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

Tool Reviewed: TNC Haugo et al.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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** |
| Model Objectives | * Regional prioritization of terrestrial vegetation restoration needs * Help determine where, how much, and what type of restoration needs exist from a structural perspective following broad categories * Quantifying departure from reference conditions |
| Processes Modeled | Process are *not* modeled, bur are rather scored. Departure is quantified (“scored”) against a baseline/reference condition. |
| Vegetation classification used | PVT is based on ILAP using crosswalking to LANDFIRE BpS (Reference conditions come from LANDFIRE BpS)  Current conditions come from classified GNN data |
| Treatment of uncertainty | Not really factored in, but some inherent uncertainty is inherent in the probability associated with generating the natural range of variation values that are used as the reference conditions. |
| Spatial options/landscape size limits | Ecological / Provincial scale (broad scale). However, this concept could be applied at other scales within certain constraints, namely the minimum size limit being based on both the resolution of inputs and more importantly, tied to the predominant disturbance regime associated with the specific BpS. |
| Required inputs and possible  outputs | Inputs:   * ILAP PVTs -> BpS xwalk * Landfire reference conditions * GNN existing conditions   Outputs   * Quantified departure scores * Classified departure by management need |
| Scenario comparison capability/ease | Not a projection model, so N/A. Though this could be used as a scoring or accounting tool for scenarios, but only within the minimum size constraints discussed under spatial options. |
| Compatibility with other modeling systems | This is a broad framework, not a modeling system, but it does tie partially with VDDT/ST-Sim |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Review Comments** |
| Documentation/training/ease of use/user interface | Documentation is good for intended use. However, if the methodology were to be applied to other datasets, then a general user interface for doing so would be beneficial. |
| Planning horizon capability – how many years out can it “look”? 10, 50, 100? | N/A not a futuring tool |
| Need for researchers to run the model | Not as already run. However, there is not a “plug and play” tool for use with new data or use outside R6 (aka novel landscapes). |
| Data requirements: existing? readily available? | Yes existing, yes available; uses existing data elements for the NWFP and R6 area. |
| Feasible with existing computing capability? | Yes |
| How simple is it to understand outcomes? | General outcomes are fairly simplistic, but there are risks inherent in over interpreting the data or interpreting them at inappropriate scales. |
| Are the drivers obvious and sensitivity known? | Yes, especially for classifying the types of activities needed at broad scales. However, the tool is not geared to fine scale elements. |
| Is it transparent? Any black boxes? | Yes, fairly transparent. |
| Can the model predict trends, or would other tools need to generate products to feed in for evaluation? | No, but it could be used to score trends generated in other tools such as St-Sim |