**MODEL/PRODUCT/TOOL/FRAMEWORK EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Tool Reviewed: Alan Ager, Landscape Treatment Designer

Small Group Members: Please listen carefully to the presentation for the tool you have been assigned to review. Record comments below related to your understanding based on what you hear. There will be a chance to get clarification with the presenter later in the day.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Review Comments** |
| Tool Objectives | Informs tradeoffs; unique restoration goals; aggregation of treatments; optimize goals. Translates assessment into project (planning); prioritizes projects by sequence (schedule) |
| Processes Modeled | Not one model. Takes all of the various layers an aggregates them; financial exposure (cost constraints) |
| Vegetation classification used | No specific layer; flexible |
| Treatment of uncertainty |  |
| Spatial options/landscape size limits | Multi-scales can be addressed. The larger the scale, the more time it takes to model. |
| Required inputs and possible outputs | User controlled output (user defined); shapefiles (polygons) of treatment areas; financial exposure |
| Scenario comparison capability/ease | Website not available for original version; current version not available for distribution: need to talk to Alan directly. Can be compared with scenario/frontiers. |
| Compatibility with other modeling systems | ? |
| Documentation/training/ease of use/user interface | Not easy |
| Planning horizon capability – how many years out can it “look”? 10, 50, 100? | Not for this purpose; not for temporal forecast; for optimization |
| Need for researchers to run the model | With the author present |
| Data requirements: existing? readily available? | Using existing layers; existing data can be used. Quality of data or proxy may vary. |
| Feasible with existing computing capability? | Unknown what computer “computing” capacity needed |
| How simple is it to understand outcomes? | “tables” were very complex/confusing. Some output (tables/shapefiles) are probably useful. |
| Are the drivers obvious and sensitivity known? | Components (layers) that lead to the outcome are obvious. Drivers are well defined. Sensitivity to the drivers is not as well described from presentation.  |
| Is it transparent? Any black boxes? | More time understanding the tool is needed to be able to say |
| Can the model predict trends, or would other tools need to generate products to feed in for evaluation? | The model is not for predicting trends. Not a process model: an optimization model. |