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

Tool Reviewed:\_\_\_\_EMDS/ OWNF version \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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.

Strengths: Can pick from wide array of variables and can integrate across disparate resources. Can see how changing management of one resource affects others. Great model for project planning and integration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Review Comments** |
| Model Objectives | Where to do which activities. Provides diagnostic data to develop prescriptions.  |
| Processes Modeled | Doesn’t model processes. Good for modeling/ analyzing landscape patterns.  |
| Vegetation classification used | Many vegetation attributes based on photo-interpreted data for both HRV conditions and current conditions.  |
| Treatment of uncertainty | Fuzzy logic – statistical sampling of conditions. |
| Spatial options/landscape size limits | EMDS works across scales. As used for the OWNF project presented, the size was a couple of watersheds.  |
| Required inputs and possible outputs | This is real challenge for practical implementation across NF lands in the Northwest. Depending on where you want to use this model, and if you want to use it as it was used on the OWNF, there could be a great deal of work involved in getting the necessary data prepped for the project. Photos need to be interpreted to create the current condition layer, and historical photos may need to be interpreted to develop the HRV conditions as well. FRV assumptions are simplistic and inadequate. Outputs are prioritized areas for specific land management activities.  |
| Scenario comparison capability/ease | Not scenarios so much but can change priorities and see the implications. Can apply to unique areas and special priorities or places.  |
| Compatibility with other modeling systems | Outputs from other models (e.g. FlamMap or other fire risk assessments) can be incorporated as a layer on which to prioritize. Works with ArcGIS.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Review Comments** |
| Documentation/training/ease of use/user interface | There is disagreement on this with some people thinking training needs are straightforward and EMDS would be relatively simple to operate with others reporting long training periods and difficulty in using EMDS. |
| Planning horizon capability – how many years out can it “look”? 10, 50, 100? | Point in time prioritization. No simulation capabilities.  |
| Need for researchers to run the model | Decisions models can be run easily with some training. Logic models generally run by researchers.  |
| Data requirements: existing? readily available? | See data requirements above.  |
| Feasible with existing computing capability? | ?? |
| How simple is it to understand outcomes? | There is disagreement on this though generally it seems that to outsiders that the outcomes can be confusing unless you’re intimately associated with running the model and interpreting the results.  |
| Are the drivers obvious and sensitivity known? | User defined so yes.  |
| Is it transparent? Any black boxes? | It appears black box-like to those not intimately involved in the modeling.  |
| Can the model predict trends, or would other tools need to generate products to feed in for evaluation? | Nope. No ability to predict trends.  |