Original Article

TOC CATEGORY:Environmental Management

HE Moore 0000-0003-1941-6471 0000-0003-1941-6471 and ID Rutherford

Using Voluntary Agreements to Exclude Stock from Waterways

Using Voluntary Agreements to Exclude Stock from Waterways: An Evaluation of Project Success and Persistence¹

Harriet Elizabeth Moore*† and Ian D Rutherford‡

†School of Geography, University of Lincoln, Lincolnshire, UK

‡School of Geography, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

(Submitted 22 May 2018; Returned for Revision 16 August 2018; Accepted 12 September 2018)

*✉Address correspondence to HaMoore@lincoln.ac.uk

Published online 26 September 2018 on wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/ieam.

DOI: 10.1002/ieam.4099

Keywords: Stock exclusion, Condition assessment, Maintenance, Voluntary agreements, River restoration

¹ This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi:[10.1002/ieam.4099](https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4099)

ABSTRACT

Agriculture is one of the major drivers of ecological degradation in river basins. Excluding stock (cows and sheep) from grazing riverbanks and accessing rivers is one of the most common river restoration activities. To be effective, stock exclusion must be maintained indefinitely. In Australia, and elsewhere, stock exclusion projects are most commonly implemented by establishing voluntary agreements between landholders and government agencies. This study examined the extent to which landholders in 3 catchment management authority (CMA) regions in southeast Australia maintain stock exclusion from waterways, whether vegetation on riverbanks recovered, and the effectiveness of assessment methods. It was found that nearly half of landholders continue to graze stock on the riverbank. There has been some success with improving the condition of riparian vegetation. Sites with full stock exclusion contain the pre-European abundance of juvenile trees, and sites with continued grazing contain significantly lower abundance of juvenile trees. Establishing the effectiveness of management was made more difficult by the inconsistent methods used by the different CMAs. Stock exclusion projects implemented with voluntary agreements have the potential to succeed if oversight is improved between government agencies and CMAs and between CMAs and landholders. Projects will be easier to assess if regional authorities use consistent methods of assessment. Voluntary agreements are only suitable for environmental management if projects are monitored, maintained, and assessed appropriately.

<H1>INTRODUCTION

Agricultural practices are 1 of the central causes of ecological degradation in river basins (Suding 2011). Over the last 30 years, improving the condition of degraded riverine ecosystems has become a central goal of river management and a widespread area of scientific research (Bernhardt et al. 2007). One focus has been on assessing the effect of the agricultural sector on ecosystems and designing evidence-based interventions to mitigate

further damage. Common river restoration interventions include establishing fishways on dams to restore fish populations, revegetating river basins for gully control, and excluding stock from grazing riverbanks to improve riparian vegetation (Moore and Rutherford 2017). Ideally, these projects should follow the principles of adaptive management (Koehn et al. 2001; Newson 2008): design, implementation, maintenance, monitoring, and assessment, whereby the outcomes of assessment inform the next stages of design and so forth (Rutherford et al. 2000) (Figure 1).

In practice, the agencies responsible for river management, including government authorities and private institutions, often neglect project monitoring and assessment (e.g., Palmer et al. 2005; Bernhardt et al. 2007; Brookes and Lake 2007; Palmer et al. 2014). By comparison, the problem of project maintenance is only now being considered (Moore and Rutherford 2017). Moore and Rutherford (2017) suggest that to be successful, many river restoration projects, including stock exclusion projects, must be maintained indefinitely. However, academic researchers and river management agencies tend to focus on design and implementation of these projects, rather than assessing how well interventions are maintained (e.g., DELWP 2015). This paper explores how well 1 common type of river restoration project (excluding stock from grazing riparian areas) has been maintained and assessed.

In Australia (Brookes and Lake 2007), North America (Bernhardt et al. 2007), and the UK (River Restoration Centre 2018), fencing along waterways to exclude stock is one of the most common types of river restoration projects. However, these projects are rarely monitored or assessed, and assessment methods are often inadequate, as demonstrated by the study conducted by Ede (2011). As a result, very little is known about whether landholders maintain stock exclusion over the long term or if these projects achieve the intended ecological objectives. In short, it is unclear how well scientific knowledge translates into effective environmental management (Bernhardt et al. 2007).

This study investigated stock exclusion projects in Victoria, Australia, including whether projects are maintained, the condition of riparian vegetation, and how effectively regional authorities conduct assessment and monitoring. Over the last 3 decades, more than 10 000 km of stock exclusion fencing has been constructed in Victoria through the establishment of voluntary agreements between regional catchment management authorities (CMAs) and landholders (P Vollebergh, DELWP, City, ST, personal communication). Voluntary agreements are contracts that stipulate the terms of stock exclusion projects, including funding and maintenance. The contracts specify that government agencies subsidize the construction of fences and revegetation of the riverbank with native species, and landholders are legally required to maintain fences, manage weeds in the fenced areas, and exclude stock from grazing riparian areas indefinitely (DSE 2011; Moore and Rutherford 2017).

Importantly, similar voluntary arrangements are used to implement a variety of environmental projects elsewhere, including stock exclusion and habitat enhancement in the UK (Rural Repayments Agency 2018) and North America (Bernhardt et al. 2007). Many of these projects have involved government grants for landholders to construct fences for stock exclusion, such as the UK Nature's Wildlife Enhancement Scheme Agreements (Smith and Rushton 1994; Smith et al. 2003). We are aware of only 1 study that has assessed the effectiveness of government-funded stock exclusion projects or whether landholders maintain projects (Ede 2011), and this study was also conducted in Victoria, Australia. Ede (2011) investigated 129 stock exclusion projects in Victoria and concluded that 92% of landholders continue to exclude stock. However, the only landholders evaluated were those who had volunteered their projects for evaluation. Landholders who had not maintained their frontages would be unlikely to volunteer. Thus, Ede's (2011) sample was unrepresentative. Further, the study assumed that intact fences meant that landholders did not allow stock access, which might not be the case. Given that stock exclusion projects implemented through voluntary

arrangements with landholders are 1 of the most common river restoration interventions, further research is justified.

We undertook our research in conjunction with 3 CMAs in Victoria who conducted the first regional assessments of stock exclusion projects (note that the CMAs are deidentified throughout this paper in order to maintain anonymity, so we refer to them as CMAs A, B, and C). Staff from the 3 CMAs collected data about the condition of fences, evidence of continued grazing, and the condition of vegetation. Measures of vegetation condition included the abundance of overall native vegetation, native juvenile trees, and invasive species. Importantly, each CMA used different measures and methods of data collection. Thus, our hypotheses vary between study regions. We focus on 3 research questions. Firstly, we examined how well landholders maintain stock exclusion projects. Few studies consider whether landholders continue to maintain environmental projects over the long term. One exception is research conducted in association with the US Department of Agriculture that emphasized the inhibiting cost of fence maintenance (Platts 1982; Platts and Wagstaff 1984; Platts and Nelson 1985; Reichard 1989; Hafner and Brittingham 1993). However, the problem of maintenance was identified retrospectively, rather than prospectively or experimentally. In contrast, Ede (2011) conducted 129 field assessments of stock exclusion sites in Victoria and concluded that effective stock exclusion was observed at 92% of sites. However, most stock exclusion fences contain gates. Thus, we tested whether fence condition was a good surrogate for stock exclusion and hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the condition of fencing and a separate measure of evidence of stock grazing in the riparian area. We also examined whether those landholders that continue to graze follow key recommendations outlined in the Victorian Grazing Guidelines (VGGs) (DEPI 2013; DELWP 2016), including the recommendation to exclude stock entirely for 3–5 years following revegetation and excluding stock in spring and early summer. Further, we

investigated whether grazing has ceased on sites with less than or up to 25% native vegetation cover, as stipulated in the VGGs. However, the data varied considerably between CMAs, and analysis of sites with less than or up to 25% vegetation cover was only possible on sites in CMA A.

The second research question we addressed was whether stock exclusion is associated with an improvement in the condition of riparian vegetation, including the abundance of native vegetation, juvenile trees, and invasive vegetation. Riparian grazing reduces the abundance of native vegetation on riverbanks, particularly during summer and dry periods (e.g., Fleischner 1994). In contrast, stock exclusion increases the abundance of native vegetation on riverbanks (e.g., Schulz and Leininger 1990; Miller et al. 2010; Hough-Snee et al. 2013). Thus, we hypothesized that sites with complete exclusion would contain a greater abundance of native vegetation than sites with continued grazing.

Grazing destroys seedlings before they can mature into canopy trees (Fleischner 1994), and stock exclusion increases the abundance of juvenile native trees (Robertson and Rowling 2000). Ede (2011) found that 52% of fenced riparian areas examined contained between 1%–5% coverage of juvenile trees. The abundance of juvenile trees was ranked on a scale of 1 to 5 whereby the value of 1 represented 0% coverage, the value of 2 represented less than 1% coverage, the value of 3 represented 1%–5% coverage, the value of 4 represented 6%–25% coverage, and the value of 5 represented more than 25% coverage (Ede 2011). Importantly, these categories do not reflect distinctions outlined in the Victorian Ecological Vegetation Condition (EVCs) assessment guidelines; the pre-European baseline coverage of juvenile trees on riverbanks in Victoria is 5%. Thus, it is impossible to determine the number of sites that meet the baseline condition. We hypothesized that sites with full exclusion would contain a greater abundance of juvenile trees than sites with continued grazing (Robertson and

Rowling 2000), and further that sites with exclusion would meet the EVC baseline of 5% coverage, but sites with grazing would contain less than 5% coverage.

Without effective weed management, stock exclusion sites can contain more weeds than grazed sites (Lunt et al. 2007; Morris and Reich 2013). Grazing reduces the abundance of all vegetation, including invasive species (Morris and Reich 2013). Thus, in the absence of grazing, the number of weeds could increase. However, landholders involved in stock exclusion projects in Victoria are required to manage weeds after the cessation of grazing (DSE 2011). Thus, we hypothesized that all sites examined in our study would contain a low abundance of invasive vegetation and that there would be no difference between grazed sites and sites with stock excluded from grazing the riverbank.

The third research question considered the quality of data collected by CMAs. It is widely acknowledged that lack of monitoring and assessment is a problem for river restoration projects (e.g., Palmer et al. 2005, Bernhardt et al. 2007; Brookes and Lake 2007; Kondolf et al. 2007; Palmer et al. 2014; Lave 2018). For example, the Victorian Catchment Management Council (VCMC) conducts 5-yearly reviews of all available data from the 10 Victorian CMAs about the state-wide condition of catchments, including the condition of riparian vegetation on river restoration sites (VCMC 2017). The 2012 VCMC review emphasized the inadequacy of condition assessment data across the state. The publication prompted an investigation by the Victorian Auditor-General into the effectiveness of the CMAs (Victorian Auditor-General 2014). The audit report acknowledged the substantial limitations of existing data and the need to improve arrangements for monitoring and assessment of catchment condition. Thus, in 2013 the CMAs began to assess the condition and outcomes of government-funded stock exclusion projects.

We examined whether the data would allow us to test hypotheses about whether stock exclusion improves the condition of riparian vegetation. We also considered the usefulness of the data in relation to the five-yearly reviews conducted by the VCMC. The VCMC reports about the state-wide condition of catchments in Victoria (VCMC 2017). This process requires that data are comparable between regions. Thus, we explored whether the data from 3 regions could be meaningfully compared to gain a state-wide overview of the success of riparian restoration projects. The research aims and hypotheses outlined above are summarized in the following.

RESEARCH AIMS AND HYPOTHESES

There were 3 purposes of the research. The first purpose was to determine how many landholders continue to graze in riparian areas after the establishment of fencing, compared to those that have excluded stock entirely. We also examined whether those landholders that continue to graze follow the VGGs (DELWP 2016). The second purpose of the research was to investigate whether stock exclusion is associated with an improved condition of riparian vegetation. We tested 7 hypotheses about the relationship between stock exclusion and vegetation condition. These hypotheses, and the statistical data analysis methods, are summarized in Table 1.

The third purpose of the research was to investigate the quality of data collected by CMA staff and thus whether CMA methods of assessing stock exclusion are effective. We considered whether the available data from 3 CMAs were sufficient for determining the ecological outcomes of stock exclusion projects and whether the data collected by the 3 CMAs were comparable.

METHODS

Participants and procedure

The participants were 231 landholders from 3 predominately agricultural regions in northern Victoria: CMA A (n = 137), CMA B (n = 50), and CMA C (n = 50). Landholder involvement in stock exclusion projects varied from 2 to 10 years prior to assessment. Few data were available about the age of each project. All 231 landholder properties were visited for evaluation by CMA staff members. The average age of landholders was 55 years old, and more than 80% were men. Participant property sizes ranged between 200 and 3000 hectares. Figure 2 indicates that the main farming activities were keeping stock, including cattle and sheep, and mixed agriculture, including cropping, horticulture, and stock fodder. Most farmers in CMA B were graziers, but the majority of farmers in CMA A and CMA C practiced multiple farming activities.

Data about evidence of grazing, fence condition, and vegetation condition, including the abundance of native vegetation, juvenile trees, and invasive species, were collected by CMA staff during these evaluations. In addition, we mailed a social survey to all participants to examine whether landholders who continue to graze follow the VGGs that were established by the Department of Environment and Primary Industry in 2013 (DEPI 2013; DEWLP 2016). The social survey also included items about the type of farming that landholders practice and the size of properties. In total, 93 landholders completed and returned usable surveys (40% return rate).

We also analyzed gridded daily precipitation data from the Bureau of Meteorology's Australian Water Availability Project (AWAP) data set (Jones et al. 2009) to investigate whether climate might explain any differences of vegetation condition we found between the 3 CMAs. Daily precipitation was extracted from an AWAP grid cell ($0.05^{\circ} \times 0.05^{\circ}$, approximately 5 km $\times$ 5 km) representative of the farm's latitude and longitude for the period 1900–2016. We calculated the average long-term rainfall for each of the 93 study sites and

the average of the 2 years during which the research was conducted (2013–2014) and used analysis of variances to explore any statistical differences between the regions.

Measures

Evidence of stock exclusion or stock grazing. Measures of stock exclusion were recorded by CMA staff during visual inspections and by landholder responses to open-ended questions about grazing practices in the social survey. Field observations recorded by CMA staff included hoof marks, eaten or damaged vegetation, and the presence of stock on riverbanks during the inspection. Three staff from each CMA conducted condition assessments. Staff underwent internal training to standardize assessment methods within each CMA. Thus, slightly different methods were used between each CMA.

We obtained information about whether landholder grazing regimes uphold the VGGs from the subsample of 93 landholders who completed our social survey. Vegetation data (described below) and survey data were used to investigate whether landholders who continue to graze do so in accordance with the VGGs. In 2013 the Victorian Department of Environment and Primary Industry published guidelines for managing grazing on riparian land (DEPI 2013). A revised edition was published in 2016 by the now Department of Environment, Land, Water, and Planning. These guidelines were introduced to restrict grazing to sites that are unlikely to be altered by the presence of stock on riverbanks. Grazing of short duration (“crash” grazing) is permitted to control invasive pasture grasses that would otherwise outcompete planted or self-sown native seedlings (DELWP 2016). Our study investigated whether current grazing regimes reflect key recommendations stipulated in the VGGs, including the following:

Stock should be excluded from riverbanks in spring and early summer when native species typically germinate;

Stock should be excluded from revegetation areas for 3–5 years to allow native vegetation to establish;</Bl>

Grazing should not be permitted on sites with less than or equal to 25% vegetation cover.</Bl></BL>

The social survey included 2 items about grazing regimes. The first item asked landholders to report how many years following the completion of the restoration project that grazing commenced. The second item asked about the time of year, including the seasons and months, that grazing occurs. The data were used to investigate whether grazing regimes reflect the first 2 recommendations outlined above.

Fence condition. The condition of fencing was described by CMA staff during site inspections. Observations were recorded including damage to fence wires and evidence that gates in fences were used for stock access. Each CMA developed a ranking system that indicated whether fencing effectively excluded stock from the riverbank or if stock were able to access the riverbank. For example, CMA A classed fence condition as “good,” “medium,” or “poor,” whereby fences in “good” condition effectively exclude stock, and those in “medium” or “poor” condition permit stock access to varying degrees. We standardized fence condition data from the 3 CMA regions into 2 categories: “good” fencing successfully excludes stock while “poor” fencing permits stock access to riverbanks.

Vegetation condition. The relationship between stock exclusion and vegetation condition was assessed by the abundance of native vegetation, juvenile trees, and invasive species.

However, the quality of vegetation condition data collected by the 3 CMAs varied considerably. CMA A and CMA C used standardized state-wide data collection procedures, and CMA B used a method devised by regional staff. Staff from CMA B conducted a visual assessment of riverbanks and classified vegetation condition as “good,” “medium,” or “poor.”

These data did not include measures of vegetation features or the abundance of native and invasive vegetation. Therefore, we excluded vegetation data from CMA B from our analysis. The assessment method and vegetation measures for each CMA are summarized in Table 2.

CMA A: CMA A used an assessment method consistent with the methods outlined in the Victorian EVC guidelines (DSE 2004). This method involved walking the riverbank for up to 100 m along the length of the fenced riverbank and recording observations about the abundance of vegetation observed at each site on a continuous scale between 0% and 100%. The EVC classes provide a benchmark for setting restoration goals and assessing projects (Parkes et al. 2003). We compared vegetation condition data from CMA A to the predicted pre-European vegetation species distributions (known as EVC). For example, the most common EVCs of sites in the study regions were floodplain riparian woodland, riparian forest, riverine grassy woodland, and box ironbark forest (DELWP 2017). These EVCs stipulate that the pre-European vegetation had a benchmark of 5% juvenile tree cover, whereby juvenile tree cover refers to the percentage of area covered by the foliage of individual canopy plants, taller than 0.3 m but below 5 m (DSE 2004). Therefore, we anticipated that sites in CMA A with continued grazing would have less than 5% juvenile tree cover than sites with continued grazing.

In accordance with the EVC guidelines, total native vegetation cover is classified as “absent” if less than 10% cover is observed, “few” if between 10% and 50% cover is observed, and “abundant” if more than 50% cover is observed. Total invasive species cover is classified as “low cover” if between 5% and 25% cover is present, “easily observable” if between 25% and 50% is present, and “visually dominant” if more than 50% cover is present. The total native vegetation cover of riparian areas was a measure of the highest percentage of cover of each of native grasses, shrubs, juvenile trees, and mature trees. These data were used to examine the relationship between native vegetation cover and stock exclusion and to

investigate whether grazing is excluded from sites with less than or equal to 25% native vegetation cover, as per the VGGs.

CMA C: In contrast to CMA A, staff from CMA C followed a “rapid assessment” method to assess vegetation condition. Staff walked the length of the riverbank for 100 m and recorded observations about vegetation condition. The abundance of juvenile trees and invasive species was classified on a categorical scale of 1 to 5, rather than on a continuous scale of between 0% and 100%. The value of 1 is equal to no regeneration, 2 is equal to less than 1% ground cover, 3 is equal to up to 10% ground cover, 4 is equal to between 10% and 30% groundcover, and the value of 5 is equal to abundant regrowth of more than 30% regeneration.

The abundance of invasive vegetation was also classified on a categorical scale of 1 to 5, whereby the value of 1 indicates that no invasive vegetation is present, the value of 2 indicates that less than 10% of the riverbank is covered with invasive species, the value of 3 indicates that between 10% and 40% is covered, the value of 4 indicates that between 40% and 60% is covered, and the value of 5 indicates that more than 60% of the riverbank is covered. We used these categorical data to examine the relationship between stock exclusion and the abundance of juvenile trees and invasive species on sites in CMA C.

The quality of vegetation data was also central to our analysis of the condition assessment methods employed by each CMA. We examined whether it would be possible to compare vegetation condition data to EVC benchmarks, as stipulated by the Victorian EVC guidelines (DSE 2004), and whether it was possible to compare data between the 3 CMAs.

RESULTS

The assessment of riparian restoration projects conducted by CMA staff across 3 regions included the evaluation of 231 landholder properties. However, the evaluation data indicated

that some properties no longer run cattle, while others do not currently have riverbank fencing. Therefore, the sample size varies for the statistical analyses used to test each hypothesis, as described below.

Figure 3 suggests that the annual average rainfall varies considerably between regions. ANOVA confirmed that there was a significant difference between the 3 regions for the long-term average rainfall, and the average rainfall of the 2 years during which the research was conducted (2013–2014). The long-term average rainfall of CMA B ($M = 1030.28$, $SD = 216.16$) was significantly higher than the long-term average of CMA A ($M = 405.93$, $SD = 50.48$) and CMA C ($M = 764.73$, $SD = 229.86$), $F(2, 78) = 3.12$, $P = 0.00$. Similarly, the average rainfall for 2013 and 2014 of CMA B ($M = 925.20$, $SD = 188.42$) was significantly higher than the 2-year average of CMA A ($M = 334.27$, $SD = 29.86$) and CMA C ($M = 652.36$, $SD = 198.29$), $F(2, 78) = 3.11$, $P = 0.00$.

In addition, a t test was computed to investigate whether the average rainfall in all 3 regions for 2013 and 2014 was different from the long-term average, as suggested by the columns marked “total” in Figure 3. A t test found that the average rainfall of all 93 landholder properties was significantly lower in 2013 and 2014 ($M = 742.78$, $SD = 312.12$) than the long-term average ($M = 645.22$, $SD = 285.88$), $t(82) = 2.09$, $P = 0.02$. Thus, rainfall was taken into consideration for interpreting our findings about vegetation condition.

Descriptive results

Grazing practices. The number of sites in CMAs A, B, and C where stock was grazed or excluded and where either the landholders no longer run stock or the data were insufficient to determine stock access is summarized in Table 3.

Of the subsample of 93 landholders that completed the social survey, 53 (57%) continue to graze restoration sites, and 40 (43%) practice total exclusion of stock from restoration sites. Of those landholders that continue to graze, 41 responded to the survey item asking landholders to report the time of year that grazing occurs. Most landholders graze in spring ($N = 14$) or summer ($N = 17$). Two landholders reported grazing all year round, and 2 landholders reported grazing only when the river is high. Of those that graze, 30 landholders responded to the survey item about the length of time since the establishment of the stock exclusion project after which grazing resumed. Four reported that grazing resumed less than 1 year after the establishment of stock exclusion projects, half reported that grazing resumed less than 3 years after, and the remainder reported that grazing resumed more than 3 years after.

Vegetation condition. Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations for measures of vegetation condition from sites in CMA A. Of the 137 site assessments conducted in CMA A, 4 assessments were missing data related to the coverage of juvenile trees and the total coverage of native vegetation, and 10 assessments were missing data related to the total coverage of invasive species. Therefore, the sample sizes vary for these measures (Table 4). The standard deviation of juvenile tree cover shows little variability between sites ($SD = 7.79$), but the standard deviations of native vegetation cover ($SD = 22.54$) and invasive species cover ($SD = 18.77$) show considerable variability between sites.

The means and standard deviations for measures of vegetation condition from sites in CMA C are also displayed in Table 4. The mean score for juvenile tree cover on sites in CMA C was close to the value of “3” on the categorical scale. Thus, according to the scale, most sites contained “up to 10% cover.” The standard deviation indicates very little variability ($SD = 2.66$). The mean score for the abundance of invasive species coverage on sites in CMA C

indicates that on average, sites in CMA C contain between 10% and 40% coverage. The standard deviation suggests there is little variability ($SD = 1.13$).

Data from CMA A were analyzed to determine if grazing continues on sites with less than or equal to 25% total native vegetation cover. Of the 65 sites that were grazed, 20 contained less than or equal to 25% total native vegetation cover.

Fence condition. Of the 232 site assessments, 30 records were missing data related to fence condition. In total, 70% of sites contained fences in “good” condition ($N = 141$) and 30% of sites contained fences in “poor” condition ($N = 61$). Further, chi square analysis revealed that fence condition varied between the 3 CMA regions, $\chi^2(2, N = 202) = 3.05, P = 0.000$. Of 118 sites in CMA A, 80% ($N = 94$) were in good condition. Similarly, of 38 sites in CMA C, 79% ($N = 30$) were in “good” condition. By contrast, of 46 sites in CMA B, only 37% ($N = 17$) were in “good” condition.

Relationships between grazing, vegetation condition, and fence condition

Hypotheses 1, about the relationship between stock exclusion and fence condition, was supported as there was no relationship between fence condition and grazing, $\chi^2(1, N = 124) = 0.411, P = 0.52$. Hypothesis 2 was supported because sites in CMA A that were grazed ($M = 1.68, SD = 4.14$) contained significantly less juvenile tree cover than sites with full exclusion, ($M = 4.77, SD = 9.87$), $t(131) = -2.32, P = 0.02$. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported as grazed sites contained less than 5% juvenile tree coverage, and sites with total exclusion contained only marginally less than 5%. Hypothesis 4 was supported because there was no difference in the amount of native species coverage between grazed sites ($M = 21.69, SD = 21.21$) and sites with total exclusion ($M = 23.38, SD = 23.83$), $t(131) = -0.43, P = 0.67$. Similarly, hypothesis 5 was not supported, because there no difference in the amount of

invasive species coverage between grazed sites ($M = 25.19$, $SD = 18.13$) and sites with total exclusion ($M = 29.95$, $SD = 19.20$), $t(125) = -1.44$, $P = 0.154$.

Hypothesis 6 was not supported, because the abundance of juvenile trees was no different between grazed sites ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.62$) in CMA C and sites with total exclusion ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.88$), $t(41) = -0.17$, $P = 0.868$. Hypothesis 7 was supported because there was no difference in the abundance of invasive species between grazed sites ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 0.87$) and sites with total exclusion ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.52$), $t(27) = -0.51$, $P = 0.31$. All sites contained between 10% and 40% coverage of invasive vegetation.

Data quality and the consistency between CMA vegetation measures

The research investigated the effectiveness of vegetation condition assessments from 2 perspectives: first, whether the data were of sufficient quality to determine the influence of stock exclusion projects on vegetation condition, and second, whether it was possible to meaningfully compare data between the 3 CMAs. We found that the quality of vegetation condition data varied considerably between CMAs. We were able to statistically analyze data collected by CMA A and CMA C. The analysis explored whether the abundance of native vegetation, juvenile trees, and invasive vegetation was different for grazed sites than for sites with complete stock exclusion. In addition, it was possible to compare data from CMA A against the relevant EVC baselines. However, we were unable to compare data from CMA B or CMA C against baseline conditions.

We also found that it was not possible to compare vegetation data between the 3 CMAs or to summarize the overall condition of vegetation across the 3 regions. Thus, with the exception of the abundance of juvenile trees in CMA A, it is difficult to be definitive about whether stock exclusion projects are effective for improving the condition of degraded riparian vegetation in Victoria.

DISCUSSION

To be effective, many environmental projects, such as stock exclusion, must be monitored, assessed, and maintained indefinitely. We examined data from an evaluation of a common river restoration project: stock exclusion. Here we discuss the main findings, and the implications for improving the success of river restoration more widely.

Maintenance of fences and stock exclusion

Despite that fact that approximately 70% of fences on stock exclusion sites were in “good” condition, stock grazing continues on nearly half of the sites examined in the research. Ede (2011) assumed that intact fences successfully excluded stock. However, we found that there was no relationship between fence condition and evidence of grazing, suggesting that fence condition alone is not an appropriate proxy for actual stock access to riverbanks. Of the 93 landholders who complete the social survey, 53 continue to graze the fenced frontage. The VGGs suggest that stock should be excluded from riverbank areas during spring and early summer and that grazing should cease for between 3 to 5 years after the establishment of restoration sites. Of the 53 landholders that continue to graze, more than half graze in spring and summer. More than half reported that grazing recommenced less than 3 years after the establishment of projects. The grazing guidelines also stipulate that full exclusion should occur on sites with less than 25% total cover of native vegetation. Grazing continues on 65 sites in CMA A, and nearly one-third of those sites contain less than 25% total coverage of native vegetation.

To be effective, stock exclusion projects must be maintained indefinitely. These results suggest that landholders who voluntarily adopt environmental practices do not necessarily maintain those practices over the long term. This failure could be explained by numerous factors, including whether the terms of voluntary agreements are adequate (in this case, this

evaluation includes whether the agreements reflect the grazing guidelines) and if the individual landholder chooses to uphold the terms of the agreement. Given that CMA records are incomplete, the exact number of landholders in agreements that predate the grazing guidelines is not known.

Problems related to the establishment and administration of contractual agreements between parties involved in environmental management are not uncommon. Even when the contract is commercial in nature, compliance can be poor. For example, Hallwood (2007) suggests that the failure of 50% of mitigation wetlands in the United States is related to the poor design and implementation of contracts between government agencies and the firms who construct the wetlands. Firms shirk contractual responsibilities, such as maintaining water levels, because their operations are not overseen by regulatory authorities. Thus, Hallwood (2007) concludes, “An un-enforced contract is not worth the paper it is written on.” Many river restoration projects, including stock exclusion, increasing instream wood loads, and habitat enhancement (e.g., Gunningham 2003; Bernhardt et al. 2007; Rural Payments Agency 2018), involve establishing voluntary opt-in agreements with farmers. It is highly probable that such voluntary agreements will require even more oversight than the robust legal contracts between regulatory authorities and mitigation wetland agencies.

Abundance of vegetation

We hypothesized that sites with stock excluded would contain a greater abundance of native species (e.g., Schulz and Leininger 1990; Hough-Snee et al. 2013). In contrast to the findings of Ede (2011), stock exclusion in CMA A did not increase the amount of native vegetation within the fenced frontage, compared to sites with continued grazing. However, it is likely that 2 years of below-average rainfall reduced the growth of native species. Thus, our data may not reflect the true benefits of stock exclusion for increasing the abundance of native

vegetation. In the context of climate change and drought events in Australia, native vegetation may struggle to outcompete invasive species, particularly in the absence of effective weed management (e.g., Morris and Reich 2013).

Consistent with Robertson and Rowling (2000), sites in CMA A with continued grazing contained less cover of juvenile trees than sites with stock excluded. Grazed sites contained less than half the amount of cover stipulated as the EVC baseline for juvenile trees, and sites with stock excluded contained nearly the baseline amount. This result suggests that excluding stock might contribute to an increase in the abundance of juvenile trees.

Sites in CMA C were ranked on a scale of 1 to 5 in relation to juvenile tree coverage. This approach is not dissimilar to the method employed by Ede (2011). However, unlike Ede (2011), we found that there was no difference for juvenile tree coverage between sites with stock grazing and sites with stock exclusion in CMA C. This difference may be because our sample size was smaller than Ede's (2011) or that the data rankings may have obscured any genuine differences between grazed and ungrazed sites.

As predicted, there was no relationship between the abundance of weeds and grazing on sites in CMA A and sites in CMA C. All sites in CMA A contained low (between 5% and 25%) abundance of invasive species. All sites in CMA C contained between 10% and 40% abundance of invasive species. This result suggests that landholders are performing weed management. The fact that sites in CMA C contain a greater abundance of invasive species than sites in CMA A may be related to climate. During 2013 and 2014, CMA A experienced significantly less rainfall than sites in CMA C (Figure 3). Thus, the low amount of invasive vegetation may reflect rainfall rather than the amount of weeding performed by landholders.

Overall, our results suggest that while most landholders maintain fences, approximately half continue some amount of grazing. Thus, fence condition does not reflect stock grazing.

Further, with the exception of juvenile trees, there is little relationship between grazing and vegetation. However, this may be because the time between the establishment and assessment of projects varies considerably between sites. Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain exact dates for when each project was established. We know that some projects were established several years ago, while others were established more than a decade ago. Juvenile trees of between 0.3 m to 0.6 m in height can grow within a year of seeding or planting saplings (Di Stefano 2002). Thus, it is possible that not enough time has elapsed since the establishment of some projects to find significant changes in the abundance of native vegetation.

Of note, our results may also be confounded by 2 years of below-average rainfall. Death et al. (2015) emphasize the importance of designing river restoration projects in the context of future climate change trajectories, such as extreme flooding, that may alter channel morphology and ecology. We suggest that it is equally as important to consider if existing management arrangements are likely to be suitable in the future. Landholders in drought-prone regions (or flood-prone regions) may require additional assistance to maintain environmental projects (Moore et al. 2018).

Effectiveness of condition assessment

This study suggests that poor data quality and lack of consistency between agencies are ongoing problems that continue to present challenges for the assessment and management of river restoration projects. Each CMA used different assessment methods. Thus, it is difficult to determine how effective stock exclusion projects are or the overall condition of riverine ecosystems in Victoria.

These observations demonstrate the importance of linking measures of condition assessment to benchmark targets for vegetation recovery and highlight a fundamental problem with environmental management that involves multiple tiers of governance (such as between the

state departments responsible for publishing guidelines and CMAs): lack of consistency and oversight. Methods of assessment and the conditions of voluntary agreements should reflect best-practice guidelines. Oversight is required, both in terms of government agencies ensuring CMAs follow consistent methods and in terms of farmers complying with contracts. Hallwood (2007) comes to similar conclusions about the widespread failure of mitigation wetlands. The US Environmental Protection Agency provides numerous guidance documents about complying with the requirements for establishing mitigation wetlands (USEPA 2018). However, these guidelines are often not adhered to. Thus, oversight is required to improve compliance, and contracts should include penalties for noncompliance (Hallwood 2007).

Our suspicion is that the problem of inconsistent methods between CMAs in Victoria is related to the transition from regional management systems to a centralized condition assessment system. Prior to the introduction of centralized systems in recent years, including the EVCs and VGGs, the CMAs developed independent methods of implementing and assessing river restoration projects. CMA officers are likely to be concerned that they will lose much of the valuable information that they have collected in the past if it is not consistent with the new centralized approaches. Thus, further research is needed to support the transition to consistent methods of condition assessment that are comparable between regions while still maintaining the value of existing CMA data. This type of transition from regional to centralized methods of environmental management represents the maturation of the river restoration sector.

Limitations. There are 4 limitations of this study that may have influenced our data and our findings. First, most agricultural sites have histories related to past land use practices. Past land use can influence the success of current restoration practices. For example, a longer history of grazing prior to the current landholder is likely to make it more difficult to revegetate the riverbank (Belsky et al. 1999). Similarly, the time since stock exclusion, and

thus the amount of recovery, varied between sites. Second, many stock exclusion projects were established during the recent decade-long drought in Victoria. Reduced rainfall may have reduced vegetation growth (Jansen and Robertson 2001). Third, while most sites included in this study ran cattle, approximately one-quarter also ran sheep. Given that sheep have less effect on riverbanks, this difference is not likely to affect the main outcomes of our study, other than to underrepresent the true effect of cattle on riverbanks. Fourth, evidence of grazing does not always reflect landholder practices. In some cases, stock from properties on the other side of the waterway can gain access to restoration sites by crossing the river channel. This crossing is a known issue and 1 that CMAs are actively addressing. Fifth, this study does not account for landscape-scale factors, including the availability of upstream seedbanks and flood regimes.

CONCLUSIONS

The success of environmental projects in river basins depends as much on maintenance and management as it does on designing and implementing appropriate interventions (Moore and Rutherford 2017). To be effective, voluntary agreements should stipulate measurable targets and reinforce strong links between restoration activities and the ecological processes that are involved for achieving those targets (Danne 2003; Kehoe 2006).

We found that each CMA involved in the research used different vegetation assessment methods. Thus, it was difficult to draw conclusions about the condition of vegetation in Victoria or the success of stock exclusion projects. Our analysis suggests that voluntary agreements should contain specific terms that are consistent with best-practice guidelines, and that policy makers should conduct more effective oversight of contract compliance.

Further, we acknowledge that the river restoration industry is in transition, from fragmented approaches to centralized approaches. While this transition is necessary to effectively

evaluate the success of costly projects, there is a need to consider the effect of this transition on regional authorities. The process would benefit from greater participation from, and consultation with, regional authorities.

It appears that there are few incentives for landholders to uphold the terms of their voluntary agreements, and no consequences if they do not do so. These limitations are common problems with using voluntary agreements to implement environmental projects (e.g., Danne 2003). Others have suggested that in some circumstances VAs should be more strictly policed (Gunningham 2003). We suggest this is possible for the VAs considered here. CMAs could require landholders to pay back the cost of fencing, revoke grazing licenses, or issue fines. However, using such legal measures may discourage other farmers from entering into voluntary agreements in the future. Thus, while there is a need to develop more effective incentives for compliance, the use of legal instruments should be given careful consideration. It may be possible to reinforce a sense of social responsibility and obligation by CMA officers visiting the sites more frequently and informing landholders of what other farmers like them are doing (Moore et al. 2018).

The agricultural sector is one of the single greatest contributors to the degradation of river systems worldwide (Belsky et al. 1999; Suding 2011). Projects to exclude stock from grazing riverbanks are among the most common river restoration projects. The next challenge is to ensure that these projects, and river restoration projects more generally, are assessed and maintained to the degree that is required to improve the ecological condition of river systems. Addressing this challenge will involve the following: enhancing the capacity of water authorities to conduct effective monitoring and assessment, supporting landholders in meeting challenges associated with climate change, and determining where in the chain of administration the link between state-level guidelines and local and regional practices has broken.

Acknowledgment—We acknowledge and thank the CMA staff who participated in this research. Their insight and experience were critical to the study (unfortunately we cannot name them to maintain anonymity). We thank the 93 landholders who completed the social survey about grazing regimes. We also thank the University of Melbourne Behavioural Sciences ethics committee who provided valuable feedback and approved the research (Approval ID: 1441618).

Data Accessibility—Data used in this study can be provided on request. However, readers should be aware that in compliance with the ethics approval for the research, no data that may identify the landholders or regional authorities involved in the research may be made public.

References

- Belsky AJ, Matzke A, Uselman S. 1999. Survey of livestock influences on stream and riparian ecosystems in the western United States. *J Soil Water Conserv* 54(1):419–431.
- Bernhardt ES, Sudduth EB, Palmer MA, Allan JD, Meyer JL, Alexander G, Follstad-Shah J, Lave R, Rumps J. 2007. Restoring rivers one reach at a time: Results from a survey of US river restoration practitioners. *Restor Ecol* 15(3):482–493.
- Brooks SS, Lake PS. 2007. River restoration in Victoria, Australia: Change is in the wind, and none too soon. *Restor Ecol* 15(3):584–591.
- Danne AP. 2003. Voluntary environmental agreements in Australia: An analysis of statutory and non-statutory frameworks for the implementation of voluntary environmental agreements in Australia. *EPLJ* 20(4):287–318.
- [DELWP] Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. 2016. Managing grazing on riparian land field companion. [cited Year Month Day].
https://www.water.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0022/52690/Riparian-grazing-guidelines-field-companion-Final-2016X.pdf
- [DELWP] Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. 2017. Bioregions and EVC benchmarks. [cited Year Month Day].
<https://www.environment.vic.gov.au/biodiversity/bioregions-and-evc-benchmarks>
- [DEPI] Department of Environment, Planning, and Industry. 2013. Managing grazing on riparian land: Decision support tool guidelines. [cited Year Month Day].
<http://www.depi.vic.gov.au/water/rivers-estuaries-and-wetlands/implementation-and-monitoring/managing-grazing-on-riparian-land>
- [DSE] Department of Sustainability and Environment. 2004. Vegetation quality assessment manual—guidelines for applying the habitat hectares scoring method version 1.3.

- [cited Year Month Day].
https://www.environment.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0023/51809/VQAM-V1_3-Chapters-1-11.pdf
- [DSE] Department of Sustainability and Environment. 2011. CMA-Landholder riparian management agreement guidelines. Victoria (AU): The State of Victoria.
- Ede F. 2011. Riparian works evaluation project: Final report. [cited Year Month Day].
https://www.water.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/52680/Final-Riparian-Works-Evaluation-report-2011.pdf
- Fleischner TL. 1994. Ecological costs of livestock grazing in western North America. *Conserv Biol* 8(3):629–644.
- Gunningham N. 2003. Voluntary and negotiated agreements in agriculture: Towards a partnership approach to resource management. *Australasian J Nat Resources Law Policy* 8(Part 1):1–28.
- Hafner CL, Brittingham MC. 1993. Evaluation of a stream-bank fencing program in Pennsylvania. *Wildl Soc Bull* 21(3):307–315.
- Hallwood P. 2007. Contractual difficulties in environmental management: The case of wetland mitigation banking. *Ecol Econ* 63(2–3):446–451.
- Hough-Snee N, Roper BB, Wheaton JM, Budy P, Lokteff RL. 2013. Riparian vegetation communities change rapidly following passive restoration at a northern Utah stream. *Ecol Eng* 58:371–377.
- Jansen A, Robertson AI. 2001. Riparian bird communities in relation to land management practices in floodplain woodlands of south-eastern Australia. *Biol Conserv* 100(2):173–185.
- Jones DA, Wang W, Fawcett R. 2009. High-quality spatial climate data-sets for Australia. *AMOJ* 58(4):233–248.
- Kehoe J. 2006. Utilisation of voluntary conservation agreements in Australia: A perspective on Queensland. In: Proceedings of the 5th EJGCS Conference. Oxford (UK): Inter-Disciplinary Press. p 1–15.
- Koehn JD, Brierley GJ, Cant BL, Lucas AM. 2001. River Restoration Framework. Canberra (AU): Land and Water Australia. Occasional Paper 01/01.
- Kondolf GM, Anderson S, Lave R, Pagano L, Merenlender A, Bernhardt E. 2007. Two decades of river restoration in California: What can we learn? *Restor Ecol* 15(3):516–523.
- Lave R. 2018. Stream mitigation banking. *WIREs Water* 5:e1279.
- Moore HE, Rutherford ID. 2017. Lack of maintenance is a major challenge for stream restoration projects. *River Res Appl* 33(9):1387–1399.
- Moore HE, Rutherford ID, Peel MC. 2018. Excluding stock from riverbanks for environmental restoration: The influence of social norms, drought, and off-farm income on landholder behaviour. *J Rural Stud* 62:116–124.
- Newson M. 2008. Land, water and development: Sustainable and adaptive management of rivers. London (UK): Routledge.
- Palmer MA, Bernhardt ES, Allan JD, Lake PS, Alexander G, Brooks S, Carr J, Clayton S, Dahm CN, Follstad Shah J, Galat DL. 2005. Standards for ecologically successful river restoration. *J Appl Ecol* 42(2):208–217.

- Palmer MA, Hondula KL, Koch BJ. 2014. Ecological restoration of streams and rivers: Shifting strategies and shifting goals. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* 45:247–269.
- Parkes D, Newell G, Cheal D. 2003. Assessing the quality of native vegetation: The ‘habitat hectares’ approach. *Ecol Manage Restor* 4:S29–S38.
- Platts WS. 1982. Sheep and cattle grazing strategies on riparian-stream environments. Wildlife-Livestock Relationships Symposium. Moscow (ID): University of Idaho Experimental Station.
- Platts WS, Wagstaff FJ. 1984. Fencing to control livestock grazing on riparian habitats along streams: Is it a viable alternative? *N Am J Fish Manage* 4(3):266–272.
- Platts WS, Nelson RL. 1985. Stream habitat and fisheries response to livestock grazing and instream improvement structures, Big Creek, Utah. *J Soil Water Conserv* 40(4):374–379.
- Reichard N. 1989. Restoring and maintaining riparian habitat on private pastureland. In: Proceedings of the California Riparian Systems Conference; 1988 September 22–24; Davis, CA. City (ST): Publisher. p 211.
- River Restoration Centre. 2018. National river restoration inventory. [cited Year Month Day]. <http://www.therrc.co.uk/national-river-restoration-inventory-nrri>
- Robertson A, Rowling R. 2000. Effects of livestock on riparian zone vegetation in an Australian dryland river. *River Res Appl* 16(5):527–541.
- Rural Repayment Agency. 2018. Hot and dry weather conditions in England. [cited 2018 August 6]. <http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hot-and-dry-weather-conditions-in-england>
- Rutherford ID, Jerie K, Marsh N. 2000. A Rehabilitation Manual for Australian Streams. Vol 1. Victoria (AU): Cooperative Research Centre for Catchment Hydrology.
- Schulz TT, Leininger WC. 1990. Differences in riparian vegetation structure between grazed areas and exclosures. *J Range Manage* 43(4):295–299.
- Smith RS, Charman D, Rushton SP, Sanderson RA, Simkin JM, Shiel RS. 2003. Vegetation change in an ombrotrophic mire in northern England after excluding sheep. *Appl Veg Sci* 6(2):261–270.
- Smith RS, Rushton SP. 1994. The effects of grazing management on the vegetation of mesotrophic (meadow) grassland in Northern England. *J Appl Ecol* 31(1):13–24.
- Suding KN. 2011. Toward an era of restoration in ecology: successes, failures, and opportunities ahead. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* 42:465–487.
- [USEPA] United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2018. Compensatory mitigation. [cited 2018 August 7]. <http://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/compensatory-mitigation#guidance>
- VCMC. 2017. Publications. [cited Year Month Day]. <http://www.vcmc.vic.gov.au/publications.html>
- Victorian Auditor-General. 2014. Effectiveness of the catchment management authorities. PP No 364, Session 2010–2014. Melbourne (AU): Victorian Auditor-General's Office. 54 p.

<abstract type="short">Key Points

Maintenance is as important to the success of river restoration as the design of projects.</Bl>

<Bl>Nearly half of landholders who exclude stock from grazing riparian areas with fencing continue to allow stock access to the riverbank.</Bl>

<Bl>Well-maintained fences are not necessarily effective for excluding stock from grazing riparian areas; the research found no relationship between fence condition and grazing practices.</Bl>

<Bl>It is difficult to determine the outcomes of stock exclusion projects because the condition assessment methods are poor, inconsistent across the state, and inconsistent with state guidelines; effective assessment and management is essential for the success of river restoration projects.</Bl></BL>

Figure 1. Principles of adaptive management for establishing river restoration projects (adapted from Rutherford et al. [2001]).

Figure 2. Frequency of common farming activities (sheep, cattle, and mixed farming, whereby mixed farming refers to a combination of cropping, lifestyle, and stock) in CMA A, CMA B, and CMA C.

Figure 3. Long-term and 2-year (2013–2014) annual average rainfall for CMA A, CMA B, and CMA C.

Table 1. Hypotheses and statistical data analysis methods

1	No relationship between stock exclusion and fence condition.	Chi square
2	Sites in CMA A with continued grazing will contain less cover of juvenile trees than sites with stock exclusion.	
3	Sites in CMA A with continued grazing will contain less than 5% coverage of juvenile trees, but sites with stock exclusion will contain 5% or greater coverage of juvenile trees.	

4	Sites in CMA A with continued grazing will contain less native vegetation than sites with stock exclusion.	<i>t</i> test
5	No difference for abundance of invasive vegetation between sites in CMA A with continued grazing and sites with stock exclusion.	
6	Sites in CMA C with continued grazing will contain less juvenile tree coverage than sites with stock exclusion.	
7	No difference for abundance of invasive vegetation between sites in CMA C with continued grazing and sites with stock exclusion.	

Table 2.

CMA	Assessment method	Vegetation measures
A	Consistent with EVC guidelines	Continuous scale % cover, 0–100
B	Method devised by CMA	Poor, medium, good
C	State-sanctioned rapid assessment method	Categorical scale, 1–5

Table 3. Summary of grazing practices

CMA	Grazed	Excluded	No stock/insufficient data
A	65	71	1
B	13	25	12
C	16	27	1
Total	94	109	14

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for measures of vegetation condition in CMA A and CMA C

	N	Mean	SD
CMA A juvenile tree cover (%)	133	3.29	7.79
CMA A total native vegetation cover (%)	133	22.56	22.54
CMA A total invasive species cover (%)	127	27.66	18.77

CMA C abundance of juvenile trees ^a	44	2.66	0.78
CMA C abundance of invasive species ^b	44	3.27	1.13

^a Juvenile tree cover for CMA C was measured on a scale of 1 to 5, in which the value of 1 represents the least amount of cover and the value of 5 represents the most amount of cover.

^b Abundance of invasive species cover was measured on a scale of 1 to 5, in which the value of 1 represents the least amount of cover and the value of 5 represents the most amount of cover.

Author Manuscript

Figure_1_FINAL .

Figure_2 .

Figure_3 .

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Moore, HE;Rutherford, ID

Title:

Using voluntary agreements to exclude stock from waterways: An evaluation of project success and persistence

Date:

2019-03-01

Citation:

Moore, H. E. & Rutherford, I. D. (2019). Using voluntary agreements to exclude stock from waterways: An evaluation of project success and persistence. INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT, 15 (2), pp.237-247. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4099>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/284530>