

## Ecological Indicator Expert Panel Q&A ARCHIVE

**QUESTION:** *On page 3 of the ecological indicator progress report (project-level reporting), “good,” “fair,” and “poor” are identified as <25%, 26-74%, and >75%. Do these percentages also apply to the landscape scale reporting on page 2?”*

**ANSWER:** Nothing was specified for the landscape score. If that break down makes sense for your landscape, by all means, use it. However, you should feel free to choose something else if it makes more sense.

---

**QUESTION:** *Should we send reports to the Regional Office or the Washington Office by the November 14<sup>th</sup> deadline?*

**ANSWER:** The deadline is for submission to the Washington Office; however, you are strongly encouraged to send your report to your regional coordinator for review prior to the WO. The Ecological Indicator Expert Panel is also happy to review draft reports.

---

**QUESTION:** *Do you have a preferred format for reporting on the National Ecological Indicators?*

**ANSWER:** Yes, please use the [Ecological Indicator Progress Report Template](#) and check out the [Southwest Crown of the Continent DRAFT example report](#) to see how the narrative text can be used to support the “good,” “fair,” and “poor” conclusions.

---

**QUESTION:** *In terms of the narrative sections that go with the landscape and project scale scores, what would be most useful to have there?*

**ANSWER:** For the optional narrative portions of the report, if you have information you can briefly share about how you arrived at a given score (for a hypothetical example, why did the project rate itself as “fair” on “Watershed Condition?”) that would be helpful to know. The narrative sections provide space to communicate why numbers did or did not come out as expected (however, please don’t feel like you need to replicate narrative information you include in the Annual Reports here).

---

**QUESTION:** *What methodology are CFLRPs using to monitor the increase/decrease in noxious weed population? Background: The forest currently only treats roadways – so the same roads (acres) get treated year after year, but no new populations are inventoried or treated. Over time, this makes it look like the restoration program is successful because noxious weed populations are not growing.*

**ANSWER:** Setting aside what you might do for future projects, I would suggest that you start with those roads. The data supports your current success. The guidance on reporting invasives is kind of narrowly focused on the “restored acres” number that comes from the FACTS performance report. Take a look at the guidance document for some more details. That said, there is room to add additional desired conditions that you can use to augment your numbers and capture other restoration activities that affect weeds. For example, if you are thinning aggressively enough that you expect native understory vegetation to increase in diversity and cover, you can also add a desired condition that relates to improving resilience to new invasions. It is a pretty reasonable conclusion and it will allow you to take a broader view of what restoration means in the context of invasive species. That is what I would suggest for this report. Just make sure that you carefully craft your desired condition statement to accommodate this approach and document your rationale for future reference.

---

**QUESTION:** *Does it really make sense to report on a single desired condition at the project-level when there are so many different objectives? The same question applies at the landscape level.*

**ANSWER:** At both the project and landscape level, you should stick with a higher-level, single desired condition and roll multiple projects/objectives into that desired condition. Otherwise, it will be impossible to “roll up” reports from all CFLR projects into the 5-Year Report.

---

**QUESTION:** *What if we don't have soil, water, and wildlife accomplishments to report?*

**ANSWER:** That's okay. You should be honest, recognizing that gaps in the accomplishments might be a good way to emphasize the need for more support, or may be necessary for “younger” projects.