

IAIA13 Training Course #7

MULTICRITERIA ANALYSIS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF PROJECTS AND PLANS: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Instructor  
Davide Geneletti: davide.geneletti@ing.unitn.it

87.50 % above 7  
"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.	
Learn about the software DEFINITE. To know many interesting people from around the world.	To know the software before the course. Davide sent the link before travel to Calgary.	To do exercises with real dates.	10	Davide made a very good presentation of the course.	1	1	2	3	2	Say to the Amsterdam University that the DEFINITE is so expensive.
Review what I knew. Learn to use a new program. Learn about combining MCA and GIS.	Having materials in advance. Using the program within the sessions.	Nothing.	10	Very good instructor. More work in exercises would be great.	1	1	2	2	2	A second level would be great. (MCA II).
A new tool for decision-making (really important). Clarify terms commonly used in the env. Evaluation. What to prioritize in the evaluation process.	To have the PPT before the course. Good size of screen (projector).	Nothing. Just that I could not attend the course because the first day the registration desk close early.	10	Lack of information signals in the conference location.	1	1	2	2	1	
Application of multicriteria analysis for EIA. Identification of different technologies.	His approach. Practical exercise.	No.	10		1	1	1	1	2	
It's hard to say. All the course was worthwhile for me.	Nothing with the program. Cases.		10		1	1	2	2	2	
Approach of problem through philosophy of MCA.	Trainer explanation is clear and in detail. Chronology of the material.		10		1	1	3	3	3	
Structured way to make decisions (I learned about it). I confirmed that there are a lot of assumptions to be made, which depend from professional judgment.	Brought my laptop and used the demo that Davide sent. There was interaction with the other participants.	My laptop failed.	10	Excellent trainer. Time schedule and content were respected. Many references given by the trainer in order to work in the future. The trainer answered all the questions fluently.	1	1	1	1	1	Excellent facility and well attended.

Very useful tool for engaging stakeholders and putting some structure around consultation. Potentially reducing sticking points for negotiation (i.e. sensitivity analysis of how much weight would need to be applied in order to change results.).	Hands-on computer work. Great pace, very knowledgeable instructor, who patiently and effectively explained points of clarification.		9		1	1	2	1	1	Can't believe the venue had all of lunch in plastic containers, with no plastic recycling on site!! Unacceptable, especially for this conference...
Use of the MCA software. Understanding of different approaches of MCA.	Informal nature of course - able to contribute software was very easy to use.	Suggest a reminder to bring an adapter plug for laptops!!	9	Rally useful course, with an appropriate amount of interacting.	1	1	2	2	1	It was a bit cold in the room - air conditioning was a bit much!
Learned more about value of sensitivity analysis and methodologies. Exp. MCA software us spreadsheet method currently used.	Available demo software, available data sets, so no lost time for data entry.	Limitations of demo software/time.	9		1	1	2	2	3	Due to nature of the course, more time for practical applications would improve the experience (esp. spatial MCA).
The use of practical exercises was very important because put me understand better how to made a decision making and choose the best choice.	The exercises and examples. The use of Demo on the decision support system.	The time framework.	9	I had a different experience and I learnt more about MCA during the two days of the training. I suggest that the course must be continue in future.	1	1	2	1	2	
Use of MAC. Use of definite 3.1 program.	Bringing my own laptop. Having the presentations beforehand.	Lack of Internet. First day, sound was very poor.	9	Good course!	1	2	3	2	2	Beside WAIAT it's stated everything was ok. Some presentations used by the instructor were not given before hand.
Applicability of methods to actual cases.	Lectures pace. Time to exercise.	Introduce come advanced topic.	8		1	2	2	3	2	
Theoretical aspects of MCA. Software.	Usage of computer. Prior knowledge of MCA.	Time. More time and materials needed.	8	I am happy with content and presentation of course.	2	2	3	2	3	
MCA methodology. Sensitivity analysis.	Use of some understandable examples. Teacher's good communication skill.	Excessive treatment of academic topics. Poor match between PPT presentations used during training and presentations circulated before training.	6	Training more beneficial if trainee has some background on the topic.	1	3	3	2	3	
Discussions and practical sessions.	Computer based practical session.	A lot of material to digest over a short time.	6		2	3	3	3	4	Would be best broken up into 2 courses - stage 1 and 2.
Theory and software review. Review of a practical example (paper). Working through examples.	Having the class work through the same example allowed for collective knowledge and questions to be answered. Instructor took time to address and come back to each question.			Could be very interested in a follow up SMCA course using ILW's software.	1	1	2	2	1	
<b>AVERAGE</b>										
Q4. (Very dissatisfied 0, very satisfied 10)			8.94							
Q5. Detailed (Excellent 1, Very good 2, Good 3, Poor 4, Very poor)					1.12	1.41	2.18	2.00	2.06	
Q5. General average			1.75							