1. Facilities
Please rate the facilities based on the following criteria (i.e., temperature, seating arrangements, etc.):
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**Improvements and Comments:**
- Comfortable room good catering

2. Facilitator
Please rate the facilitator based on the following criteria (i.e., accomplishing roles & responsibilities):

![Bar Chart](chart2.png)

**Comments:**
- Dynamic "on the ball"
- Myriad of resources, transparent, fair and impartial
- Great improvement
3. Please rate the Speakers (i.e., handouts, speaking at a level that is clearly understood):

a) Storm Damage - Justin Kumagai, WFP, Resident Engineer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>10% Excellent</th>
<th>80% Good</th>
<th>10% Good</th>
<th>90% Satisfactory</th>
<th>40% Satisfactory</th>
<th>40% Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>100% Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Mills and Processing - Doug Abbott – Manager Fiber Contracts (WFP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>10% Good</th>
<th>90% Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10% Good</td>
<td>90% Satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Presentation on Variable Retention - Bill Beese; WFP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>40% Excellent</th>
<th>20% Good</th>
<th>40% Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>40% Excellent</td>
<td>40% Good</td>
<td>20% Satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Watershed Projects - Glynnis Horel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>10% Excellent</th>
<th>90% Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>10% Excellent</td>
<td>90% Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) District Manager, Trish Balcaen, South Island Forest District, Ministry of Forest and Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>10% Excellent</th>
<th>10% Good</th>
<th>40% Satisfactory</th>
<th>40% Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>50% Good</td>
<td>40% Satisfactory</td>
<td>10% Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Operations Engineer, WFP Mike Davies; Analysis of Non-Contributing Landbase Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>20% Excellent</th>
<th>80% Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>10% Excellent</td>
<td>90% Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Out of the 12 evaluation forms completed 2 AG members did not comment as they were new to the process. The above % were based on 10 completed = 100%
  * Fortunate to have a strong compliment of speakers and a broad range of topics on relevant issues
4. Please rate the information provided at and for the meetings (i.e., adequate information provided for informed decision making)

![Graph showing relevance and informative ratings]

**Comments:**
- I like the new format for agenda and actions; we seem to be actually finishing something!

5. **General Process**
Please rate the overall process based on the following criteria. The process is based on effectiveness (i.e., accomplishing desired effect), Company Performance (i.e., performance, continual improvement over time), Achieving goals (i.e., SFM performance over time), and representation (i.e., is it adequate enough?)
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**Comments:**
- The Company deserves an “Excellent” for effort excellence in achievement must await more long-term results

6. **SFM Process**
There are six criteria within the Sustainable Forest Management Plan. Under each criterion is a set of elements which are established by the CSA standard. Within each criterion is a comprehensive Management Strategy. Please rate the overall process based on the following:

**Conservation of Biological Diversity** - Indicators 1 – 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forest Ecosystem Condition and Productivity** - Indicators 13 - 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conservation of Soil and Water Resources - Indicators 21 - 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forest Contributions to Global Ecological Cycles - Indicators 29 - 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Benefits to Society - Indicators 31 - 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepting Society’s Responsibility for Sustainable Development - Indicators 44 - 59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Comments

- Little or no improvement in performance
- The process over the last year appears to be far more informative and fair
- Is this forestry sustainable?
- The entire process is valuable but it becomes meaningless if we do not listen to one another and we continue to change the targets
- Indicators which WFP have trouble making are either dropped or the target is changed to make it easier to achieve
- The company appears to be trying to do the best they can, there is value in this table
- The kinds of measures which have been chosen, speak only indirectly to bio-diversity and the ecosystem. While they were chosen for ease and simplicity of collection they fall short of achieving the biological and ecological measure in many cases
- Water conservation may be out of our local hands given global trends; likewise contributions to global ecological cycles are different at a local scale.
- The effort is achieving its greatest success in terms of endeavoring to involve and respond to societal concerns and needs
- We spend a great deal of time spinning our collective wheels. To put it bluntly the goal posts are constantly being moved and the playing field is under construction. Sometimes I wonder if we are making progress.