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Abstract

Summary: Local watershed organisations, including Landcare groups in Australia, are an important element of efforts to better manage our natural resources. Much has been written documenting the activities and outcomes of Landcare groups. Notwithstanding these important efforts, there has been little attention given to the important issue of how to sustain these organisations over time. In this paper we address this gap and identify five principles for sustaining effective watershed groups. In developing these principles we hoped to strengthen the conceptual foundation of these initiatives; help structure citizen-agency interactions; and provide a framework for the evaluation of watershed programs. Although we have examined local watershed groups in other countries, particularly in the state of Oregon in the United States, we have largely drawn upon our research and experience with Landcare.

Conclusions:
Our first principle is that these groups must be established at a local scale using social as well as biophysical boundaries. It is also critical that these organisations are embedded within a supportive institutional framework that identifies realistic roles for private landowners, local organisations and regional planning bodies. Our third principle is that without broad stakeholder representation, the perceived benefits of participation are quickly forfeited. It is also unrealistic to expect an effective network of local groups to be sustained without substantial investment by government to provide for program management, group coordination and cost-sharing for on-ground work. Our final principle is that there must be the commitment and skills within a program to establish processes that build trust and competency amongst citizens and agencies. These principles should also provide a foundation for the critical evaluation of local watershed or sub-catchment group programs.
Introduction

Local watershed or sub-catchment groups (WG) established as part of government initiatives are becoming an important part of the natural resource management landscape in developed economies (Griffin 1999; Curtis and Lockwood 2000; Yaffee et al. 1996). Australia’s Landcare program has now been operating for over fifteen years in the state of Victoria (Campbell 1994), much longer than similar programs in other developed nations, and Landcare has been widely acclaimed as an Australian success story. However, much has been written and said, including at this conference, about the need to move beyond voluntary, Landcare-type approaches. It seems to us that there is a concerted effort underway to downplay the contribution and ongoing relevance of Landcare. The real irony is that many of the speakers at this conference have emphasised the fundamental importance of engaging stakeholders and building the capacity of land managers and rural communities to respond to the challenges of developing agricultural systems that are profitable and sustainable in the Australian environment. It is in this context that we want to provide an overview of empirical research exploring the achievements of Landcare. We also want to reflect on the Landcare experience to address the critical task of learning how to sustain local watershed organisations. In doing so we also hope to invite closer scrutiny of existing approaches and offer a mechanism for monitoring and evaluating outcomes.

This paper draws heavily upon our research exploring Landcare, particularly in Victoria, during the 1990’s. This research effort involved state-wide and regional studies that explored program logic and effectiveness, agency-community partnerships, volunteer motivations, the impact of networks in building social capital, and attrition and burnout amongst Landcare members and coordinators. We also draw on our knowledge of the much more recent history of watershed groups in the United States, particularly in the state of Oregon (Duram and Brown 1999; Kenney et al. 2000; Cheng 1999; EPA 1997; and McGinnis et al. 1999); and other elements of ecosystem-based management (e.g. Stankey et al. in press; Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000). Whilst our reflection on the United States experience was important in articulating lessons from Landcare, given the limitations of a brief conference presentation, in this paper we have made only very limited references to the United States experience. Readers interested in a more thorough comparison between Landcare and WG in the United States are referred to our recent paper (Curtis et al. 2002).

The Landcare Program

Landcare can be viewed as part of a lengthy process where Victorians adapted emerging theories of rural development to an Australian context. A small vanguard of soil conservationists, extension agents and farmers were attracted by the core elements of rural development theory that emphasised 1) self help supported by change agents; 2) human resource development rather than technology transfer; 3) public participation; and 4) cooperative efforts at the local community scale (Curtis 1998). Early experience with groups in Victoria confirmed overseas evidence, that participation through local organisations could accomplish broad-based rural development (Chambers 1983; Esman and Uphoff 1984).

Recognising the potential of Landcare groups as a potent force for improved natural resource management, in 1988 the federal government committed spending of 360 million dollars (Australian) in the Decade of Landcare program. From a federal government perspective, Landcare was a national program intended to engage a large proportion of the rural population
and produce more informed, skilled, and adaptive private resource managers. In turn, these managers would adopt a stronger stewardship ethic and increase the use of sustainable practices (Curtis and De Lacy 1996a). The program initially had limited government funding, principally for education and demonstration activities. Establishment of the five-year, $1.25 billion Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) in 1997 significantly altered the course of Landcare (Commonwealth of Australia 1998). The NHT increased funding for on-ground work and employed cost-sharing principles to enable community and private benefits from specific works to be identified. In 1999-2000 alone, the NHT funded 870 Landcare projects, worth $71 million (Wonder 2000).

Although the federal government has greater financial resources, natural resource management authority rests primarily with the six Australian states and the Northern Territory. By 1992, most Australian states had established regional Catchment Management Committees (CMC). In Victoria, the nine CMC are comprised of ministerial appointees from regional communities, including Landcare representatives. CMC are responsible for developing and implementing regional catchment strategies that guide the expenditure of state and federal natural resource management funds. Landcare groups have become an important delivery mechanism for CMC but they are not formally linked (Curtis and Lockwood 2000; Ewing 2000).

Landcare membership is voluntary and open to any local person. In rural areas, groups frequently operate at catchment or sub-catchment scales and are encouraged to view their activities holistically, using a systems approach. Groups are autonomous in that they are not formally linked to government and members usually determine group structures, processes and priorities. While the focus of group activity is usually on privately owned or leased land managed by group members, groups also work on roadsides, reserves and other public lands. Groups are involved in a variety of rural development activities across the broad spectrum of community education and on-ground restoration work (Curtis and De Lacy 1995).

To a large extent, Landcare is seen as an Australian success story. Landcare groups have mobilised a large cross-section of the rural population. By 1998, there were 900 Landcare groups operating across Victoria with an estimated membership of 27,500. In those areas where a Landcare group operated, about 46 per cent of rural properties had a Landcare member (Curtis 1999). Groups provide opportunities for learning by doing and through interaction with peers (Chamala 1995). Group processes have enabled participants to discuss conflicting views in a reasonable fashion and have generally enhanced social cohesion, increased the capacity of rural communities to attract resources from governments and better equipped them to respond to change (Alexander 1995; Curtis and De Lacy 1995). With strong agency commitment to participatory processes, agency staff and Landcare members have established robust, productive partnerships and avoided many of the perils of co-option (Curtis 1998). Landcare participation has also increased awareness of issues and enhanced landholder skills and knowledge and contributed to increased adoption of best management practices (Mues et al. 1998; Curtis and De Lacy 1996b). There are also examples where group activity has had substantial impacts on land and water degradation at the local or sub-catchment scale (Commonwealth of Australia 1997; Campbell 1994). Recent evaluations of the NHT suggest that government investment through Landcare has been more than matched by community contributions (Hill 2000). Landcare participants are represented on regional CMC and other important fora and are contributing to important natural resource management decision-making (Ewing 2000). By enhancing citizen competency, providing continuity of
community representation and acting as a place of retained knowledge, Landcare groups and their emerging networks, appear likely to bridge the gap between the demands of adaptive management and the limitations of stakeholder participation (Curtis et al. 1999).

Despite these impressive achievements, there have been concerns about Landcare program logic and implementation (Lawrence 2000; Curtis and De Lacy 1996b; Curtis 2000). A powerful critique is that Landcare involves the shifting of responsibility for action from government to local communities (Martin et al. 1992). We will draw on these critiques in our later discussion of the five principles for sustaining WG initiatives.

**Principles for sustaining watershed groups**

The following set of principles are derived from an assessment of research and management experience with Landcare in Victoria and, to a lesser extent, with Watershed Councils in Oregon (State of Oregon 1997). Our goal in this analysis was threefold. First, we hoped to strengthen the conceptual foundation of these initiatives through an improved understanding of the complex socio-political processes involved in multi-partner land and water management. Second, the five guiding principles should help structure citizen-agency interactions for sustaining watershed groups over time. Third, we intend for this analysis to provide a basis for critical evaluation of ongoing watershed programs.

**Establish local groups using social as well as biophysical boundaries**

From the public’s perspective, the future of social systems related to watershed resources (e.g. employment and economic opportunities, maintaining a rural lifestyle, and localised decisions) is just as important as the biophysical components (Shindler 2000). Ewing (1995) found that community cohesion and sense of purpose were stronger where Landcare groups were established on social and not just watershed boundaries. This experience is consistent with Cheng’s (1999) finding that small scale, close-knit relationships among Watershed Council members provided a better community connection regardless of differences that may exist.

The work of Uphoff et al. (1998) and Devine (1986) suggests that there are limits to the number of people who can be linked effectively by local organisations. Indeed, most Landcare groups have a membership of between 20 to 30 people living in small communities with somewhere between 200 and 1,000 rural residents. Experience suggests that where Landcare groups have attempted to work with larger populations they have been less effective in that they have failed to attract a substantial proportion of residents as members and have had little impact on most landholders. There have also been a number of examples where groups covering larger populations have agreed to split to form subgroups or establish new groups based on local community boundaries. The new structure has invariably been more effective in mobilising participation and satisfying participant needs.

Many Watershed Councils in Oregon have been established at the regional or basin scale rather than local community scale. Although they perform important functions, most Councils have not mobilised widespread participation and have had little impact on landholder understanding or behaviour. In part, the limited impact of Councils can be attributed to the relatively short time they have operated (Shindler and Wright 2000). It also seems that part of the explanation is that many Councils are operating at the wrong scale. This assessment is
supported by McGinnis et al. (1999) who concluded from their review of watershed organisations in California and the Pacific North West that “The lack of a sense of community may be the single most important barrier to successful long-term watershed planning.” In the case of the McKenzie Watershed Council in Oregon, Cheng (1999) found that the smaller sub-catchment organisation in the Mohawk had established much stronger ties to the local community and was more effective in mobilising landholder participation in community education and restoration work.

**Embed WG within an institutional framework that identifies realistic roles for landowners, local organisations and regional planning bodies**

Along with the need to establish local relevance, we recognize that resource management increasingly involves regional issues and there needs to be some regional organisation that undertakes regional planning and implementation.

With the Victoria Landcare groups, and their emerging networks and the community-based regional CMC, strong community driven organisations appear to have emerged at both the local and regional scales (Curtis and Lockwood 2000). Articulating distinctive roles for these organisations has been a vital element in developing a supportive institutional framework in Victoria. Clearly defining the respective roles can avoid competition and conflict between different organisations and enables stakeholders to make decisions about participation with knowledge of the amount of power offered and the level of commitment required. As Ewing (2000) observed, in Victoria this process has largely occurred by trial and error and has generated considerable angst on the part of Landcare participants concerned about perceived threats to group autonomy. To the credit of the lead agency, there has been considerable preparedness to learn from experience.

The Victorian experience suggests there are four important roles for regional organisations: 1) to aggregate and express regional needs; 2) to establish priorities for allocation of government resources; 3) to provide accountability for expenditure of public funds; and 4) to link and support independent local groups.

We also need to establish realistic expectations of what WG can accomplish in an environment where they are relying on volunteer efforts, are working with limited resources and knowledge, and are attempting to address difficult and complex problems that often require long time frames for visible improvement. Landcare participants know they are being asked to undertake work that has community benefits in terms of biodiversity conservation, improved public health and protecting export income (agriculture and tourism). They also understand that some of the problems they are being asked to address have resulted from previous government policies. Establishment of the NHT was in part an acknowledgment of the legitimacy of these arguments. At the same time, NHT funding has geared-up Landcare group activity to the extent that many groups are operating at historically high levels of activity that appears to be unsustainable (Curtis 2000). It seems that the most important roles for local groups are therefore: 1) to mobilise participation; 2) to initiate and support learning; 3) pull-down resources to support local efforts; and 4) to undertake on-ground work to the extent that resources are available. Of course, it must also be understood that levels of group activity will vary from group to group and over time.
In an era of two income families and considerable off-property work, it is unreasonable to expect landholders in developed economies to take leading roles in administering grant projects or implementing large WG projects. They simply do not have the time. On the other hand, we can expect individual landholders: 1) to participate in group activities; 2) to establish community priorities; and 3) undertake work on their properties or those of others as time permits.

**Maintain broad stakeholder participation in watershed organisations.**

Without strong stakeholder representation the perceived benefits of public participation are likely to be forfeited. Urban interests, including rural towns, have been under-represented on CMC in Victoria, as have women and Aboriginal interests. The exclusion of conservation interests from CMC meant that biodiversity issues were poorly represented in regional catchment strategies and NHT funded projects.

Understanding volunteer motivations is fundamental to sustaining broad stakeholder participation. Landcare participation has been motivated by desire to work locally on national issues, to effect improvement in environmental conditions through on-ground work, for the benefits of social interaction and to learn about land and water management (Curtis and Van Nouhuys 1999). Volunteer literature (Brudney 1990; Pearce 1993) emphasises that social interaction is the most important factor in retaining members. WG experience in Victoria and Oregon suggests that it is also important to establish group protocols and norms that encourage broad stakeholder representation. These approaches include: encouraging membership from urban residents in nearby towns; demonstrating an inclusive approach to membership by allowing people to “come when they are ready”; rotating leadership positions; identifying and making personal approaches to potential members; and making efforts to retain members, including direct personal contacts to follow-up on absences. On-ground work is also an important part of the learning process, both in terms of how to organise a group and to restore degraded areas. Experience with Landcare suggests that it is important for groups to undertake a variety of activities and work across a range of topics to cater for the different interests of participants.

**Substantial investment required by government**

Despite the rhetoric of Landcare as a “grass roots” development, government (and bipartisan) support has been critical to Landcare success. Much of the early success of Landcare was due to the energies, commitment and expertise of state agency staff. Amongst other things, government support has enhanced credibility; funded facilitation and coordination by agency staff; provided important communication links between groups; and through cost-sharing arrangements has funded much of the community education and on-ground work of groups. State and federal government support for arrangements establishing regional CMC has also facilitated regional planning and improved linkages between Landcare groups. In Victoria, higher Landcare group activity is strongly linked to higher levels of government funding and to higher levels of contact with government support staff (Curtis 2000).

While the mean value of funding per Landcare group has increased significantly under the NHT, most groups still receive small amounts of government funding. Indeed, a third of all Victorian groups received less than $2,000 in 1998 and a majority of groups said the funds they received were inadequate to address problems in their area. Rising levels of
dissatisfaction with government commitment to Landcare reflect, at least in part, increased awareness of the extent of cuts to state government expenditure in rural areas over the past decade (Curtis 2000).

Many Victorian groups need assistance with leadership succession planning, with priority setting and catchment planning, and with member recruitment and retention (Curtis 2000). In the most recent Victorian survey a majority of respondents said that leadership issues were an important factor affecting the level of their group’s activity. Further investigation established that most groups did not have an established process for leadership succession (Curtis 2000). Successful volunteer organisations have strong induction programs and management styles that reinforce the worth of volunteer contributions (Pearce 1993). Volunteer literature also emphasises that it is more efficient to devote resources to retention than to attracting and inducting recruits (Curtis and Van Nouhuys 1999). Around 40 per cent of Victorian groups had not adopted approaches likely to enhance membership retention in that group leaders did not follow up with members when there was a pattern of absence and had not publicly acknowledged the contribution of individual members to projects or administration (Curtis 2000). Priority setting is also linked with more effective WG (Selin and Myers 1995; Curtis 2000). However, about half of the Victorian groups were not involved in catchment planning and where they were, there was often no documented outcome of planning processes (Curtis 2000).

These program management deficiencies reflect the absence of a coherent and determined approach to the management of Landcare as a volunteer organisation. The reality is that Landcare in Victoria has been run with small budgets and limited numbers of personnel; has very few senior staff directly involved in program management; and a limited number of managers with specific knowledge of volunteer management.

The management issues identified above have been linked to burnout amongst volunteers in a range of settings (Maslach and Leiter 1997). The core elements of burnout are emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson 1981). In response to community and agency concerns about the phenomena, a pilot study was undertaken in Victoria to assess the extent of burnout and identify factors contributing to higher burnout (Byron et al. 2001). At present only a small proportion of individuals appear to be experiencing high levels of burnout. At the same time, many respondents were experiencing very low levels of personal accomplishment, and higher burnout was linked to the Landcare group management issues identified above, suggesting that burnout may become an important issue. One approach to the management of burnout is to hold workshops to raise awareness of burnout and explore management strategies in a constructive manner. It would be unreasonable to expect groups to develop and undertake such sophisticated management practices without substantial assistance from trained support staff.

It seems that there has been the assumption that, over time, Landcare groups would become independent of government funding. This is unrealistic for most groups given the amount of time people have available for volunteer activities, the low profitability of many on-property enterprises, the scale of problems faced, and the extent that there are large public benefits from on-property work. Recent experience in Victoria and Oregon suggests there are three different areas where governments need to invest in WG. Firstly, there needs to be state-wide coordination of a program that provides for the facilitation of groups as they are established
and the training of coordinators and group leaders so they can address critical group management issues.

Secondly, governments need to provide funds to employ WG coordinators who can facilitate meetings, coordinate watershed planning, prepare funding bids, contribute to community education and harness local resources for restoration projects. Until very recently, the assumption was that Landcare groups could be “kick-started” by government funding of a coordinator, but over time they would become largely independent of funded coordination. This approach fails to acknowledge the growing weight of Australian (Campbell 1992; Curtis 1999) and overseas (Brudney 1990; Pearce 1993) evidence highlighting the critical role of group coordination in volunteer programs. Experience with Landcare suggests a minimum of one full-time staffer is needed per Watershed Council or CMC and a shared person between four or five local community groups. Again, these coordinators need to be part of a team that operates within a coherent state-wide program that provides training for coordinators and a systematic process for implementing the monitoring and evaluation of WG health and outcomes.

Finally, as part of the mix of policy options supporting change in management practices, there should be some form of cost-sharing for work on private property where there are identifiable public benefits. In some cases it may be necessary to go to 100 per cent cost-sharing for restoration work and to make stewardship payments for maintaining the new management regime over time. Cost-sharing for work on private property has a much shorter history in the United States than in Australia. But even these programs have helped reveal potential shortcomings in multi-partner cooperation. In a recent example in Oregon, a 250 million dollar volunteer incentive program to improve riparian management met with low levels of acceptance (State of Oregon 1999). It was suggested that the low acceptance rate was due to a lack of public knowledge about the program and landowner concerns about their loss of private property rights. Australian landholders are also suspicious of government and jealously guard their private property rights. Experience with Landcare, including the fencing of riparian corridors, suggests that WG operating at the local community scale can build the understanding, trust and reciprocal relationships needed to surmount some of these issues.

Establish processes that build trust and competency amongst citizens and agencies

Establishing trust between agency staff and citizens is fundamental to getting long-term change in watershed condition. This is particularly true where collaborative decision-making and management is required across multiple ownerships, where resources are limited and stakeholders are unsure about what to do. Citizens often have difficulty judging the accuracy of information and the level of trust they have for the information provider often shapes their judgements. In comparing case studies in the United States and Australia, Moore (1995) noted the importance of trust in both personnel and organisations. She found that trust in individuals most often derived from interpersonal attributes like honesty and reciprocity that fostered productive planning environments and that organisational trust stemmed from decision-making processes that participants perceived were fair.

Not only is trust important in building relationships, it is a primary ingredient for building competency. Jamieson (1994) noted that citizens do not come with a ready-made ability to engage in constructive, deliberative discussions and that management agencies should contribute to developing the competency of those with whom they engage. Behn (1997) went
straight to the heart of the issue in saying: “In this age of citizen cynicism, having a reputation for knowing how to run the place is a prerequisite for actually doing it. To accomplish anything, public agencies first need a reputation for competence.”

A good way to begin building competency and trust is through the involvement of agency staff in WG strategic planning processes as facilitators and co-learners. In Victoria, Landcare participants consistently report very high levels of satisfaction with agency staff working with groups in terms of their communication skills, technical knowledge and the level of respect agency staff show towards community participants (Curtis 2000). With strong agency commitment to participatory processes, agency staff and Landcare members have generally established robust, productive partnerships. Oregon Watershed Council participants also value these attributes highly, but have provided less positive assessments of the quality of their interactions with agency personnel. Oregon participants often raise the concern that agency managers pay lip service to community interests by favouring technical factors over public deliberation (Shindler 2000).

Achieving broad-scale trust and competency is a tall order and may mean considerable changes in the way agencies do business. The potential of poor program management to affect Landcare outcomes was highlighted by the significant decline in on-ground work in Victoria in 1998 that followed delays of up to nine months in receipt of NHT funding by groups (Curtis 1999). Failure by government to deliver NHT funds on time was perceived as a breach of trust that contributed to growing disillusionment about government commitment to a Landcare partnership. Curtis and Lockwood (2000) argued for the simplification of the NHT funding process by removing some of the layers in the assessment process and for the devolution of greater power to regional communities so that they could manage their own budgets to achieve outcomes identified in their regional catchment plans.

However, trust is fragile and can easily be lost. The experience with Landcare suggests that problems have arisen where governments ignored community priorities; mismanaged funding processes; attempted to co-opt Landcare by siphoning off Landcare funds to state agencies, or have expected groups to carry out work that is really a government responsibility (Curtis 1998).

**Conclusions**

As a program that involved only limited funding of a community development process, Landcare has probably exceeded any realistic goals established at the start of the Federal government’s Decade of Landcare in 1989. Landcare accomplishments include mobilising a large cross section of the rural community, increasing awareness of issues, enhancing the knowledge and skills of resource managers, increasing adoption of recommended practices, and contributing to improved environmental conditions in some smaller catchments. The increasing number of Landcare networks provides another tier of local organisation likely to improve communication between groups and enhance the capacity of groups to address regional problems, pull down resources from cooperating agencies and shape natural resource management policy. Landcare emerged over time as part of an iterative process in which sound rural development theory and practice was adapted to Australian contexts. Landcare offers a powerful example of how to establish effective local organisations across a range of jurisdictions and issues.
We have also raised a number of critiques of the WG initiatives in Victoria and Oregon, but it is probably poor program management at state and federal levels that has had greatest impact on outcomes. Participants say they need more support in terms of government funding for on-ground work; better support for group administration, particularly in terms of funding of coordinators; and training for group leaders. In part, these management deficiencies reflect the absence of a focused and determined approach to the management of WG as volunteer organisations. Many groups are not effectively managing leadership succession, priority setting and catchment planning, or member recruitment and retention. Landcare is only loosely coordinated at state and regional levels and there are few staff dedicated to providing that support. It seems that without improved support that we are approaching the limits of what Landcare participants can accomplish.

Reflecting on the experience with Landcare in Victoria and with Watershed Councils in Oregon we have identified five guiding principles that appear fundamental to sustaining WG initiatives over time. In the first instance, these groups must be established at a local scale using social as well as biophysical boundaries. If these local organisations are to be sustained, it is critical that they are embedded within a supportive institutional framework that identifies realistic roles for private landowners, local organisations and regional planning bodies. Without broad stakeholder representation, the perceived benefits of participation are quickly forfeited. It is also unrealistic to expect an effective network of local groups to be sustained without substantial investment by government. There must also be the commitment and skills within a program to establish processes that build trust and competency amongst citizens and agencies. These five principles should also provide a foundation for the critical evaluation of WG programs.

Given evidence that environmental conditions continue to deteriorate, Australians are critically examining our heavy reliance on voluntary approaches to improved natural resource management. Indeed, this has been a recurring theme at the Fenner conference. Indeed, there appears to be a concerted effort to downplay the contribution and ongoing relevance of Landcare. The real irony is that many of the speakers at this conference have emphasised the fundamental importance of engaging stakeholders and building the capacity of land managers and rural communities to respond to the challenges of developing agricultural systems that are profitable and sustainable in the Australian environment.

It is our view that little has changed in the underlying context of natural resource management in Australia. Australians are still attempting to address land and water degradation on a massive scale; there is considerable uncertainty about how to proceed in terms of the practices to implement or what the priority issues and catchments should be; much of the burden for action lies with a small number of private landholders, and most of these family enterprises are selling commodities on global markets and are operating at low levels of profitability; governments are unable or unwilling to invest on a large scale because of Australia’s small tax base and the lack of commitment to “brown” issues from a largely urban electorate on the eastern seaboard. Landcare continues to resonate with rural Australians, is an important part of the social fabric of many communities and appears to have much to offer in terms of providing fora where: 1) there is sufficient trust for stakeholders to explore difficult issues, including those where there is a discontinuity between the source and impact of degradation; 2) learning with peers is likely to increase the awareness, knowledge and skills of land managers; and 3) co-learning occurs between land managers and researchers and contributes to greater understanding of the nature of sustainability. Landcare groups can also help break
down what has been identified as a city/country divide and build the political constituency required to deliver increased investment in sustainability issues. Landcare therefore has much to offer as Australians respond to the challenge of developing agriculture for the Australian environment.
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