

Workshop Evaluation


NAWMP Workshop

Ottawa

February 16-17, 2010


The meeting objective “To begin a process of engagement with waterfowl managers concerning the practical aspects of fulfilling ‘A Vision for Integrated Waterfowl Management’” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




The meeting objective “To provide stakeholders (and/or their proxies) an opportunity to express their beliefs about the appropriate objectives of waterfowl management, and how they might best be pursued from a large-scale, strategic perspective” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




The meeting objective “To provide feedback that will be useful to the Plan Committee as they develop the scope and nature of the pending Plan Revision” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




The meeting objective “Seek input from Canadian waterfowl managers, partners and stakeholders so that interests related to habitat and harvest objectives are included in the NAWMP revision process” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




The meeting objective “Encourage Canadian waterfowl managers, partners and stakeholders to contribute to the revised tri-national vision for waterfowl conservation on the North American continent” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




How do you feel about the Revision process as described at this meeting?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Okay
4. Not so good
5. Bad



The meeting's facilitation by Ginny Wallace and Dave Case was:

1. Very Good
2. Good
3. Average
4. Poor
5. Very Poor



Overall, I thought this workshop was a success

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

