

IAIA13 Training Course #2

ECOSYSTEM SERVICE REVIEW FOR IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Instructors  
 Gabriela Factor: gabyfactor@icloud.com  
 Jo Treweek: jotreweek@treweek.co.uk  
 Florence Landsberg: flandsberg@wri.org

94.74 % 7 or above  
 "Threshold" for recommending the course again is 80%

Q1. List 2 or 3 worthwhile things you learned and did during the course.	Q2. Identify 2 or 3 things which helped you to work effectively at this course.	Q3. List 2 or 3 things which kept you from being more effective.	Q4. Rate your overall satisfaction with the course by circling the appropriate number. (Very dissatisfied 0, very satisfied 10)	Comment	Q5. Rate the following aspects of the course putting an X in the appropriate column. (Excellent 1, Very good 2, Good 3, Poor 4, Very poor 5)					Q6. Other comments or suggestions with regard to the course, the venue, accommodations or facilities.
					Trainer(s)'s knowledge of the subject.	Trainer(s)'s teaching skills and methods.	Course materials.	Practical exercises.	Time available for content of the course.	
Overall application of EST for IA method. Practical example.	Internal Approach. Highly collaborative.	Spreadsheets don't quite function properly!	10	Very pleased with overall experience.	1	2	3	1	2	Excellent standard of food + drink!
Considering and identifying important linkages between activities, benefits, uses, and the ecosystems that support them. The importance of not racing to conclusions. Involving and consulting people with local expertise on social factors.	Knowledgeable teammates. Well-thought-out exercises.	Time constraints. Acoustics in the room.	10	I am a relative novice, so everything was useful.	1	1	1	1	3	Facilities: Better heating!
How important it is to engage with stakeholder to identify ES. It is difficult to find the right indicators!	Work with my team. Sharing of exper	Not knowing enough the project analyzed. It may have been easier if I would know the project, the stakeholders, the area better.	10	Thank you, I really appreciated the course. Even if I felt loss sometimes, I feel I am going back home with new knowledge and tools.	1	1	1	2	2	
Definition terms of ecosystem service analysis. Impact identifications. Benefits.	The instructors were detailed and ready to listen and give further explanations.		10		2	2	3	2	2	Will appreciate if I could get materials posted to my e-mail.
	Case study. Deep knowledge of instructors.	My own lack of knowledge on ecosystems.	10	Time available for content of the course was good but only as intro.	1	1	2	2	3	Provide case study in advance and bit more detail.
A methodology to assess impacts on ecosystem services and benefits theory.	Size of class, # of instructors, structure of course (presentations, games, group work, etc.)		10	I chose the right course!	1	1	1	1	1	Follow up material+spreadsheets. "Community of practice" to allow consultants to stay up to date on documentation, methodology + share experience.
All of it!	Group work; working on real projects.	None.	10		1	1	1	1	1	
New technique. More knowledge.	The instructors. The group work.	Few lectures, more exercises.	9		2	3	2	2	3	We should have been provided internet as well.
Systematic process for ES assessment.	Small and large group discussion one on one with instructors.	Had difficulty hearing instructors and participants. Room was very cold on day 1.	9	Instructors were very knowledgeable and engaged in the material.	1	2	3	3	2	A room with windows.

Understanding the importance of identifying suitable indicators to target all data collected. Importance of stakeholder engagement in the process.	Practical component. Examples of presenters helped show how the tool worked-not just theory.	Drop down menus didn't work on the tool.	9		1	1	1	1	1	
Approaches and methodologies for ecosystem services analysis.	The patience and the encouragement of the facilitators.	N/A.	8	A lot has been learnt.	2	2	2	1	3	
New framework, systematic approach.	Good course material. Very good examples from real-world cases.	Lecturer talked too fast and went the (...) through too fast.	8	The content was excellent, the methodology for teaching wasn't so good.	1	3	3	2	3	
Good overall understanding of the new structured approach. Apply the approach to own project.	Personal support from the "teachers". Own project helped to concretize abstract terms.	I did not hear/see everything. Jet lag.	8	The approach very interesting. Excel spreadsheet needs rethink, it did not work well. Moderate in the columns is missing!		A 1, B 1				Diamond exercise was difficult in the sense that it forced to give ratings which do not reflect my opinions. Suggestion for line scale from -1 and on.
The link between ecosystem services and beneficiaries. Dependency of project on ecosystem.	Exercise. Group work.	None.	8		1	2	2	2	2	
Process understanding. Stakeholder engagement importance. Difficulty in setting indicators.	Group sessions. Interactive discussion.		8		1	2	3	2	2	Provision of PowerPoint slides as print-outs at the start would be helpful as it allows us to take notes.
Everything was worthwhile.	Spreadsheets. Practical examples.	Too long of breaks not enough course time.	8	Breaks were a little too long and would have preferred to focus more on course content.	2	2	3	2	3	
Work through steps. Saw perspective on whole process.	Work spreadsheet steps with team.	The complexities and contradictions in the examples were distracting and/or confusing.	8	helpful and will be used.	1	2	2	3	2	Simpler examples would help focus on principles (despite the interest from the complex ones).
Methodology for ESR, work exercises.	Interaction with other participants. Discussion with trainers.	Subjectivity of some services/indicators.	7		2	2	2	4	3	
Importance of stakeholder consultations. Importance of incorporating ES at early stages of ESIA.	Group work. Course materials.	Technical terminology.	6		1	2	3	3	3	
Knowledge sharing.					1	2	2	2	2	
<b>AVERAGE</b>										
Q4. (Very dissatisfied 0, very satisfied 10)			<b>8.74</b>							
Q5. Detailed (Excellent 1, Very good 2, Good 3, Poor 4, Very poor)					<b>1.25</b>	<b>1.79</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.30</b>	
Q5. General average			<b>1.90</b>							