cycle again. Did the workshop achieve “celebration of achievements”? Hmmm.
- People develop greater sense of achievement when their peers acknowledge their efforts. Also greater confidence when problems or concerns are being felt by others is witnessed.
- Was a great experience to hear how other people are progressing through their projects and experiencing problems along the way. I’m not alone.
- The presentations and discussion contributed to the understanding of progress by others. The presentations and discussions gave the opportunity for support. Didn’t recognise any celebration (really) but don’t think celebration was that important. Most people still have a way to go .... so our focus was on progressing not celebrating.
- Really helps to share thinking.
- Gained a good understanding of others’ projects. Surprised by how similar some of the issues were although projects were very different. Support was valuable → improved focus, more readily achieved.
- Understanding: short PowerPoint presentation with handouts was very good for understanding. Length good. Support in the main well offered and accepted. Cyclical feedback good. Celebration – could have been more!

Creation and Synthesis, & Re-Focusing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much has the workshop contributed to:</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new observations, questions and ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of new opportunities &amp; focus for improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on how the workshop contributed to the creation of new observations, questions and ideas, and the synthesis of new opportunities and focus for improvement:

- Excellent. OQI.
- The report of ones focus and progress provided feedback of high value in continuing to improve our focus and outputs and outcomes etc. It has also highlighted areas overlooked in the past.
- Others feedback revealed new opportunities and ideas.
- Presentation of report, subsequent discussion and OQIs lead to significant change in focus (although stayed on same path) → easier to achieve.
- Right approach to fostering thought.
Confidence & Enthusiasm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much has the workshop contributed to:</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence for the direction necessary for progress over the next 180 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm to achieve improvements and innovations in sugar RD&amp;E over the next 180 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on how the workshop contributed to confidence and enthusiasm:

- By ensuring a stop and reflect phase was conducted. By CI&I team members supporting me and showing their support for my focus.
- Success of others instil new vigour into your own efforts. We all support the efforts of others.
- I hope that in the next 6 months I can complete the outcomes of our focus. May be a little disheartening if we don’t get there but we can, I suppose, refocus our focus and do things better next time.
- Got me re-focused on the CI&I process and the new ‘focus’ developed commenced my planning for my upcoming project requirements.
- Enthusiasm already fairly high.
- Expect enthusiasm to increase once I get into the project over the next couple of months.
- Renewed interest in process. Not too much jargon which was good.

CI&I Tools used in the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI&amp;I Tools Used During the Workshop</th>
<th>Value of the Tool (1 = low value; 10 = high value)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI&amp;I Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting for Support</td>
<td>8 6 9 9 7 9 8 Av. 8.0</td>
<td>• Some of the report headings were not meaningful to me – maybe less sub-headings next time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• As said on other pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Great approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OQIO Framework for Support &amp; Focus</td>
<td>1 0 9 8 9 7 8 6 Av. 8.1</td>
<td>• This is an excellent tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• As said on other pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Good complement to reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements and Innovations Stacker</td>
<td>6 5 8 1 7 3 7 Av. 3.9</td>
<td>• I’m still getting my head around the value of this tool. Feedback to improve this tool should lead to significant improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Really didn’t get it. May of the comments are either too broad or project specific to mean much to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Didn’t get much out of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OK for overall view – better definition of headings required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Robin OQI</td>
<td>7 7 7 5 7 3 8 Av. 6.3</td>
<td>• I am more interested in my own focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Thinking too much about lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Well done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CI&I Tools Used During the Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI&amp;I Tools Used During the Workshop</th>
<th>Value of the Tool (1 = low value; 10 = high value)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Opportunities for Action List                                                                                      | 9 7 9 9 8 7  Av. 8.3                             | • Allow you to jot down opportunities raised by the group  
• Helps set priorities  
• Good for refocussing                                                                                                                                 |
| Impact Analysis Tools (Impact & Influence, and 8 Dimensions)                                                      | 1 0 8 8 7 9 5 8  Av. 7.9                        | • Excellent tool  
• Focus on those opportunities above and create a new focus which can be worked towards for completion for the end of year session  
• Good way to assess options – but mine all rated the same  
• Pretty clear which opportunities to follow up  
• Good to sort out priorities  
• Print on white paper so different colour pens can be used.                                                                 |
| SMARTT Focus Tool                                                                                                   | 9 8 8 8 9 8 8  Av. 8.3                         | • Helps set priorities  
• Used it                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

### Overall enjoyment of the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much did you enjoy the following aspects of the workshop?:</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of support from participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of support from CI&amp;I partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall enjoyment of the workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Quality of support not consistent across participants: some provide excellent support; others disinterested/no support.
- Overall very enjoyable. I didn’t enjoy and found frustrating that some people don’t “get” CI&I and aren’t demonstrating a willingness to learn ….. why are they here?? Are they getting anything out of it? If not maybe we need an “exit strategy”. I enjoyed the level and amount of feedback.
- The reporting and feedback sessions were great. Hearing others opinions in regard to my focus. Having positive thoughts makes things far more enjoyable than focusing on negatives.
- Good format, not too boring or draining. Interaction and feedback was great. New SMARTT focus very handy.
- A lot of fun
- A good time to refocus. Increased hope of a success project. Time went fast (a good sign).

### Any other comments?

- Overall excellent effort. Maybe improve introduction/definition of the stacker tool. Refresh our memory of what is the difference between practice/process/system etc. Great team effort.
- Not sure whether all participants have a common understanding of some of the terminology being used – as a result sometimes confusion appeared. This may be the result of lack of understanding on our behalf.
• Keep the 30 day session and support – need them to keep CI&I concepts fresh in mind – therefore you keep using them – which is important given we are still new to the CI&I process and are yet to subconsciously use it day in – day out.
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About the Forum

The impetus for the Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum came from a partnership program involving 16 people from the sugar industry and the RD&E sector (including BSES, CSIRO, SRI, DPI&F and SRDC). This partnership commenced in December 2003 and aimed to achieve continuous improvement and innovation in the delivery of sugar industry RD&E. There was an opportunity for other people involved in sugar industry RD&E to join with people from the program to share experiences and identify ways to further enhance the delivery of industry benefits from RD&E.

Financial support for the Forum was provided by the Sugar Research and Development Corporation and the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries.

Forum Intent and Target Outcomes

The intent of the Forum was to provide people from across the sugar industry an opportunity to share and build-on their own and others' experiences in relation to achieving RD&E outcomes more effectively and improving RD&E systems.

The target outcomes for the Forum were:
1. Sharing of experience, knowledge and innovative methods used to achieve outcomes more effectively
2. New thinking about improving RD&E delivery
3. Identification of high impact opportunities and methods to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of sugar industry RD&E systems.

The Forum Process

The Forum process was designed to enable participants to build on their own and others' experience in relation to improving RD&E. It aimed to give each participant quality time to contribute their knowledge and experience and involved each person giving a presentation to a small group of 10 to 12 people. In their presentations people told participants about a situation where they had improved some aspect of sugar industry RD&E. To help participants to understand their story, presenters were asked to cover the following aspects in their presentations:

- **Context**: Brief background of the situation
- **Need**: What it was that they thought needed to be improved and why
- **Methods**: The key approaches or tools they used and the action they took
- **Outcomes/Results**: The outcomes or benefits achieved and their impact on the need
- **Conclusions**: The key lessons and implications for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of sugar industry RD&E delivery and systems.

Question and response sessions were held after each presentation to enable participants to improve their understanding of the presenter's experiences. During the presentation sessions participants recorded key observations, questions, lessons and insights, and copies of these were given to the presenters as a record of the thinking stimulated by their presentation.
Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Systems Forum

At the end of each presentation session participants formed pairs to develop key lessons and insights from the presentations they had experienced in relation to five key focuses:

1. Designing RD&E projects and systems
2. Leadership and management of RD&E projects and systems
3. Assessing performance of RD&E projects and systems
4. Roles and relationships in RD&E projects and systems
5. Methods for achieving RD&E outcomes.

After all the presentation sessions were complete, participants formed into small groups and used the key lessons and insights developed from all the presentations to synthesise opportunities for improving sugar industry RD&E. The opportunities developed in the small groups were presented to all Forum participants.

The last step of the Forum process involved participants forming into small groups based on the commonality of their roles or organisations in the RD&E system. Each group selected the three opportunities they believed would have most impact on improving sugar industry RD&E at this time. They then developed short term and longer term actions that could be taken to implement these opportunities.

**Layout of the Forum**

**Presentation Sessions**

Lessons & Insights

Lessons & Insights

Lessons & Insights

Opportunities for Improving Sugar Industry RD&E Projects & Systems

Actions that will make a real difference
Forum Participants and Presentations

Twenty-five people participated in the Forum, and represented the range of key partners needed for effective RD&E systems including R&D end-users (growers, millers, harvesters), researchers, advisors and RD&E managers. While most participants came from the sugar industry in Queensland and northern New South Wales, there were also two participants who offered perspectives from other industries and contexts.

All Forum participants prepared presentations which they delivered to groups of between 6 and 12 people. Question and response sessions were held after each presentation to enable participants to improve their understanding of the presenter’s experiences. During the presentation sessions participants recorded key observations, questions, lessons and insights, and copies of these were given to the presenters as a record of the thinking stimulated by their presentation.

Presentation Titles

Organisational Improvement and Innovation
Jenny Adams, Natural Resources and Mines, Brisbane

Enriching the Bundaberg Women in Sugar
Palmina Bonaventura, BSES Limited, Bundaberg

Achieving Uptake of Improved Herbicide Technology by Large Scale Growers in the Burdekin. Stomp Extra
Barry Callow, BSES Limited, Bundaberg

Regional Industry Improvement and Innovation
Richard Clark. Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, Brisbane

Sugar Research Cultures and the Future
Diana Day, Sugar Research and Development Corporation & University of Sydney

Canegrowers Grain in Cane
Alan Dingle, Bundaberg Canegrower

Integrating Seasonal Climate Forecasting with Decision Making
Yvette Everingham, James Cook University, Townsville

A Cooperative Approach: Applying alliance principles to effective RD&E
Geoff Fleming, Mackay Sugar

Progressive Wet Tropics Canegrowers for a Farm Management System (FMS)
Steven Garrad, BSES Limited, Innisfail

Operationalizing the BSES Strategic Plan 2004-2007
Ross Gilmour, BSES Limited, Brisbane

A Grower. Developing the change from what we have. In PRACTICE.
Ian Haigh, Burdekin Canegrower
The Human Factor!
Tracy Henderson, Sugar Research and Development Corporation, Brisbane

Identifying Sugar Milling Company RD&E Needs
Geoff Kent, Sugar Research Institute, Mackay

Extension Packages for Bundaberg Canegrowers
Tony Linedale, BSES Limited, Bundaberg

Nutrition Management
Ryan Matthews and Rob Milla, BSES Limited, Ayr

Implementing an Improved R&D Investment Process
Lisa McDonald, CSR Limited, Brandon

Changing the Farming System in New South Wales
Peter McGuire, BSES Limited, Condong

Professional Recording System (PRS)
Mark Poggio, BSES Limited, Ingham

Review of Three Major Projects for Opportunities to Apply CI&I Program
John Reghenzani, BSES Limited, Ingham

A Review of Sugarcane Cropping Practices on Sugar Group Estates
Brian Robotham, BSES Limited, Bundaberg

A New Way of Farming Cane
Neil Sing, Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, South Johnstone

Working with People – Strategies for ethical research
Karen Vella, CSIRO, Townsville

Crop Chats – Grower Discussion Forums for Enhancing Farm Management
Mick Ward, Bundaberg Sugar, Mourilyan

Improving Sugar RD&E Outcomes
Arnold Wissemann, Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, Brisbane

Presentations on CD
All presentations are included on a CD which can be found inside the back cover of this book.

Forum Coordinating Team
The Forum Coordinating Team included Andrew McCartney, Paul Stewart, Richard Clark and Janice Timms from the Continuous Improvement and Innovation Unit, Department of Primary Industries and Fishers, and Tracy Henderson, Sugar Research and Development Corporation.
Lessons & Insights from the Presentations

At the end of presentation sessions participants formed pairs to develop key lessons and insights stimulated by the presentations in relation to five sub-focuses:

1. Designing RD&E projects and systems
2. Leadership and management of RD&E projects and systems
3. Assessing performance of RD&E projects and systems
4. Roles and relationships in RD&E projects and systems
5. Methods for achieving RD&E outcomes.

The thinking generated during these sessions is presented on the following pages.

Designing RD&E projects and systems

1. Use farmer committees in project design → outputs
2. Need a process to pick up really innovative projects or new concepts
3. Need to incorporate the skill types and levels needed in projects (specifications) in designs – particularly for new concepts
4. How should everyone understand the term “systems” and the relationship between “systems” and “projects”? 
5. Design to be (industry) issue-driven, not technology driven with proven methodologies where possible
6. Ethical research practice will become more significant to research project, planning and approval
7. Set and monitor guidelines for R&D ethics – make standard requirement for approval of projects
8. Focus for R&D is critical. Targets of relevant type and measurable early in project and not at the end helps with shared understanding. Essential to be designed-in
9. Plan co-publication with individuals in communities as part of research outputs
10. Project design and system design is a discipline and a skill not an activity. This means involving the right people
11. Have a project website
12. Involve extension right from the beginning (i.e. EREDE)
13. Needs analysis important
14. Dimensional approach worthwhile
15. Balance according to constraints, e.g. resources
16. Established CSFs and plan to properly cater for them
17. Good design necessary for efficient projects (means you don’t have to go back as much to redo stuff or fix it up)
18. Clear outcomes required and then design to achieve these
19. Emphasis on design of process to deliver outcomes
20. Resourcing to deliver outcomes
21. Links between CSFs and outcomes
22. Design should involve key partners and design specialists
23. Design needs a clear goal/target outcome
24. Projects should not be designed solely for the purpose of employing people in current positions
25. Projects should be designed as systems
26. A difficulty with RD&E projects is to ensure they fit into a sustainable system rather than a system that needs sustaining
27. It takes longer/more skill/more effort to design innovative/high leverage/revolutionary projects as compared to designing evolutionary (incremental improvement) projects
28. Taking time/making the effort to get the "right" targets ends up saving time/getting greater impact
29. Need a way of getting to all growers not just meeting attendees – design this into project. Non-attendance does not necessarily mean a lack of interest
30. Using CI&I tools such as SMARTT Focus, Action Design and Focusing Frameworks to achieve quality outcomes
31. Develop strategies to maintain and/or increase participation – this relates to maintaining momentum
32. Need to build in flexibility into design – don’t get caught up in efficiency – work for effectiveness. Accommodate other demands on your time. Flexibility that recognises different thinking and timescales (e.g. to pick up where left off, or different format/same info)
33. Design phase must include "end user" / "industry" early on
34. Need to be aware of the market we are trying to reach and what motivates them
35. It will take time to change peoples thinking - need to plan for this
36. Timing implementation is critical
37. Survey for stakeholder requirements
38. Growers and technical people assist in design
39. Are we "innovative"/"creative" in designing projects?…Do we default to past processes?
40. How can we encourage creative thinking in design phase? Get people from outside etc
41. Participatory action groups incorporated
42. Recognise and get value from linkages between projects
43. Value in whole-of-system thinking (GM,Env,EE)
44. Remember – "do the same → get the same"
45. Involvement of key people in the design of project or R&D plan, etc is critical to success
46. Build capacity of key RD&E people in the concept and practice of design of effective projects, i.e. design is not "planning" and it is not writing a "proposal"
47. There are insufficient feedback loops in sugar RD&E projects…we should improve this in the design phase (and in the process phase)
48. Like minded people and communication can help

49. Have a clearly agreed defined goal before you start (at some level)

50. Design for an outcome, e.g. Ian’s group doing “demonstration” work - achieving the outcome/s they wanted

51. Need to define a system as a first step to improving it

52. Develop RD&E project/system targets that connect directly to industry system targets

53. Designing cultural change projects is a new area with few skills for this existing in the industry service providers

54. Recognise “political/policy” element of both projects and systems in design

55. A 5 year cropping cycle slows rate of change

56. Extension is often an after thought

57. A good idea demonstrated will not go “out” into wide adoption if culture not designed in

58. A structured process for innovation is important to achieve the desired outcomes

59. Needs to be a regional focus

60. Tools used very useful for planning the whole picture

61. Must take into account cultural aspect

62. Identify high impact opportunities and methods to create major effects

63. Must be “in-step” with the culture and needs of the individuals

64. Understand culture first to work out what motivates people to generate change and improvements

65. Design a planned, well structured program

66. Develop a logo with key goal of project on it (with team members)

67. A clear understanding of project objectives by all involved

68. Driven internally with specialist support

69. Building capacity to sustain is critical

70. How do we design projects to make change more “palatable”?

71. Design clear criteria (Kepi’s) for impact on target outcomes into projects

72. Design project for improvement and/or innovation i.e. improvement is different from innovation

73. Fully understand your target market/s before designing your RD&E projects - even including creating demand

74. Where appropriate design, build and deliver RD&E to fit into existing systems – some innovations are easily won

75. Manage attitudes to risk

76. Identify need → develop a project → do the work based on need (good ideas) → the rest is easy, good ideas sell themselves

77. Clear objectives and aims are important.
Leadership and management of RD&E projects and systems

1. Keep critical success factors in front of team throughout project
2. Communication, marketing & promotion are important to support and maintain commitment & momentum (energy, passion & enthusiasm)
3. The concept of shared leadership may need to be further explored
4. Use proven researchers. Use of steering committees comprising end user's, researchers, etc (diverse group)
5. Build the capacity to ensure you have the right ratios of achievers, leaders, managers (60, 6, 3)
6. Strong and inspiring leadership is needed to maintain interest
7. It takes leadership to go in new directions
8. Managers should take a greater role and responsibility for outcomes
9. Document & obtain sign-off on information that people provide (permission/agreement to use)
10. Ensure ownership transfers from leaders → project people → clients
11. Need to secure resources for undertaking projects and changing systems
12. Look outside the square to identify new processes
13. Integration → cohesiveness of all components
14. Transfer of ownership (to staff and clients) early
15. Because of the increased rate of change in the industry, need a RD&E system which anticipates and meets needs at a more rapid rate
16. RD&E needs to be relevant to the stakeholders, not so much orientated to "political" issues
17. Greater levels of partnership in leadership and management of regional people
18. All staff should have an across project knowledge with someone having ability to act on this
19. Don't take on too much – quality not quantity
20. R&D funding leadership must focus on future needs as much as (if not more) than present ones → Where is the new technology for innovative growers to adopt?
21. Organisations are providing leadership for their own bits of the system but who is providing leadership for the whole RD&E system
22. Project leaders need to plan for the life of their work after project completion (life of work doesn't equal life of project)
23. CSR has showed leadership in CPI
24. Technologies are being delivered and adopted – they are not sitting on the shelf
25. Growers are asking for the next wave of innovations
26. Don't dictate to people – can't force them to change, suggest, coach, facilitate
27. Be realistic in expectations particularly when considering adoption of complex systems like FMS – time and adoption
28. Managers/leaders can provide support for reflection/learning/understanding
29. Grower participation is crucial/essential
30. Take the initiative
31. Provide a bar on one SERUKE
32. Who is going to take the lead in improving communications in the sugar RD&E system?
33. Clear understanding of outcomes required
34. Development of shared concept glossary to lead to shared mental model in RD&E system
35. Right balance of locals, leaders, etc (structure)
36. Holistic leadership necessary and continual
37. Communication and quality of relationships between leaders, managers and achievers is critical to a well functioning system
38. Build capacity of industry leaders and managers in the design and management of RD&E partnerships
39. On farm R&D can be grower driven – with the appropriate partnerships
40. Role of leaders to : keep everyone involved; not “recipe” driven – needs to be designed for each situation; set criteria for “team” members in beginning – get the right people
41. No project without leadership
42. Workplace and business improvement and innovation has been used successfully in SE region for NR&M – support for staff embodied in this technique is excellent idea
43. Systems management needs to work out “best”/“appropriate” rates of change – enough, i.e. get momentum and keep it going – versus – too much i.e. break the industry rather than make the industry
44. Organisational change requires support from the top (we need leadership and resources)
45. Managers need to be identified as being part of the achieving team
46. Decide to do the things that are going to be of real value, then make it happen
47. If early success is not possible, then leadership and management become more important - need to impact
48. Change driven by the top
49. Hierarchy where cause and effect are obvious
50. Have community champions lead parts of the RD&E, e.g. fertiliser champion
51. Using “champions” to promote the project; builds the bridge; increases their status; and brings others along
52. Manage attitudes to risk
53. One size doesn’t fit all...... design projects or strategies etc with this in mind
54. Leaders must have excellent “feel” for the projects at grass roots level
55. Management support (including financial) necessary at each stage/part of program
56. Continuous improvement applies to leaders and managers – however these people are according to literature most resistant to applying Continuous Improvement.
Assessing performance of RD&E projects and systems

1. Level of adoption is an indicator/s of change
2. Evaluation recognised as important, evaluation promoted, but people not happy with current evaluation methods/knowledge
3. Need more specialist support for evaluation
4. Should have an improved (standardised) method of calculating cost/benefit ratios. Perhaps a spreadsheet where calculations & assumptions are shown. Do at submission and conclusion
5. Real and realistic targets need to be set and measured – also specify how they will be measured and tracked over time (KPIs)
6. Set realistic quantifiable goals
7. Is it (R&D) just increasing knowledge or is it having a positive impact?
8. Beware of the “white coat” effect i.e. people sometimes give different answers to what they actually do/believe
9. Develop and use “performance management frameworks”, CSFs and KPIs for RD&E projects and systems and practice CI&I, i.e. every 90-180 days
10. Performance measurement could extend to social elements of change as well as technical elements
11. Determining performance targets needs a: Quantitative approach (situation statements); People needs approach
12. Targeting performance is critical to both achieving and assessing performance
13. Different levels (systems, project, activity levels) of performance have very different measures
14. Use system design and management methods for making the regional RD&E system fulfil the needs of real practical situations – some real, practical needs are not being met
15. Designing good CSFs is good for monitoring performance
16. Benchmark initial position for comparison
17. Benefits come from what people learn by participating in good projects and systems
18. Measure “impact” not just outcomes
19. Need a better way of determining long term yield trends (qualitative and quantitative) – some suggestions: Multivariate stepwise assay; Contrast attendees v non attendees
20. Regular review and evaluation
21. Design performance management framework (balanced scorecard)
22. Just because a grower accepts that information is valuable and useful does not mean it will be implemented. Need to push further as extension officers
23. Benchmark sugar against other agricultural industries
24. Measuring “soft data” like understanding, is difficult and hard to judge how long it may take to improve
25. Regular self assessment. Look at your own assumptions/thinking
26. It is important to prioritise evaluation to understand why something was successful/unsuccessful.

27. Events such as these allows us to compare scope or range of intents of different projects and comment on progress.


29. Is performance reliant on external (e.g. govt) funding? And what will happen when $$$ dry up?

30. Targets

31. Use SMARTT focus tool to develop up-front targets with the key goal.

32. Important to continually revisit focus.

33. If you can’t describe it, you can’t measure it. If you can’t measure it, you can’t manage it.

34. Have a well defined statement of what is “good” performance.

35. No feedback – no report! I.e. don’t provide reports for no feedback.

36. Feedback should be both congratulatory (recognise the great things) and formative (suggestions for improvement) – there is not enough positive feedback for jobs well done.

37. The principles and practice of 30, 90, 180 day improvement and innovation sessions are essential for improvement and innovation.

38. In some situations nothing beats observation/demonstration as a catalyst for change.

39. Important to have mechanisms in place for assessment.

40. Performance orientated – must be cost effective and not detrimental to production, profitability or environment.

41. All costs and benefits should be included in assessment i.e. “with” and “without”.

42. Very important to measure impact but equally important to take into account all externals.

43. Need to consider opportunity cost of R&D when existing RD&E impacts are weak.

44. Continuing R&D funding levels will be contingent on ROI.

45. What is considered the benchmark for good/excellent RD&E projects/programs regarding benefit/cost ratios – within sugar and across agricultural industries?

46. Lies do get told! A side effect of competition/single “filters”.

47. More “selling” of project performance benefits in Australian RD&E systems.

48. Australian RD&E assessment systems need increased global exposure.

49. Regular meetings to review progress. Regular and supported reporting and feedback is important.

50. Develop types of impact eg profit, efficiency, environment and KPIs for each type.

51. Develop KPIs for improvement and separate KPIs for innovation.

52. It is important to reflect on both successes and “failures” (not so successful) to understand and learn how to do better next time (i.e. applying active learning).

53. Continuous improvement applies to growers and researchers and extension and managers and leaders and funders and organisations.
Roles and relationships in RD&E projects and systems

1. Involvement of different parties in steering committee
2. Cooperation with other R&D providers with specialist skills is good – but can become costly and cumbersome
3. Need to have appropriate linkages and skills base
4. Greater involvement from a bigger range of farmers
5. Identify range of roles needed. Define those roles (clarify) establish criteria and skills to fill roles
6. Building trust is critical to maintain relationships within teams
7. Co-management of research (eg stakeholders plus research providers) can be an appropriate management mechanism and requires defining/re-defining the relative roles and relationships
8. Define and use the concept of partnership – have “achievers, leaders and managers” in the partnership
9. Keep participants/clients involved throughout the process
10. Roles must be aligned to CSFs and integrated to the main objectives
11. If “traditional” relationships have achieved current performance/situation what do future relationships in R&D partnerships need to look like?
12. Same expectations – same outcome. Same roles – same outcomes. Same conversations – same outcomes
13. Develop research – industry group charter
14. Shared values reduce conflict
15. Match skills to the tasks that need to be performed
16. Good communication between participants critical
17. Group processes with shared learnings successful
18. Relationship between doers and funders is critical, and across doers
19. Maintain nexus of RD&E from beginning especially D&E
20. Whose role is it to design, manage and improve the sugar industry RD&E system?
21. Ensure right ratio of involvement of industry ie greater ratio of involvement by growers & millers
22. Identify the right/necessary skills including systems skills
23. Understand/acknowledge a farmer is part of a community and think on this when designing RD&E systems (after all, farming is a lifestyle as much as a business)
24. Consider the importance of capacity building to sustain & grow individuals, teams and networks
25. Grower groups seem to be a very important part of extension – it seems that successful groups mean we also need successful facilitators
26. Since growers are the interface between research and on-ground technology use, maybe they are the real “D” in RD&E
27. Maintain the partnership arrangement – cradle to the grave
28. Important to focus on people in the system
29. We are all people in the system, we need to take the time and effort to interact at all levels (formal and informal) to understand each other (sometimes you need to go out in the field and get dirty)

30. Who is responsible for ensuring people in the sugar industry system understand each other?

31. Recognise people in “roles” may not meet the criteria for the job

32. Good internal communications needed – in regions and organisations

33. Is there an opportunity to better link information that’s “kept” within regional/Brisbane offices/people’s heads?

34. People must recognise their role and relationships are critical to success of projects. Sharing data/information helps to overcome our defensiveness (old way vs new)

35. There are many overlapping roles/functions in sugar RD&E that are currently not linked

36. Design RD&E systems to integrated projects and programs, i.e. ensure linkages across projects and programs regional target outcomes

37. Never assume people understand

38. Develop and design RD&E partnership logo with stakeholder/community input & with projects

39. Better integration within and across institutions

40. We need to make “offers” or “invitations” to people to people outside our team, i.e. be proactive in improving roles/relationships

41. Critical relationships with harvesting group – to address cost issues

42. Good relationships – no energy wasted

43. Keep others involved (eg harvesters)

44. Trust is essential – must be developed (work on it)

45. “Structure” of partnerships can facilitate good R&R – e.g. succession issues, break up issues. Not just business considerations for structure

46. The “client” is not always obvious eg NR&M’s main client is State Govt

47. Recognition of personal inputs, connections, feedback and reward is fundamentally important

48. There needs to be a better consultation and discussion between government, their agencies and the sugar industry to help prevent flaws in logic

49. Need to engage growers who are not motivated at the moment

50. Get growers to sign off on targets

51. Roles need to be clearly understood

52. Need project “champions”

53. Identifying key clients and stakeholders is important

54. Cultural differences need understanding/identification to enhance relationships in RD&E project development

55. You have to have an effective relationship with your end users

56. Development of supporters is essential to successful project outcomes

57. Clear project leadership and a short chain of command are beneficial

58. Those delivering “new” information must be aware of personality types at meetings
**Methods for achieving RD&E outcomes**

1. Use SMARTT focus (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-framed and Targeted)
2. Use evaluation processes to explore change in awareness of knowledge/application of knowledge – biophysical evaluation – perception evaluation
3. Shared methods in and across projects by all partners. Process of doing (getting Shared Mental Model) is valuable towards achieving outcomes
4. Seeing is believing – more power to demonstrations
5. Demonstrations with guidance/assistance to ensure robust outcomes
6. Make sure project is always focused correctly by periodically reviewing current activities against regional objectives (ie the CI&I focusing framework tool)
7. Start by identifying the outcome you want
8. Working in partnership/strong relationships
9. Design and use detailed processes
10. Use the right tools for planning and implementation
11. Involve the appropriate people (i.e. experts & clients)
12. Build trust – especially with rural people
13. Negative and unexpected outcomes from unethical research are a major barrier to adoption (and any further cooperation)
14. Integrate learning activities with existing social functions (time-saving)
15. Use/set criteria to select the “appropriate methods”
16. Inputs → method → outcome. If you want a different outcome try a new method/s
17. Meetings should be short, focused and to the point
18. Meetings can be structured differently for different people
19. The design and use of a rigorous process of identifying RD&E needs is much better than using intuition alone
20. Use different types of industry people to get different insights on needs
21. Use methods to stimulate innovative thinking and ideas for now and the future
22. Need methods for needs analysis that prompt new/radical/adventurous thinking – not just same old same old thinking about needs
23. Quantitative approach should be further developed within constraints of resources
24. Involve client early in the process
25. Action learning – demonstration
26. Choose good CSFs
27. Emphasis on planning
28. Link operations to strategy
29. Untapped potential of husband and wife team – tap into “pressure points” of environmental, social, health etc – can be a simple approach

30. Greater interaction in the small (5 or 6) size group

31. Go minimalist in amount of material to be presented (be brave, take risks)

32. Important to seek the support and views of other people such as external views on project ideas and how to do it

33. We need to be rigorous in understanding and using methods

34. Awareness and implementation of CI&I obviously important to achieving good methods and outcomes

35. Use people involved in the industry (with rapport and experience) to instigate change

36. Work with “progressive” people and develop them as change advocates/champions

37. Use multiple methods for the one message (e.g. large farm tour vs small groups vs 1-on-1)

38. How do you define a group? Are there social ways of grouping growers?

39. Important to feel comfortable with sharing your “initial” thoughts/ideas, rather than developing your ideas to “final draft” before sharing them

40. We need better methods and process to achieve change – testimonials – case studies

41. Participatory approaches with end users very early will help achieve success

42. Small group work where fear of failure is major consequence – support and strength

43. Bring in new concepts step by step

44. Involve all the stakeholders from the beginning

45. Successful delivery of R&D outcomes = increased end-user uptake

46. Specifically target and eliminate “mystery elements”

47. Use CI&I process and tools within and across RD&E projects and programs

48. Forums like this are an important way of sharing methods and building our capacity to think differently and creatively

49. Check regularly with people “outside” the activity to get new and different thinking

50. Well thought out and researched each issue, also had strong belief in concept

51. Identify and develop “change champions” and direct funding support to them

52. Structured approach to developing/adapting technologies to system

53. Processes need to identify real problems, not symptoms of problems for the processes to be successful

54. A methods approach to planning and execution obviously successful – key to success was ownership – key to ownership was workshops

55. Processes developed for industry that ensure either action or information, not just continuing “discussion”

56. Cultural aspects are very important but not as bad as perceived by govt which appears to rely on old data (5-10 yrs out of date)
57. Agitation can be managed to assist change
58. Culture may be a problem, but need to manage industry restructure first, then change the culture of what remains
59. Pride through ownership enhances adoption. Involve them up front
60. Providing appropriate tools (spanners) to get the job done
61. Establishing a clear and shared focus, (e.g. 10 tonne)
62. Raising the bar (to 12 tonne) may lose the ownership if 10 tonne is not sufficiently celebrated
63. Work with "corporate" farm – might get "instant" adoption by CEO/board
64. Use of language barrier to advantage (re succinct, visual)
65. Reporting concisely and clearly – implement
66. Using badging/logo i.e. caps, billboards, song, etc are important ways to build identity and ownership
67. Demonstrate the need effectively
68. Organisational psychology has implications for the methods we use (e.g. understand the people, how to best approach them and work with them to achieve change)
69. Use different ("right") methods for improvement as opposed to innovation, i.e. different methods for different outcomes
70. Different approaches may be needed for different personality types and levels of risk aversion
71. Offer people a clear choice between improving and/or innovating
72. Have a thorough understanding of the people that are involved
Opportunities to Improve Sugar Industry RD&E

Forum participants formed into small groups based on whether they wanted to focus on opportunities for improvement from a whole of RD&E system or project perspective. In developing the opportunities they also considered to whom each opportunity was relevant (shown in italics in brackets below).

**Opportunities from a whole-of-system perspective**

1. Create a regional RD&E prioritisation and delivery system (by doing 2-6 below)

2. Develop partnership with stakeholders in projects and programs for regional R&D needs. Form a R&D steering group (now). Include funders. (BSES)

3. Develop strategic R&D plans linked to the regional plans that are already developed by RAGs (R&D steering group)

4. Use existing cell group structure to feed RD&E needs upwards to the strategic plan to implement (Cell groups CPI)

5. Split RD&E into core activities and user pays activities (All stakeholders and provider groups)

6. Use regional strategic plans to prioritise R&D funding (Regions and funders)

7. Achieve/develop improved integration/formal agreement/partnership between key R&D players/providers/institutions in the design and management/implementation of projects – ensuring a shared model (Managers and leaders)

8. Ensure perspectives/inputs are obtained and used from other/outside R&D organisations and industries in the design and management of projects (Funders, managers and leaders)

9. Develop and use a clear understanding of the target market in the design and management of RD&E projects through involvement of the market, market researchers and specialists (Leaders and managers)

10. Apply continuous improvement to projects from the start to the finish (SRDC funders, managers and project officers)

11. Ensure integration of R + D + E and endorse through the project and follow-on i.e. next stages and implications for future (Managers)

12. Ensure a focus on ‘bang-for-the-buck’ (ROI) in both the design and management of projects & through CI&I (All)

13. Make sustainability of improvements/outcomes a focus/key performance indicator of projects (Funders and managers)
14. Utilise new/available technologies/approaches to enhance impact of projects eg SMS, women's networks/capacities, photo-phones (Leaders)

15. Utilise a regional focus more in projects i.e. more than the current industry focus (Funders, managers and leaders)

16. Ensure the identification and involvement of necessary/appropriate types of people in the design and management of projects i.e. have a checklist - RD&E + end-users + market research + capacity building etc (Funders and managers)

17. Better understand and define the RD&E system (Those who wish to improve the system)

18. Improved partnering between end-users and RD&E people (End-users and RD&E people)

19. Improve project management systems and processes (people skills and support systems) (Research managers)

20. Improve communication within the system and with the broader community (Each group in the system)

21. Increase participation by stakeholders (RD&E providers)

22. Embrace principles of continuous improvement and innovation (CI&I) in planning (Everybody)

23. More creativity (RD&E providers)

**Opportunities from both a whole-of-system & project perspective**

24. Delivery of agreed packages under contract to growers, mills and commercial bodies (room to exceed and be rewarded) (CSR, BBS, BSES, growers, banks)

25. Redefine/reinvigorate/maintain a skilled body of field staff/scientists (BSES HRM management and staff)

26. Leadership/coordination to follow up and respond to opportunities created (e.g. where do this forum's findings go?)

27. Project selection to invest in those that deliver greater returns and be part of an optimised portfolio of research (BSES, investors, CSIRO, SRI)

28. Opportunity for business partnerships

29. Well organised, accessible data sets that influence resource allocation and achieve change (BSES, CRC)

30. Segmentation of the grower base to better serve different needs (BSES, growers, consultancies)
Opportunities from a project perspective

31. Industry needs to revalue RD&E as a means to solve its problems (Industry organisations, regional groups, RD&E providers)

32. Framework for facilitating cooperative joint projects – better deal with bureaucratic and equity issues (cooperative projects and funding) (RD&E providers and funders)

33. Compress RD&E cycle while organisational environment is conducive (Providers and funders)

34. Stop basic ‘repetitive’ tasks and redirect resources to high priority areas (RD&E critical areas) (Providers, funders and cane growers)

35. Balance RD&E portfolio with appropriate mix of long term strategic research (over the horizon) (Industry strategists, funders)

36. Industry should set targets for the profitability and productivity it wants from RD&E (Combined industry stakeholders)

37. Model farms (R&D providers)
Forum participants formed into small groups based on commonality of their roles or organisations in the RD&E system. The groups were:

**Role based groups:**
- Research Funding role
- Regional Industry Productivity role

**Organisation based groups:**
- State Government - Department of Primary Industries & Fisheries; Natural Resources & Mines
- BSES Limited

Each group selected the three opportunities they believed would have most impact on improving the Sugar Industry RD&E system at this time. They then developed short term and longer term actions that could be taken to implement these opportunities.

### Research Funding Role

**OPPORTUNITY 1:** Improve communication within the RD&E system and with the broader community.

**Short term action:**
- More frequent communication.
- Prioritise “making links” and following up with potential partners.

**Longer term action:**
- Develop communication networks between players in RD&E system.
- Improve links between SRDC and the media/“outside” the system.
- SRDC Board to brainstorm around “How to improve communication by SRDC with the broader community”.

**OPPORTUNITY 2:** Streamline SRDC & Regional Strategic Planning systems to create shared understanding of sugar RD&E priorities.

**Short term action:**
- SRDC to contact/link with each region.
- Present synthesis of regional RD&E priorities to SRDC Board and management to improve their understanding.

**Longer term action:**
- Compile synthesis of regional priorities to improve RD&E system.

**OPPORTUNITY 3:** Embrace principles of continuous improvement and innovation (CI&I) in planning.

**Short term action:**
- Offer opportunity to partner with people interested in “follow-on” CI&I programs.
- Present synthesis of regional RD&E priorities to SRDC Board and management to improve their understanding.
Regional Industry Productivity Role

OPPORTUNITY 1: The formation of a R&D steering group for each region.

Short term action:
- Develop the framework for the steering groups (BSES to drive).
- Involve SRDC.

Longer term action:
- R&D steering groups maintain themselves.
- BSES fulfils coordinating and administration roles.

OPPORTUNITY 2: Develop a regional R&D strategic plan.

Short term action:
- Draw information together from all sources – RAG, NRM Plan.

Longer term action:
- Develop a process e.g. using the CI&I framework.

OPPORTUNITY 3: Get funding bodies to accept regional strategic plans as a basis for prioritising project funding.

Short term action:
- Regional groups engage funders to reach agreement.

Longer term action:
- Change project selection criteria/process.

State Government – DPI&F and NR&M

OPPORTUNITY 1: Market research and market the benefits/outcomes of CI&I of R&D systems, programs, projects and partnerships to funders, managers and organisations.

Short term action:
- Develop a market and market research process focused on outcomes/benefits using the thinking generated during this forum.
- Place greater emphasis on design and redesign of the process.

OPPORTUNITY 2: Consider the “model farm” concept and setting profitability targets, and how these translate into R&D strategies.

Short term action:
- Influence DPI&F and the investment process.

OPPORTUNITY 3: Incorporate/integrate people issues into improvement and innovation opportunities, processes, activities and tools.

Short term action:
- Talk to key people/specialists and use participant feedback, and incorporate ideas from these into the design and management of improvement and innovation activities.
**BSES Limited**

**OPPORTUNITY 1:** Delivery of agreed packages under contract to growers, mills and commercial bodies (room to exceed and be rewarded).

**Short term action:**
- Develop an inventory of off-the-shelf packages and skills sets.
- Develop and negotiate principle e.g. SMART targets.
- Put out tenders/Expressions of Interest to identify partners.

**Longer term action:**
- Change model that staff work to where high priority is attached packages.
- Demonstrate growth in skill sets.

**OPPORTUNITY 2:** Re-define, reinvigorate and maintain a skilled body of field staff/scientists.

**Short term action:**
- Rewards.
- Succession planning
- Training
- Negotiated and flexible rewards
- More proactive and support human resource management
- Knowledge retention

**Longer term action:**
- Improve and integrate the demographic and sociological capability of staff.
- Culture change re managing up.

**OPPORTUNITY 3:** Develop R&D plans linked to regional plans developed by RAGs.

**Short term action:**
- Increase the overlap between people involved in R&D.

**Longer term action:**
- Form partnerships with regional stakeholders.
Summary of Forum Outputs

- 22 presentations describing situations where participants have been involved in improving some aspect of sugar industry RD&E
- 2 presentations from participants who offered experiences from other industries and contexts
- Key observations, questions, lessons and insights in relation to each presentation developed by participants, and copies given to presenters as a record of the thinking stimulated by their presentations
- 77 lessons and insights in relation to designing RD&E projects and systems
- 56 lessons and insights in relation to leadership and management of RD&E projects and systems
- 53 lessons and insights in relation to assessing the performance of RD&E projects and systems
- 58 lessons and insights in relation to roles and relationships in RD&E projects and systems
- 72 lessons and insights in relation to methods for achieving RD&E outcomes
- 37 opportunities for improving sugar industry RD&E systems and projects
- Identification of short and longer term actions that could be taken to implement 12 opportunities which participants considered would have most impact on improving sugar industry RD&E at this time.
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Forum Evaluation and Feedback

Forum Outcomes

How much has the Forum contributed to sharing of experience, knowledge and innovative methods?

Average Score: 8.1
Range of Scores: 6 - 10

Comments:
- Presentations great idea. Kept short and given only to small audience made this process successful.
- Interesting range of skills and experience applied in presentation.
- Thank you for the invite and the opportunity to be part of the forum. I have learnt about other ways of thinking and doing things and how to improve our CI&I process for the future.
- The 25 presentations were excellent opportunities for us to “share”. The time allocated to questions/clarifying was excellent to reflect, dig into details, etc. I learnt about new methods and I identified opportunities.
- I have really valued from learning about the techniques used by other conference members.
- The Presentation Framework and time and timing was simple and optimal ie effective and efficient
- Was a forum in the true sense of the formal and informal meeting and learning.
- Amazing how much extra input received by those who haven’t been supporting our project over last 12 months.
- It was great to hear the reviews people gave of projects, programs and reflective practice generally. What a fantastic opportunity. Please invite me again next time!
- Exposure to various work aspects, roles etc as well as attitudes was very interesting and informative.
- Listening and commenting at the presentations certainly helped understand alternative methods to achieve an outcome.

How much has the Forum contributed to new thinking about improving RD&E delivery, projects and systems?

Average Score: 7.0
Range of Scores: 4 – 9

Comments:
- Not a lot of new ideas collectively, but individually we now share all new ideas and new ones will result.
- The forum program provided lots of opportunities for generating new thinking - both formally and informally (through networking). It was good to present to people external to my organisation to be challenged and to gain different perspectives.
- Excellent opportunity to take a ‘birds eye’ view of the sugar RD&E system with ‘partners’ external from industry, from R&D organisations, etc. The Sugar RD&E system is far from optimised. There are many opportunities to improve the sugar RD&E system
- There has been a lot of discussion and ideas generation
- I think the thinking was the best possible – This given that we are programmed to use old thinking. Perhaps in hindsight a greater emphasis on re-emphasising the need and value and expectation of new thinking and action.
- Basic patterns of operating are still in place – under pressure to change but direction is confused.
- I now have a direction for where to take the CI&I concept next in my own area.
- I think this forum has planted some seeds for future ideas about research projects and new ways of administering them. I think I need some time to really tell, but I sense that I have some ideas already germinated.
- Danger of process taking inordinate amount of time available to reach outcomes.
- Understand current problems in extension of R&D. Opportunity to make comment/initiate deeper thinking on extension of R&D new farming systems.
How much has the Forum contributed to identification of methods to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of sugar industry RD&E projects and systems?

Average Score: 7.2
Range of Scores: 6 - 8

Comments:
- Yellow sheets on walls helped a lot. Summary will be well used.
- A lot of common ground and agreement on priorities is encouraging.
- Great to know how other organizations have adopted CI&I and their achievements. This has helped to confirm our direction and approach and also provided ideas on how we can improve in the design of our 2005 program.
- There was not much emphasis on us using new methods – the start up workshop and 180-day workshop was most useful in identifying new methods.
- Difficult to really do this in a two-day workshop. Perhaps something for the future.
- Best possible given a lack of shared understanding and value of the concept and methods.
- Ability to flesh out thoughts/ideas and refine them.
- Good tools with potential for sustained change.
- See previous comment. (I now have a direction for where to take the CI&I concept next in my own area)
- I am acutely concerned about this aspect of RD&E and feel that there was a good opportunity to do this at the forum. The challenge will be in implementation.
- Good demonstration of tools in use – could do with more exposure.
- I believe much more consultation with leading farmers needs to take place at the planning stage of any process which impacts on them.

How much has the Forum contributed to identification of high impact opportunities to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of sugar industry RD&E projects and systems?

Average Score: 6.75
Range of Scores: 3 - 9

Comments:
- The forum provided me with the opportunity to reflect on the outcomes of our WP&BI forum and 12-month program and to further develop and discuss opportunities with our partners DPI&F CI&I unit to incorporate into the design and management of our next phase – 2005 program.
- The most important outcome is that together a group of people have identified opportunities for the future. The test will be if any/most of these opportunities are followed up on and its “impacts” are achieved.
- Solid brainstorming sessions
- Possibly have been improved by using an Input/Leverage analysis tool.
- Ideas seem “half-baked” and unclear how to advance. Could/should take personal responsibility but is hazardous...
- Haven't yet thought too much about “high impact”.
- The forum gave us space to do this – but I don’t think I have had sufficient time to identify the real behavioural change that I (and my organisation) need to make to really improve effectiveness.
- Felt needed more time at program’s end to better define the opportunities.
- As above. (I believe much more consultation with leading farmers needs to take place at the planning stage of any process which impacts on them.)
Participants, Process, Environment and Resources

How much did the diversity and type of participants contribute to the Forum?

Average Score: 8.5  
Range of Scores: 6 - 10

How much did the process used (presentations, questions and small group work) contribute to the Forum?

Average Score: 8.0  
Range of Scores: 6 - 10

How much did the environment contribute to the Forum?

Average Score: 7.0  
Range of Scores: 1 - 10

How much did the materials and resources contribute to the Forum?

Average Score: 8.0  
Range of Scores: 3 - 10

Comments about Participants, Process, Environment and Resources:

- Well run and resourced. Great job 😊
- I'm not a great fan of group work “cold”, ie. Without thinking about it myself first, and the power of the pen can be a problem for people who aren’t good at getting other thoughts written up properly. However, time is the problem for any other way.
- All of the above elements are critical to a successful forum and I appreciate the level of energy commitment and passion that is required – Thank you. Having a broad cross section of participants was excellent and is a great way to build and/or improve relationships, increase awareness and understanding of the different areas.
- Overall excellent. Air conditioner very noisy (quiet speaking people difficult to hear). Pillars prevented eye-to-eye contact. Tremendous effort in the planning and designing of the forum ensured it was as successful as it was.
- As always very well planned in all respects. I especially thought that plentiful breaks were good for restoring energy and allowing time for participants to talk to each other.
- A very effective and efficient process (forum) given the outcome achieved for the time inputs by participants (not counting the time inputted by the Forum designers and leaders).
- Missed 2/3 of presentations but would have been hideous to hear them all – quality not quantity.
- Diversity great. Like small groups (~ 6 people best).
- This was the best forum I have ever been to. Congratulations on such a wonderful event. It is testament to the preparation and organisation that I am sure went into the 2 days. Thank you.
- Generally good overall. Would have rather had fewer breaks and interruptions and longer time to discuss final outcomes. Question time/discussion often curtailed.
- The small group process is excellent. Most participants are relaxed and keen to offer questions, comments and observations which otherwise may never been heard in larger groups.
## Enjoyment of the Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of support from participants</th>
<th>Average Score: 8.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of Scores: 6 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of support from Forum leaders</th>
<th>Average Score: 8.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of Scores: 6 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the socials</th>
<th>Average Score: 8.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of Scores: 7 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of organisation</th>
<th>Average Score: 8.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of Scores: 6 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall enjoyment of the Forum</th>
<th>Average Score: 8.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of Scores: 5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The things participants enjoyed most at the Forum

- Having the opportunity to share what we have done (the presentation) and receive feedback and support. The opportunity to meet other people using CI&I principles, processes and tools.
- The sense of “team” — people were genuinely interested in contributing to a greater good (rather than being negative). Very positive “vibe” i.e. people were focused on creating a positive future; not reliving the past or blaming or criticising
- Listening to what other people were doing.
- The good intent, input and support of all involved.
- Presentations and discussion
- Presentations and the quality discussions that followed — well chaired.
- Support/ideas from others.
- Socialisation was enjoyable. Ability to see other’s point of view.
- Fantastic — the whole thing!
- Diversity of participants and their contributions. Venue/setup/organisation of program.
- The well organised event.
## The Forum In Total

### Overall value of the Forum

| Average: 7.5 | Scores: 4 - 10 |

### Comments about the value of the Forum:

- I will take back everything I have learnt and experienced and see how what you have done in this forum can be used in our future forums in NR&M.
- This is the first forum of this kind in the Australian sugar industry and it can be judged as a success because people appeared to be willing to participate, enthusiastic and contributing. The real test will be revealed in the next 12 months ... what will we do in terms of follow on activities?
- Hope I can get others in my organisation interested to take this forward.
- Proof will be in the pudding but it has given me a wonderful space to think creatively.
- A worthwhile forum overall which had a good mix of work aspects and interests. Would see good opportunity for stratified forums of same type as well as subject oriented events which draw on a wide range of experience and circumstance viz crop x role x subject x organisation etc.
- It will be really difficult to manage, however all the heavy thinking on future direction is difficult when everyone is tired and having to dash off to the airport.

### Other comments about the Forum

- Too much “down time” on first day, but picked up after that.
- Do you want to increase the level of participation at future forums? If so, each project brings along another person. I really liked the forum kit with personal card idea!
- Thank you QDPI&F team – a huge effort – well done!
- A very valuable method to harness thinking for impact on improvement and innovation. Excellent design and leadership of the Forum. A small opportunity for improvement could be to smooth the connection between the steps and tools in the last session and to remind participants to harness the thinking created from the Forum.
- Feedback from forum somehow needs to be relayed to industry: RD&E leaders to add to their own thinking otherwise the forum’s value is greatly diminished.
- Good venue and appreciate the timings (kept to time very well)
- Many thanks to Janice, Richard, Paul and Andrew for a great experience.
- The forum objectives are laudable but it must be realised that projects will be slow. Progress depends on funding and decisions of funding organisations – all of the SRDC leaders and managers should have been here.
- Would suggest greater opportunity to develop “opportunities” (without getting down to specifics) for improved RD&E so that new directions are identified and hopefully some ownership transfer occurs.