

Proposed Key Performance Indicators for Greater Sydney Regional Strategic Weed Management Plan – 12 April 2019

Goal	Key outcome	Key Performance Indicators (indicators previously proposed identified in bold)	Data source and method (more details on methods in Error! Reference source not found.)
1	Land managers and other duty holders better understand obligations and regional priorities	•	•
1	Land managers have increased knowledge and skills in best practice weed management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of management plans activated</li> <li>• Number of Biosecurity Directions issued</li> <li>• Number of Biosecurity Undertakings</li> </ul>	LLS/DPI - Annual data extracted from BIS
1	More stakeholders complying with obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCA operation expenditure on weed control / management (excluding contractors)</li> <li>• LCA expenditure on weed control / management (contractors)</li> <li>• State agency expenditure on weed control / management (contractors)</li> <li>• % of LCAs with Authorised Officers appointed under the Act</li> <li>• % of LCAs submitting weed data to BIS</li> <li>• % of inspections resulting in breaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCAs report annually</li> <li>• LCAs report annually</li> <li>• State agencies report annually</li> <li>• LCAs/DPI - annually</li> <li>• LLS/DPI - Annual data extracted from BIS</li> <li>• LCAs report annually or extracted from BIS</li> </ul>
1	More stakeholders engaging in best practice weed management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of weeds related staff employed (FTE)</li> <li>• Control of priority weeds by volunteers (sqm/no. sites)</li> <li>• Control of priority weeds by LCA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCAs, LLS and other State agencies</li> <li>• LLS report annually</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS - quarterly</li> </ul>
2/3	Earlier/more effective intervention for weeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of LCAs with proactive inspection programs</li> <li>• Surveillance – Regional High Risk Pathways (km)</li> <li>• Inspections – area inspected for new incursions</li> <li>• Inspections – Regional High Risk Sites (No.)</li> <li>• Number of new weed incursions found</li> <li>• % Incursions of new species eradicated from region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCAs report annually</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS - quarterly</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS – quarterly</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS – quarterly</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS – quarterly</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS - annual</li> </ul>
2/3	Introduction of new weeds prevented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspections – Properties 2 ha or greater (No.)</li> <li>• Inspections – Properties under 2 ha (No.)</li> <li>• % of clean/weed free inspections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCAs/BIS – quarterly</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS – quarterly</li> <li>• LCAs/BIS - quarterly</li> </ul>
2/3	Better planning and coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of species delimited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LLS - annual</li> </ul>

Goal	Key outcome	Key Performance Indicators (indicators previously proposed identified in bold)	Data source and method (more details on methods in Error! Reference source not found.)
	<b>in relation to new weed incursions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of new incursions of priority species managed under a new incursion/rapid response plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LLS – quarterly</li> </ul>
2/3	<b>Active management of high priority and widespread weeds that threaten key assets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Volunteer hours spent on weed management</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>LLS – annual</b></li> </ul>
2/3	<b>Improved protection of high priority assets including Aboriginal cultural heritage sites</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
2/3	<b>Weed risks and/or impacts on primary industries are reduced or avoided</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
2/3	<b>Weed risks and/or impacts to biodiversity and landscape health are reduced or avoided</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Change in area of priority infestation – 6 priority sites</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCA – annual (note that priority sites need to be identified beforehand and agreed by RWC)</li> </ul>
4	<b>Increased involvement of stakeholders in decision-making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No of partnerships in WAP and other weeds project funding arrangements</li> <li>• % composition of RWC (government/non-government)</li> </ul>	LLS – annual
4	<b>Weed threats are continually identified, assessed and prioritised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. of new weed risk assessments (for region)</li> </ul>	DPI/LLS – annual
4	<b>Cross-tenure partnerships established</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
4	<b>Improved cross-tenure integration and coordination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
4	<b>Regional investment is better coordinated</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
4	<b>Increased availability of weed data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. of new BIS records</li> <li>• <b>% of LCAs submitting weed data to BIS</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPI/LLS - annual</li> <li>• <b>Note this is the same indicator as that used for <i>More stakeholders complying with obligations</i></b></li> </ul>
4	<b>Improved understanding of drivers and barriers to weed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	

Goal	Key outcome	Key Performance Indicators (indicators previously proposed identified in bold)	Data source and method (more details on methods in Error! Reference source not found.)
	<b>control (across weed stakeholders)</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Improved tools and systems for managing weeds</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of new tools/systems/processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eg Sydney Weed App, GBD Decision tool.</li> </ul>

Notes:

Table format is taken from MERI framework (pages 17 – 20).

Key outcomes are those identified in the MERI framework program logic (page 9)

Indicators in bold are those that have previously been proposed to RWC and inserted into appropriate row.

Indicators in grey are taken from MERI framework and proposed for consideration by RWC

RWC should identify gaps (ie where there is no KPI proposed) and consider the need for additional KPIs. See table 5 of MERI Framework for potential KPIs.

Likewise, RWC should identify areas where there is too many, and therefore unnecessary, KPIs and consider removing specific KPIs.