

Appendix | 6

2008 - 2009 Integrated Watershed
Management Initiative


Integrated Watershed Management
Symposium Feedback Questionnaire

1. Please rank the following: 5 = Excellent ----> 1 = Poor								
	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Rating Average	Response Count
Pre-Symposium Communication	27.6% (16)	29.3% (17)	32.8% (19)	1.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	8.6% (5)	3.91	58
Symposium Location	34.5% (20)	41.4% (24)	17.2% (10)	3.4% (2)	3.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.00	58
Meeting Rooms	37.9% (22)	32.8% (19)	19.0% (11)	10.3% (6)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.98	58
Meals	46.6% (27)	36.2% (21)	10.3% (6)	3.4% (2)	3.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.19	58
Symposium Coordination	55.2% (32)	37.9% (22)	3.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.4% (2)	4.54	58
Registration Process	53.4% (31)	32.8% (19)	5.2% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.6% (5)	4.53	58
Comments								17
answered question								58
skipped question								0

Comments		
1	Meeting Rooms - cold	May 29, 2009 6:57 PM
2	Meeting Rooms - cold Meals - would be nice to have had supper arranged	May 29, 2009 6:57 PM
3	Pre-Symposium Communication - could have explained the symposium objective more clearly Meeting Rooms - A/C was excessive	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
4	I didn't know much about it, not sure where it was advertised? Presenters were very good. The first day, it would have been nice to have had a break between long presentations.	May 29, 2009 7:53 PM
5	Meals - fantastic	May 29, 2009 7:59 PM
6	Meeting room was too cool	Jun 1, 2009 1:58 PM
7	It would be very helpful for choosing concurrent sessions to be given more information about what will be covered in them. The titles provided were often quite broad, and weren't always very helpful for choosing the most relevant sessions to attend.	Jun 3, 2009 2:38 PM
8	Very well organized, helpful and friendly support available.	Jun 4, 2009 8:56 PM

Comments		
9	The IWM symposium was very well run, great speakers with diverse experience and knowledge. I will definately go next year.	Jun 5, 2009 7:30 PM
10	As a visually impaired person, getting to the location was difficult. By car, I am sure it was a great site. Having said that, the facility itself was great and the rooms for all events were appropriately sized and easily accessible.	Jun 15, 2009 2:20 PM
11	traffic was terrible, rooms were freezing	Jun 15, 2009 3:10 PM
12	The only comment that I have was on the content of the concurrent sessions. Didn't feel as though some of the session speakers were on their game or on topic in that some were not aware of what or how IWM related. Also, was hoping that we would learn how to take existing watershed plans and revise them to create truly integrated watershed management plans - that knowledge was not clearly passed down to the participants. Something to think about for next year in order to improve the workshop. The speakers from other countries and other provinces were fabulous.	Jun 15, 2009 3:43 PM
13	In Ontario, since the early 1990s, the concept behind watershed management was always one of integration. I am at a loss to understand why the pretense that "Integrated Watershed Management" is something new and improved.....	Jun 15, 2009 4:00 PM
14	The breakout room for the social learning session was poorly lit and acoustics were poor.	Jun 15, 2009 4:14 PM
15	rooms were unbearably cold	Jun 15, 2009 5:55 PM
16	Fabulous job; very professionally run; excellent speakers and information provided.	Jun 15, 2009 6:28 PM
17	A better venue is needed. The conference center was extremely cold and they charged for internet access as well as parking.	Jun 16, 2009 2:20 PM


Please rank the following: 5 = Excellent ----> 1 = Poor



2. Please rank how relevant you found the Thursday, May 21 plenary presentations 5 = Very relevant ----> 1 = Not so relevant								
	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion / Did Not Attend	Rating Average	Response Count
IWM in Context, Don Pearson	32.1% (17)	54.7% (29)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	11.3% (6)	4.34	53
Current IWM Approaches, Hazel Breton	39.6% (21)	39.6% (21)	13.2% (7)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	7.5% (4)	4.29	53
Challenges of Institutional Arrangements and Governance, Dr. Ken Genskow	49.1% (26)	37.7% (20)	5.7% (3)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	5.7% (3)	4.42	53
European Water Framework Directive, Nicole Kranz	43.4% (23)	37.7% (20)	9.4% (5)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	7.5% (4)	4.33	53
Canadian Experience in IWM (Alberta), David Trew	24.5% (13)	45.3% (24)	13.2% (7)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	13.2% (7)	4.04	53
Canadian Experiences in IWM (Quebec), Steve Turgeon	20.8% (11)	43.4% (23)	13.2% (7)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	20.8% (11)	4.05	53
Comments								4
answered question								53
skipped question								5

Comments		
1	Well presented and very relevant, well linked to current challenges of IWM.	Jun 4, 2009 9:00 PM
2	The only comment that I have was on the content of the concurrent sessions. Didn't feel as though some of the session speakers were on their game or on topic in that some were not aware of what or how IWM related. Also, was hoping that we would learn how to take existing watershed plans and revise them to create truly integrated watershed management plans - that knowledge was not clearly passed down to the participants. Something to think about for next year in order to improve the workshop. The speakers from other countries and other provinces were fabulous.	Jun 15, 2009 3:44 PM
3	European Water Framework Directive presentation was not sufficiently adapted to meet the Canadian context. However, it was a good input to put Ontario's work into perspective!	Jun 15, 2009 3:50 PM
4	In Ontario, since the early 1990s, the concept behind watershed management was always one of integration. I am at a loss to understand why the pretense that "Integrated Watershed Management" is something new and improved.....	Jun 15, 2009 4:02 PM


Please rank how relevant you found the Thursday, May 21 plenary presentations 5 = Very relevant
----> 1 = Not so relevant



3. Please rank how relevant you found the Friday, May 22 plenary presentations 5 = Very relevant ----> 1 = Not so relevant								
	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion / Did Not Attend	Rating Average	Response Count
Planning for Uncertainty: Adaptive Environmental Management, Dr. John FitzGibbon	18.9% (10)	45.3% (24)	17.0% (9)	7.5% (4)	3.8% (2)	7.5% (4)	3.73	53
Exploring the Role of Non Government Organizations in IWM, Dianne Ramage	28.3% (15)	34.0% (18)	20.8% (11)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	15.1% (8)	4.04	53
Australian Case Study: Murray-Darling Basin, Dr. Fraser MacLeod	30.2% (16)	20.8% (11)	5.7% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	43.4% (23)	4.43	53
Comments								5
answered question								53
skipped question								5

Comments		
1	Planning for Uncertainty - Relevant but too long	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
2	Planning for Uncertainty - Dianne Ramage - GREAT!!	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
3	Dr. John FitzGibbon - very theoretical but good	May 29, 2009 8:00 PM
4	Again, well presented and very relevant, well linked to current challenges of IWM. Great idea to link Fraser MacLeod by video rather than loose his contribution; good example of technology working for us.	Jun 4, 2009 9:00 PM
5	FitzGibbon's presentation was nice, but did not address the core problem - HOW to do that. He mainly proposed what WE should do, but the core question is: How do WE actually organize ourselves, and who are WE anyway?	Jun 15, 2009 3:50 PM


Please rank how relevant you found the Friday, May 22 plenary presentations 5 = Very relevant -
---> 1 = Not so relevant



4. Please rank how relevant you found the Thursday, May 21 concurrent presentations 5 = Very relevant ----> 1 = Not so relevant								
	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion / Did Not Attend	Rating Average	Response Count
T1A - Climate Change and IWM, Dr. David Pearson	26.4% (14)	20.8% (11)	3.8% (2)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	47.2% (25)	4.36	53
T1B - Social Learning, Dr. John FitzGibbon	5.7% (3)	7.5% (4)	7.5% (4)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	77.4% (41)	3.75	53
T1C - Economic Considerations, Professor Steven Renzetti	7.5% (4)	7.5% (4)	11.3% (6)	0.0% (0)	1.9% (1)	71.7% (38)	3.67	53
Comments								5
answered question								53
skipped question								5

Comments		
1	Professor Steven Renzetti - very relevant but presentation could have said more about its relevance to IWM in the context of financing. Water/watershed management too focused on municipal water supply.	May 29, 2009 7:01 PM
2	Causally presented but maybe that is the best atmosphere to present "scary" information.	Jun 4, 2009 9:06 PM
3	Returning to the old and tiring "Economists vs. Others" - Front. Not much new here, it seemed.	Jun 15, 2009 3:54 PM
4	The social learning session was informative, but could have benefitted from a more interactive format.	Jun 15, 2009 4:19 PM
5	the economic presentation was a pretty basic level, by-the-books approach - i was expecting more cutting edge tools/techniques and solutions	Jun 18, 2009 1:43 PM

Please rank how relevant you found the Thursday, May 21 concurrent presentations 5 = Very relevant ----> 1 = Not so relevant








5. Please rank how relevant you found the Friday, May 22 concurrent presentations 5 = Very relevant ----> 1 = Not so relevant								
	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion / Did Not Attend	Rating Average	Response Count
F1A - Setting Targets, Doug Cuthbert	7.5% (4)	13.2% (7)	9.4% (5)	3.8% (2)	1.9% (1)	64.2% (34)	3.58	53
F1B - Assessing Watershed Stressors, Dave Maunder and Brian Hindley	5.7% (3)	9.4% (5)	9.4% (5)	5.7% (3)	3.8% (2)	66.0% (35)	3.22	53
F1C - Updating IWM Plans, Dr. Dan Shrubsole and Dr. Dan Walters	3.8% (2)	5.7% (3)	3.8% (2)	1.9% (1)	13.2% (7)	71.7% (38)	2.47	53
F2A - Monitoring and Evaluation, Dr. Isobel Heathcote	13.2% (7)	17.0% (9)	1.9% (1)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	64.2% (34)	4.11	53
F2B - Integration, Jack Imhof	20.8% (11)	11.3% (6)	5.7% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	62.3% (33)	4.40	53
F2C - Ontario Case Studies, Phil Beard	9.4% (5)	1.9% (1)	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	86.8% (46)	4.57	53
F2C - Ontario Case Studies, Sonya Meek	7.5% (4)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	88.7% (47)	4.67	53
Comments								9
answered question								53
skipped question								5

Comments		
1	Session on Updating IWM Plans - Did not talk about IWMP but instead SWP and committees, contradicted CWA legislation as well as a number of other *** (not legible) specific items. Did not talk about IWM planning.	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
2	Session on Updating IWM Plans - focus was on DWSP plans - none of which are prepared yet - so none are due to be updated? should have talked about updates to CA-led or other IWM examples. Phil Beard, Sonya Meek - these were the most relevant presentations of all!!!	May 29, 2009 7:01 PM
3	attended F1A and F1B partially	May 29, 2009 7:34 PM
4	Session on Updating IWM Plans - This presentation was extremely poor. A great many facts/info related to the clean water act were incorrect. Very disappointing.	May 29, 2009 7:44 PM

Comments		
5	Dave Maunder and Brian Hindley - v. good presentation	May 29, 2009 8:01 PM
6	Very, very informative	Jun 4, 2009 9:06 PM
7	Very nice presentation of Jack Imhof about what should be done regarding integration. Core question left open: How do we get this knowledge into water management institutions?	Jun 15, 2009 3:54 PM
8	In the morning session, I attended the integrated watershed management plans. I felt the scope of what I had expected was much greater compared to the scope provided by the researchers.	Jun 15, 2009 4:42 PM
9	F1A was disappointing - the speaker didn't distinguish among objectives, measures, targets and strategies, so the discussion really didn't have an opportunity to move understanding forward	Jun 18, 2009 1:43 PM

Please rank how relevant you found the Friday, May 22 concurrent presentations 5 = Very relevant
 ----> 1 = Not so relevant









6. Did you find the topics covered:			Response Percent	Response Count
improved your understanding of IWM			65.4%	34
helped you in specific areas of IWM			36.5%	19
were not helpful			1.9%	1
other (please specify)			26.9%	14
			answered question	52
			skipped question	6

other (please specify)		
1	helped and improved my understanding of what direction IWRM is taking in Ontario. Some of the content in the sessions, while relevant, was not well detailed by the presenters. The approach is still very antropocentric and needs to move towards ecosystems and other specie needs as well	May 26, 2009 2:50 PM
2	liked the single topic focus much nicer pace than Latornell	May 29, 2009 6:09 PM
3	nice for reassurance that we are on the right track + not alone in the boat	May 29, 2009 6:57 PM
4	at least my understanding that all jurisdictions are recognizing the need for it and are figuring out ways to achieve it	May 29, 2009 7:01 PM
5	Alberta + Quebec were too general + could have been replaced with an Ontario IWM effort (Humber River) Not many of the speakers addressed land use planning or how IWM in an Ontario perspective might tackle challenges such as more development, more forestry, more agriculture, etc.	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
6	outlined some issues we are having in our watershed	May 29, 2009 7:07 PM
7	improved understanding of what some others are doing prespectives from others provided interesting viewpoints	May 29, 2009 7:39 PM
8	not answered	May 29, 2009 7:44 PM
9	posed new questions and interest	May 29, 2009 7:56 PM
10	Brian Hindley's presentation was practical and well structured. It will be helpful in understanding the indicators that need to be identified and the tools of implementation that may be required for future or current IWM planning.	Jun 15, 2009 2:28 PM
11	Lots of "good old IWM - talk", and nearly all buzzwords were thrown in once. Next conference should fill these with success stories, to make themes more tangible. Cheers, Thorsten	Jun 15, 2009 3:55 PM

other (please specify)		
12	I did not attend because I thought that the talks would be helpful, I was curious about the event and why it was being held. I was impressed with the stature of those attending - perhaps as a promotional event this was a good thing.	Jun 15, 2009 4:05 PM
13	I thought the concept of an integrated watershed management conference was a good idea. However, I found that the practitioners could have provided more comment regarding implementation of actions rather than the development of plans.	Jun 15, 2009 4:44 PM
14	the topics themselves were great, but some of the presentations weren't at a level to move understanding forward	Jun 18, 2009 1:44 PM


Did you find the topics covered:



7. How often should an IWM Symposium be held? (Please choose one)			
		Response Percent	Response Count
annually		26.9%	14
every 2 years		44.2%	23
every 3 years		7.7%	4
no further symposiums needed		0.0%	0
don't know		5.8%	3
other (please specify)		15.4%	8
		answered question	52
		skipped question	6


other (please specify)		
1	depemds on goal of event	May 26, 2009 2:50 PM
2	Need at least 2 years for new info to become of relevance	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
3	Not sure. Could the Latornell Symposium be re positioned as an annual IWM effort?	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
4	not answered	May 29, 2009 7:44 PM
5	I believe doing it every two years allows for some evolvement of ongoing IWM projects. If one were done every year I would alternate every second year between 'big picture' IWM and technical/practical/implementational IWM.	Jun 15, 2009 2:31 PM
6	as knowledge progresses	Jun 15, 2009 3:00 PM
7	Annually would be OK - but how would the content of this event differ from the sorts of things discussed at the Latornell sessions?	Jun 15, 2009 4:06 PM
8	I think that this should be integrated into Latornell.	Jun 15, 2009 4:45 PM

How often should an IWM Symposium be held? (Please choose one)



8. What should the duration of the symposium be? (Please choose one)			Response Percent	Response Count
1 day	<input type="checkbox"/>		17.3%	9
2 days	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		78.8%	41
3 days	<input type="checkbox"/>		3.8%	2
		answered question		52
		skipped question		6




What should the duration of the symposium be? (Please choose one)



9. What topics would you like to see covered?		
		Response Count
		33
<i>answered question</i>		33
<i>skipped question</i>		25


Response Text		
1	More case studies which explain the processes by which CA's dealt with obvious conflicts and difficulties with specific examples(e.g., setting objectives, getting buy-in). More case study explanations with expert panels serving a challenge function.	May 25, 2009 6:09 PM
2	depends	May 26, 2009 2:56 PM
3	conflict resolution priority setting mechanisms case studies challenges: what works and what doesn't what kind of models are used? mapping of data using Web Mapping Service and Web File Service applications	May 26, 2009 5:15 PM
4	- expansion on the identified 'gaps' in IWM - implementation of IWM	May 27, 2009 6:38 PM
5	community based social marketing what are the barriers to IWM approaches performance measures	May 28, 2009 12:53 PM
6	Social Marketing / Community Mobilization	May 29, 2009 6:10 PM
7	which provincial agencies + departments within belong on a committee for IWM pl** (not legible) - fisheries management - monitoring for targets reporting on implecation	May 29, 2009 6:57 PM
8	how to develop a plan - successes and challenges	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
9	Emphasize examples of IWM in practice - mix Ontario examples (50%) + examples outside Ontario (50%) try to cover various watershed scales sub catchments to major river basins	May 29, 2009 7:01 PM
10	Science Integration Policy Integration Community Integration	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
11	- success stories: case studies; details, issues - new science; monitoring + evaluation - reviewing gaps in legislation	May 29, 2009 7:10 PM
12	ties to natural heritage systems	May 29, 2009 7:35 PM
13	would appreciate broader jurisdictional exploration i.e. Brazil - Cuba Apparently also missed opportunities to include & invite First Nations with free passes or opportunity to speak or be invited	May 29, 2009 7:41 PM

Response Text		
14	Examples what others are doing in other jurisdictions Science of IWM Public participation - dealing in stakewater	May 29, 2009 7:49 PM
15	Case studies of IWM - putting it into practice. Are there success cases of this.	May 29, 2009 7:50 PM
16	Examples of results and recommendations	May 29, 2009 7:54 PM
17	tools for integrating examples perspectives from other organizations/industries	May 29, 2009 7:58 PM
18	tools for implementing more case studies implementation of climate change in iwm	May 29, 2009 7:59 PM
19	IWM Case Studies; Agency **Comme*** (not legible) to IWM	May 29, 2009 8:07 PM
20	Importance and role of each media (land, air, socio, economic etc.) in intergration governance of water and other media	Jun 1, 2009 2:04 PM
21	Solutions to emerging challenges, how do they differ by region or nation, how are other jurisdictions managing.	Jun 4, 2009 9:13 PM
22	Great topics covered...can't think of what may have been missed, since this is a new area for me.	Jun 5, 2009 7:34 PM
23	More technical matters, such as implementation, types of plans for SWM, ecological, educational, etc. Wrap up would tie them all together.	Jun 15, 2009 2:36 PM
24	Focus on integration. This symposium noted how challenging integration is but there were few practical suggestions. The symposium should answer the integration question as a priority.	Jun 15, 2009 3:16 PM
25	Updating watershed plans to become truly integrated watershed management plans. Tools and toolkits.	Jun 15, 2009 3:47 PM
26	Canadian success stories	Jun 15, 2009 4:05 PM
27	Building a publically accessible free download e-library of all watershed management plans/strategies and related technical documents in Ontario	Jun 15, 2009 4:09 PM
28	current science and tools; current approaches/institutional; status in Ontario	Jun 15, 2009 6:33 PM
29	Climate Adaptation Strategies Ecological Needs Water Conservation Strategies (Soft Path etc)	Jun 15, 2009 6:53 PM
30	More on hands topics and less lecturing.	Jun 16, 2009 2:23 PM
31	IWM and climate change	Jun 17, 2009 1:14 PM
32	More specific details about how different agencies are implimenting IWM through monitoring programs.	Jun 17, 2009 1:29 PM
33	a continuation of the topics focused on this year - but more cutting edge; could add a topic on approaches to reporting on watershed conditions and implementation of watershed plans	Jun 18, 2009 1:45 PM

10. What additional activities should be included?			Response Percent	Response Count
training sessions			32.7%	17
workshop sessions			44.2%	23
other (please specify)			40.4%	21
			answered question	52
			skipped question	6

other (please specify)		
1	negotiating sessions, best practic sessions, working demonstrations of projects and issues on the landscape	May 26, 2009 2:56 PM
2	open panel discussions, tours	May 28, 2009 12:53 PM
3	none	May 28, 2009 7:44 PM
4	none	May 29, 2009 6:10 PM
5	not answered	May 29, 2009 6:28 PM
6	not answered	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
7	to generate input from practicioners to the development of an Ontario framework for IWM	May 29, 2009 7:01 PM
8	Panels w/more discussion. Plenaries w/more discussion.	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
9	facilitating watershed planning	May 29, 2009 7:10 PM
10	not answered	May 29, 2009 7:41 PM
11	not answered	May 29, 2009 7:45 PM
12	with a conference that size it was good to have the breakout sessions where you could choose options of which speaker to hear. Smaller groups also allowed from more discussion.	May 29, 2009 7:50 PM
13	not answered	May 29, 2009 7:52 PM
14	not answered	May 29, 2009 7:58 PM
15	none	May 29, 2009 7:59 PM
16	not answered	May 29, 2009 8:01 PM
17	not answered	May 29, 2009 8:07 PM
18	Discourage concurrent sessions, speakers were too interesting and I didn't get to hear them all..	Jun 4, 2009 9:13 PM
19	Technical sessions (especially knowledge management, data- and model management)	Jun 15, 2009 4:05 PM
20	I would like to see plans that result in some tangible environmental improvements.	Jun 15, 2009 4:46 PM
21	Field trips	Jun 16, 2009 6:50 PM

What additional activities should be included?



11. What location would be preferred?		
		Response Count
		35
<i>answered question</i>		35
<i>skipped question</i>		23

Response Text		
1	Close to airports	May 25, 2009 6:09 PM
2	depends	May 26, 2009 2:56 PM
3	near airports/restaurants	May 26, 2009 5:15 PM
4	a location with outdoor activities possible	May 27, 2009 6:38 PM
5	in a watershed where IWM is being applied	May 28, 2009 12:53 PM
6	Good - not too deep into city	May 29, 2009 6:10 PM
7	the GTA is fine	May 29, 2009 6:57 PM
8	out of city	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
9	rotate - SW Ontario, GTA, Eastern Ontario, Northern Ont.	May 29, 2009 7:01 PM
10	Keep close to Toronto	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
11	Delta Meadowvale was very good. Good site. Fitness club - great.	May 29, 2009 7:10 PM
12	good central location	May 29, 2009 7:35 PM
13	The GTA	May 29, 2009 7:49 PM
14	GTA location (mississauga venue was nice)	May 29, 2009 7:50 PM
15	no preference	May 29, 2009 7:54 PM
16	this one	May 29, 2009 7:58 PM
17	same	May 29, 2009 7:59 PM
18	GTA region is appropriate	May 29, 2009 8:07 PM
19	Greater Toronto Area is central and easily accessed	Jun 1, 2009 2:04 PM
20	I thought the location was excellent	Jun 3, 2009 2:39 PM
21	same	Jun 4, 2009 9:13 PM
22	Near the airport is great! Not in the heart of downtown Toronto as it is not desirable from a commuting perspective	Jun 5, 2009 7:34 PM
23	Downtown T.O. or even Barrie/Innisfil Conservation Centres on Lake Simcoe.	Jun 15, 2009 2:36 PM
24	Outside Toronto	Jun 15, 2009 3:16 PM
25	Mississauga is fine	Jun 15, 2009 3:47 PM
26	Latonnell	Jun 15, 2009 4:46 PM
27	Toronto okay	Jun 15, 2009 6:33 PM
28	Mississauga	Jun 15, 2009 6:53 PM
29	Mississauga seems to be a central location for the conference, but a better venue is needed	Jun 16, 2009 2:23 PM
30	toronto	Jun 16, 2009 2:48 PM

Response Text		
31	Not in Toronto	Jun 16, 2009 6:50 PM
32	This location is fine.	Jun 17, 2009 1:14 PM
33	The location was suitable	Jun 17, 2009 1:29 PM
34	Mississauga	Jun 17, 2009 6:01 PM
35	location was fine	Jun 18, 2009 1:45 PM

1. What time of year would be preferred?		
		Response Count
		36
	<i>answered question</i>	36
	<i>skipped question</i>	22

Response Text		
1	depends	May 26, 2009 2:56 PM
2	may october	May 26, 2009 5:15 PM
3	spring or fall	May 27, 2009 6:38 PM
4	spring/fall	May 28, 2009 12:53 PM
5	Right time	May 29, 2009 6:10 PM
6	This is a good time	May 29, 2009 6:28 PM
7	Jan/Feb	May 29, 2009 6:57 PM
8	spring is good	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
9	Spring (May is good)	May 29, 2009 7:01 PM
10	N/A	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
11	fall/winter to better plan for future monitoring opportunities	May 29, 2009 7:05 PM
12	Late spring or late fall	May 29, 2009 7:10 PM
13	not field season	May 29, 2009 7:35 PM
14	May / June	May 29, 2009 7:49 PM
15	Any time	May 29, 2009 7:50 PM
16	Jan - Feb	May 29, 2009 7:54 PM
17	same	May 29, 2009 7:58 PM
18	same	May 29, 2009 7:59 PM
19	April - May or mid October to mid November	May 29, 2009 8:07 PM
20	early spring before field seasons	Jun 1, 2009 2:04 PM
21	Winter would be most preferable (early new year)	Jun 3, 2009 2:39 PM
22	same	Jun 4, 2009 9:13 PM
23	May is great...as travel by car and plane would be good!	Jun 5, 2009 7:34 PM
24	May	Jun 15, 2009 2:36 PM
25	Spring	Jun 15, 2009 3:16 PM
26	Feb or March	Jun 15, 2009 3:47 PM
27	Fall	Jun 15, 2009 4:09 PM
28	Integrate with Latornell	Jun 15, 2009 4:46 PM
29	no preference	Jun 15, 2009 6:33 PM
30	Spring	Jun 15, 2009 6:53 PM
31	Timing from this year was fine.	Jun 16, 2009 2:23 PM

Response Text		
32	may was good	Jun 16, 2009 2:48 PM
33	This is a good time of year.	Jun 17, 2009 1:14 PM
34	Fall/winter before start of field season.	Jun 17, 2009 1:29 PM
35	earlier in spring	Jun 17, 2009 6:01 PM
36	timing was fine	Jun 18, 2009 1:45 PM

1. Can you recommend any future speakers?		
		Response Count
		19
<i>answered question</i>		19
<i>skipped question</i>		39

Response Text		
1	Yes. The OEN held discussions in the margins of this meeting on establishing a water caucus. OEN would like to explore working collaboratively to establish an event that focused on IWRM within the context of ecosystem needs and functions and species needs.	May 26, 2009 2:56 PM
2	Dr. David Evans, MNR Warren Yerex, GRCA	May 28, 2009 12:53 PM
3	local CA examples	May 29, 2009 6:57 PM
4	loved the international aspect, and outside Ontario, very informative - keep that aspect	May 29, 2009 7:00 PM
5	Speaker +/- or panelists from an ENGO/Community org. eg - CELA/CELAP/Eco***** The Taylor Massey Project Sierra Club, Pen***/Suzuki Great Lakes United	May 29, 2009 7:03 PM
6	- Australian speakers - I believe they are fairly advanced in the field - CA staff speakers - CA staff were not as well represented as I expected	May 29, 2009 7:10 PM
7	No - don't know enough people in the area	May 29, 2009 7:49 PM
8	not at this time	May 29, 2009 7:54 PM
9	no	May 29, 2009 7:59 PM
10	IWM practitioners / spokespersons	May 29, 2009 8:07 PM
11	Barb Horn, Colorado barb.horn@state.co.us Steven Grieger, S4S sjgeiger@telus.net	Jun 4, 2009 9:13 PM
12	No...sorry!	Jun 5, 2009 7:34 PM
13	Dr. Thomas Homer Dixon for a big picture overview of how IWM could transform our lives, Dr. David Suzuki, Elizabeth May and then technical speakers like Brian Hindley (he gave a great presentation this year).	Jun 15, 2009 2:36 PM
14	Rather than speakers, a workshop format to come up with integration strategies would be better. If Ontario and CAs are leaders in this field, it doesn't make sense to look for answers elsewhere. We should be looking to advance the science ourselves through our own experts and experience, and then test it.	Jun 15, 2009 3:16 PM
15	Dave Schindler	Jun 15, 2009 4:09 PM
16	n/a	Jun 15, 2009 6:33 PM
17	Oliver Brandes - POLIS Institute (BC)	Jun 15, 2009 6:53 PM

Response Text		
18	Dr. Rob deLoe Maude Barlow	Jun 16, 2009 2:23 PM
19	no	Jun 17, 2009 1:29 PM