

AGSO

RGM MINERALS OPEN DAY 17 NOVEMBER 1996

REPORT ON THE FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM ATTENDEES AND RGM STAFF

COMPILED BY

S. VOGT

RECORD 1996/35

AGSO



AUSTRALIAN
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
ORGANISATION

1996/35
C.1

RGM MINERALS OPEN DAY

17 NOVEMBER 1995

**REPORT ON THE FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM
ATTENDEES AND RGM STAFF**

**PREPARED BY STEVE VOGT RGM DIVISIONAL BUSINESS
MANAGER**

INTRODUCTION

This report summarises feedback received from minerals open day attendees and RGM staff on the minerals open day held on 17 November 1995. The minerals open day was attended by 57 people, representing either mining companies, Australian universities, geological consulting companies, BRS or the DPIE coal and minerals branch. A list of attendees is provided as Attachment C to this report.

The format of the day was based on brief presentations by NGMA Project Leaders to attendees focusing on Project progress to date, products, scientific results and future plans. Presentations lasted approximately 20 minutes. Following each presentation Project Leaders responded to questions for about 10 minutes. While Project presentations were conducted attendees had the option of meeting with Project staff from other Projects and viewing products on display.

The report identifies a number improvements that ought to occur in planning for future open days to ensure AGSO builds on the success of this minerals open day.

SUMMARY

Twenty-three (40%) of the attendees at the RGM minerals open day completed evaluation forms. Statistically this is considered a sufficiently large sample size proportion of the total attendance, to provide a representative opinion of the total audience, through responses to questions in the evaluation form.

The responses to questions in the evaluation form are provided as either a rating of 1 to 5 (1 low and 5 high) in relation to product quality and relevance questions, other responses were provided as yes/no or as detailed responses.

Attendees responded very positively to the success of the open day in terms of meeting their expectations. Respondee support a repeat open day being held every one to two years. Responses to product relevance and quality questions were that current AGSO products identified within the evaluation form rated extremely high.

Suggested improvements that have been made to improve the next open day are both numerous and constructive. Many of the comments made by attendees on suggested improvements are similar to comments made by RGM staff. The most frequently suggested improvements are :

- * Provide separate time for displays to be viewed.
- * Reduce the content put into one day by providing additional time.
- * Use an alternative venue allowing sufficient room for displays to be set up close to presentations. An alternate venue should include better acoustics, audioequipment and lighting.
- * Ensure more time is made available for interaction between attendees and project staff. There was too much concentration on formal, at the expense of informal discussion.

Feedback received from RGM staff and attendees indicates the open day was a major success. There are also clear steps identified to ensure the success of similar future events.

The overall success of the day was substantially due to the efforts of many RGM staff, in particular Lesley Wyborn and her technical support staff. This was clearly acknowledged in feedback provided by RGM staff. RGM staff feedback identifies the need for the co-ordination of similar events to be through a nominated Co-ordinator, which would result in more efficient co-ordination of required tasks. To assist further the management of similar events, improved planning would significantly reduce the amount of last minute effort required.

FEEDBACK FROM ATTENDEES

GENERAL

It is clearly evident from the summary analysis below through responses received to questions put to attendees there is significant support for the "open day" concept. The level of client satisfaction for the relevance and quality of AGSO's products, also identified below, is impressive.

One statistic that is of particular interest is that 35% of evaluations state there are products, services or scientific needs currently not met by AGSO despite strong support for existing AGSO products. I suggest these people be contacted to determine their specific needs.

Detailed statistics supporting my analysis are provided in Attachments B and D.

How did you find out about the day ?

Seventeen of the twenty-one responses received to this question found out about the open day from direct mail or AUSGEO.NEWS. This response suggests these two methods as being very successful for targeting our clients.

How well did the open day meet your expectations ?

On a rating scale of 1 to 5 (5 highest) only one respondent rated the day at 2 with no-one giving the day a rating of 1. It is extremely satisfying that 81% of the respondents rated the day as meeting their expectations by providing a 4 or 5 rating.

Which Projects were of interest to you ?

There was substantial interest in all of the Projects from respondents.

AGSO Product Quality

Respondents are obviously highly satisfied with the quality of AGSO products with 32% and 68% of respondents providing ratings of 4 and 5 respectively.

Would you like to be informed of product developments ?

Only one person stated that they would not like to be informed of product developments.

Does your business desire any services, products of science that are currently unavailable ?

A substantial amount of the respondents (35%) indicated there are services, products or science that AGSO could provide which is currently unavailable. This significant number of clients who have a demand for additional AGSO services, products or science identifies the need for AGSO to identify what these additional client requirements are. Some client requirements are identified in Attachment B.

RELEVANCE OF CURRENT PRODUCTS

PAPER PRODUCTS

Geological, Geophysical and Regolith Landform Maps

The relevance rating for geological, geophysical and regolith landform maps was impressive, with between 60% and 90% of respondents rating their relevance at 4 or 5. Although these maps were assessed as highly relevant, 17% provided a rating of only 2 for the relevance of airborne magnetic and radiometric maps. It was suggested the 2 ratings reflects the fact that larger companies tend to buy and enhance data themselves.

Geochemical Datasets, Databases and GIS Packages

These products were not rated as highly relevant as the geological, geophysical and regolith landform maps. Relevance ratings of 3 or above were recorded of approximately 80%, 73% and 53% for geochemical datasets, databases and GIS packages respectively. The substantial low relevance rating for GIS packages as paper products probably reflects the preference for purchase of the digital product which receives a relevance rating of 3 or above of 100%.

Reports and Bulletins

High relevance ratings were provided for these products, with both products receiving a relevance rating of 4 or 5 of approximately 90%. No respondents provided a rating of 1 or 2.

DIGITAL PRODUCTS

Geological, Geophysical and Regolith Landform Maps

As with the paper geological, geophysical and regolith landform maps the digital versions of these products also were rated 'highly relevant'. Relevance ratings of 4 or 5 totaling between 60% and 89% were received for these products. The highest relevance rating of any single product surveyed was 89% for digital airborne magnetic maps.

Geochemical Datasets, Databases and GIS Packages

The digital versions of these products were given a higher relevance rating than that provided to the paper version of the products. This is expected due to the considerable additional information and functionality the digital products provide. Relevance ratings of 3 or higher totalling 82%, 90% and 100% were received for digital geochemical datasets, databases and GIS packages respectively.

Reports and Bulletins

Lower comparative relevance ratings for the digital version compared with the paper version were provided for these products, with 20% of respondees providing ratings of 2 for these products.

FEEDBACK FROM RGM STAFF

Positives

Staff commended the efforts of all RGM staff who contributed to the day. The overwhelming opinion was that the day was a success, although there were parts of the day that could be improved on. The "dry run" although not initially thought essential by some, was considered afterwards as a key element contributing to the success of the day.

Suggestions for improvements should another open day type function occur

There are many suggested improvements, included in Attachment A. The key suggestion made by staff and attendees was there needs to be more time to have informal discussions and view displays. A larger, alternate, venue with more time devoted to displays and an agenda over 2 days would appear to "take on board" the suggestions of RGM staff.

One suggestion is for two separate "open days" one focussing on East Australia and the other on West Australia.

Attachment A

RGM Staff feedback received on success of open day.

Positives

- * Effort put into open day preparations by RGM staff is commendable. Particularly the efforts of Lesley Wyborn and her technical support staff.
- * Feedback received from discussion with clients was perceived as positive.
- * The "dry run" definitely continued to the overall success of the presentations.

Suggestion for improvements should another open day type function occur

- * Displays were poorly attended, therefore ensure time set aside for displays.
- * There was too much information crammed into one day, either reduce content or provide more time.
- * The agenda for the day should have provided separate time for Project Displays to be visited.
- * Next time there needs to be a designated co-ordinator. There was "too many Chiefs and not enough Indians".
- * Clearer up front identification of open day objectives, and planning for the day would have made preparation easier.
- * Perceived lack of interest leading up to the day, therefore some staff next time need to be motivated and encouraged more to participate.
- * Arrange audio equipment prior to the day. Preferable to trial its use at "dry run".
- * Venue where there is room for displays nearby to presentation area.
- * Spread Program over 2 days with 1/2 day each day devoted to presentations and the other 1/2 day on seminar/presentations. Alternatively have 2 separate one day sessions at different times of the year.

- * Timing for future open days ought to be biannual or annual.
- * Maps and signposting inadequate, next time they need to be larger.
- * Project managers to mention staff working within projects.
- * Database display ought to have been in the foyer. It was important, and would have attracted people during the breaks.
- * More RGM staff ought to have made an effort to mix with open day attendees.
- * Ground floor meeting room has poor acoustics and wasn't the best venue, better venue required for next time.
- * Posters need to be near the food and drink.

Attachment B

Answers to the questions in evaluation form.

Does your business desire any services, products or science that is currently unavailable?

Please comment:

- * Additional areas of very detailed gravity for Eastern Goldfields. (Passed on to A. Whitaker).
- * Map showing seismic database/network of both AGSO and other seismic lines.
- * Advancements in the regional geology of Asia, China and India.
- * Improved databases for Tanami region, e.g. Gravity, Regolith, Whole Rock Geochemistry, GIS.
- * Gawler Craton regolith mapping and gravity.
- * Illustrated catalogue!
- * Teleseismic work/data - crustal lithospheric domains to continue.

What aspects of the day would you like to see repeated?

- * Many attendees stated "All Aspects Repeated".
- * Summaries of current projects and planned activities.
- * Both presentations and project displays

What did you find least useful and why?

- * The posters - only because I wanted to hear all the talks and had no time to visit display rooms and talk with old friends/colleagues.
- * Talks which present list after list of things being considered v's examples of the work being done with insight into techniques.
- * The notes handed out for some projects are lacking some good information which was presented in the summaries.

- * Lack of time for interaction with program groups.
- * Couldn't visit and talk with project geologists because talks were on.
- * Difficult to attend all presentations - no programmed periods for project room review.
- * Too much information at once!
- * Include more diagrams and maps in project summaries.
- * For proposed projects OK to go through objectives etc.; but for existing projects concentrate on summary of results and future activities, and products.

How do you think we could improve our Minerals Day?

- * Many slides were too busy - far too many lines of text.
- * Background talk should contain not only a technical content but a 'perspective' summary - why the activity, what impact there's been or is likely to be on explanation.
- * Speakers need to speak more slowly and clearly and not cram too much into their presentations.
- * Not everyone knows technical terms and acronyms e.g. SHRIMP, VMS....
- * A policy and program overview in simple, layman's terms is important to give perspective to the whole of AGSO's activities. The trees shouldn't obscure the woods.
- * Poster displays
- * Useful break-up into regions - some core framework.
- * At some later stage a reasonably detailed presentation once mapping accord has been completed to a satisfactory level e.g. Kimberley/Arunta, as opposed to outlines only of work which has/is intended in a given area.
- * Possibly hold on 2 days - more time for discussion, looking at posters etc.
- * Overview of projects are most useful.
- * Better examples of how new data is building up resource models for the country.

- * A brief overview of the NGMA would be of interest - its history, achievements, costs and directions.
- * I think AGSO needs to be congratulated in the focus and quality of their work and their desire to meet industry needs - which they are achieving!
- * Bearing in mind that I am not familiar with the detail of the databases, AGSO must be careful not to design their databases to inadvertently capture data in a form that may reflect preconceived interpretations.
- * To what extent will AGSO use the www system?
- * Less overlap of presentations and displays. A little bit more lighting to allow note taking during slide presentations.
- * More time for poster display review.
- * Better sound system.
- * Handout bit of new releases and prices.
- * Separate presentations from open displays i.e. keep talks to a shorter time and/or let the talks be done over examples of the project.
- * Some of the talks could not be heard from the rear. This is a real waste of time/interest. Speakers must be able to project their voice or a state of the art sound system utilised.
- * Keep slide presentations to material which illustrates technique and results using field evidence, not simple charts and words.
- * By setting aside times especially to visit project posters.
- * Better access to poster displays.
- * Separate pre-meetings (NABRE Prot Granites, Tas):
- * Get a decent lecture hall (i.e. Tiered, Air-conditioning, sound, lectern with controls and put slides in glass to avoid refocusing.
- * This meeting room reminds me of lectures given in underfunded university facilities. The high quality of the work being carried out by AGSO deserves a far better forum.
- * Less information presented at once - more specific points.

- * Liaise with industry (by questionnaire on future project areas. Industry to comment on project plans and directions).
- * Include discussion on how to better use AGSO information to define drill targets.
- * Congratulations for significant improvement in both
 - quality
 - quantityof new data and information. Areas well chosen also!
- * Great to see close and genuine co-operation between AGSO and State Geological Surveys.
- * Have distinct time periods for viewing project rooms. Include copies of significant cartoons/tables in notes.
- * Difficult to get full benefit out of project displays because of lack of time due to attendance at presentations.
- * For my first visit to AGSO I came away highly impressed well done!
- * Make geologists available during set times when lectures are not running.
- * More time available for interactions with program groups and persual of new products.

Attachment C

AGSO Minerals Day Attendees

	Name	Job Title	Company	City
1	Dr. Alan D.T. Goode	Manager-Business Development	Aberfoyle Resources Ltd	Melbourne
2	Mr. Chris Young	Exploration Manager	Aberfoyle Resources Ltd	Melbourne
3	Mr. E. Hugh Skey	Executive General Manager - Exploration	Aberfoyle Resources Ltd	Melbourne
4	David Borton	Regional Exploration Manager - East. Australia	Acacia Resources	Melbourne
5	Dr. Michael. J. Richard	Reader	Australian National University	Canberra
6	Dr. Stephen Snodin	Director	Australian Photogeological Consultants	Downer
7	Mr. J.G. Wilson	Managing Director	Australian Photogeological Consultants	Downer
8	Douglas Price	Principal Geophysicist	BHP Minerals	Spring Hill
9	Michael Raetz	Principal Geologist	BHP Minerals	Hawthorn
10	Andrew Johnstone	Project Geophysicist	BHP Minerals	Spring Hill
11	R. Skizeczynski	Exploration Manager - East.Australia	BHP Minerals	Spring Hill
12	Mr. Don Perkin	Principal Resource Geologist	Bureau of Resource Science	Parkes
13	Dr. Subhash Jaireth		Bureau of Resource Science	Parkes
14	Mr. Yanis Mieztis		Bureau of Resource Science	Parkes
15	Mr. Ian Keith Simon	Principal Geologist	CRA Exploration	Belomont
16	Mr. Alan Hogan	Principal Geophysicist	CRA Exploration	Bundoora
17	Jacob Rebek	Group Geologist	CRA Exploration	Preston
18	Phil Rosengren	Geologist	CRA Exploration	Box Hill
19	Roger Thompson	Exploration Manager	Delta Gold N.L.	West Perth
20	Mr. Brett Ferris	Senior Geologist	Delta Gold N.L.	Campbell
21	David Truman	Senior Officer B	DPIE Coal & Mineral Industries Division	Barton
22	Stephen O'Shea	ASO 5	DPIE Coal & Mineral Industries Division	Barton
23	Anthea Munro		Ethridge Henley Williams	Deakin
24	G.M. Derrick	Director	G.M. Derrick and Associates	Corinda
25	Mr. Peter Ellis	Regional Exploration Manager	Gold Mines of Australia	Temora
26	Mark McGeough	Senior Geologist	MIM Exploration Pty Ltd	Brisbane
27	Ian Garsed	Project Geologist	MIM Exploration Pty Ltd	Brisbane

28	M. Hinman	Principal Geologist	MIM Exploration Pty Ltd	Brisbane
29	Gary Sparks	Project Geologist	MIM Exploration Pty Ltd	Brisbane
30	Mr. Eoin Rothery	Senior Geologist	MIM Exploration Pty Ltd	Brisbane
31	Ms. Kathy Stewart	Project Geologist	MIM Exploration Pty Ltd	Forestville
32	Mr Stephen Mann	Regional Exploration	Mines & Resources Australia P/L	Perth
33	Roland Aumaitre		Mines & Resources Australia P/L	
34	Wanfu Huang	Research Fellow	Monash University	Clayton
35	Kate Pound	Research Fellow	Monash University	Clayton
36	Nick Langsford	Principal Geologist	Newcrest Mining Ltd	Cloverdale
37	Dr. Brett Davies	Consultant Geologist	Normandy Exploration Ltd	West Perth
38	Dr. Roric Smith	Geologist	Normandy Exploration Ltd	West Perth
39	Geoff McConachy	Senior Evaluation Geologist	Normandy Exploration Ltd	Kent Town
40	Puquan Ding	Structural Geologist	North Flinders Exploration	Wayville
41	Andrew Allen	Geologist	North Limited	Milton
42	Ian Mathison	Regional Manager	North Limited	Milton
43	Stephen Abbott	Geologist	Northern Territory Geological Survey	Darwin
44	Barry Murphy	Manager - Project	Pasminco Exploration	Melbourne
45	Steve Harrison	Senior Geologist	Pasminco Exploration	Belmont
46	Francis Brown		Pasminco Exploration	Melbourne
47	Robert Rutherford	Senior Geologist	Phelps Dodge Australia	Sydney
48	Mr. Stuart Williams	Regional Exploration	PNC Exploration (Aust) Pty. Ltd	Sydney
49	John Rowntree		Quadrant Resources	Queanbeyan
50	John Feguson		Spar Resources Pty Ltd	Queanbeyan
51	Mr. Joe Joyce	Chief Geologist	Stockdale Prospecting Ltd	South Yarra
52	Mr. Bruce Wyatt	Senior Geologist	Stockdale Prospecting Ltd	South Yarra
53	Dr. Martin J. Van Kranendonk	Post - Doc Fellow	University of Newcastle	Callaghan
54	Tim Craske	Senior Geologist	Western Mining Corporation - Exploration Division	Belmont
55	Mr Bruce Harris	Geophysicist	Western Mining Corporation - Exploration Division	Garbutt
56	Mr Bruce Rohrlach	Senior Geologist	Western Mining Corporation - Exploration Division	Garbutt
57	Roland Bartsch	Senior Geologist	WMC Ltd	Garbutt

Attachment D

STATISTICS FROM COMPLETED RGM OPEN DAY QUESTIONAIRES

How did you find out about the day ?					
Direct Mail	Flier	By Accident	Word of Mouth	Ausgeonews	TOTAL
9	2	1	1	8	21

How well did the open day meet your expectations ?					
RATING 1=LOW 5=HIGH					
1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
	1	3	10	7	21
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL					
0%	5%	14%	48%	33%	100%

Sample Size	
Questionnaires completed	23
Attendance	57
% Questionnaires completed	40%

Which Project were of interest to you ?		
		% of Total
NABRE	22	11.46%
Arnhem Land	14	7.29%
Kimberly- Arunta	21	10.94%
BHEI	18	9.38%
AMS	19	9.90%
Mineral Databases	16	8.33%
Lachlan	17	8.85%
Tasmania	14	7.29%
NTH QLD	15	7.81%
Pilbara	10	5.21%
E/G	14	7.29%
Musgraves	12	6.25%
TOTAL	192	100.00%

How relevant are our current products to your business ?**PAPER PRODUCT****Geological Maps**

1:250,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	1	1	4	15	21

% of total	0%	5%	5%	19%	71%	100%
------------	----	----	----	-----	-----	------

1:100,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	1	1	3	16	21

% of total	0%	5%	5%	14%	76%	100%
------------	----	----	----	-----	-----	------

Thematic	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	1	4	7	5	17

% of total	0%	6%	24%	41%	29%	100%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----	------

Geophysical

Airbourne Magnetic	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	3	1	3	11	18

% of total	0%	17%	6%	17%	61%	100%
------------	----	-----	----	-----	-----	------

Airbourne Radiometric	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	3	4	3	8	18

% of total	0%	17%	22%	17%	44%	100%
------------	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

Gravity	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
---------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	2	2	5	8	17

% of total	0%	12%	12%	29%	47%	100%
------------	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

Regolith Landform

1:250,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	0	5	4	8	17

% of total	0%	0%	29%	24%	47%	100%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----	------

1:100,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	2	4	2	8	16

% of total	0%	13%	25%	13%	50%	100%
------------	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

Thematic	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------

Response						
Total	0	1	5	5	3	14

% of total	0%	7%	36%	36%	21%	100%
------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----	------

Geochemical						
Datasets	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	3	3	6	3	15
% of total	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	100%
Databases	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	4	4	2	5	15
% of total	0%	27%	27%	13%	33%	100%
GIS Packages	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response	5	4	3	1	6	
Total	5	4	3	1	6	19
% of total	26%	21%	16%	5%	32%	100%
Reports	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response			2	6	12	
Total	0	0	2	6	12	20
% of total	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%	100%
Bulletins	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response			2	4	14	
Total	0	0	2	4	14	20
% of total	0%	0%	10%	20%	70%	100%

How relevant are our current products to your business ?						
DIGITAL PRODUCTS						
Geological Maps						
1:250,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response	3			4	12	
Total	3	0	0	4	12	19
% of total	16%	0%	0%	21%	63%	100%
1:100,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						0
Total	3	0	2	1	13	19
% of total	16%	0%	11%	5%	68%	100%
Thematic	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	0	2	5	6	13
% of total	0%	0%	15%	38%	46%	100%

Geophysical						
Airborne Magnetic	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	0	2	0	17	19
% of total	0%	0%	11%	0%	89%	100%
Airborne Radiometric	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	2	0	3	4	11	20
% of total	10%	0%	15%	20%	55%	100%
Gravity	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	1	2	2	12	17
% of total	0%	6%	12%	12%	71%	100%
Regolith Landform						
1:250,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	2	3	3	7	15
% of total	0%	13%	20%	20%	47%	100%
1:100,000	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	2	2	4	7	15
% of total	0%	13%	13%	27%	47%	100%
Thematic	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	2	4	4	5	15
% of total	0%	13%	27%	27%	33%	100%
Geochemical						
Datasets	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	3	2	5	7	17
% of total	0%	18%	12%	29%	41%	100%
Databases	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	0	4	4	8	16
% of total	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	100%
GIS Packages	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	0	3	2	10	15
% of total	0%	0%	20%	13%	67%	100%
Reports	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	2	1	3	4	10
% of total	0%	20%	10%	30%	40%	100%
Bulletins	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response						
Total	0	2	1	3	4	10
% of total	0%	20%	10%	30%	40%	100%

AGSO PRODUCT QUALITY						
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Response				7	15	22
% of total				32%	68%	100%

WOULD YOU LIKE TO BE INFORMED OF PRODUCT DEVELOPMENTS ?			
ANSWER	YES	NO	TOTAL
Response	21	1	22
% of total	95%	5%	100%

DOES YOUR BUSINESS DESIRE ANY SERVICES, PRODUCTS OR SCIENCE THAT IS CURRENTLY UNAVAILABLE ?			
ANSWER	YES	NO	TOTAL
Response	6	11	17
% of total	35%	65%	100%