

Connecting Corridors Workshop Evaluation Answers

October 29, 2019, Airdrie, AB

1 In your opinion, did the workshop meet the objective to: "identify specific locations that need to stay connected or be better connected (considering both structural and functional connectivity) to maximize benefits for multiple native species, multiple species types (groups) and multiple habitat types."

Partially. We weren't really able to address multiple species or habitats. Too much information required and not enough time!

Still too high level, but this would be better split into subregions workshops to focus effort.

Yes, but exceptionally challenging to give good consideration to all issues.

Yes, although at a higher level than I think may have been expected. The areas identified were very broad, although still necessary to consider at a large scale. I think there is a greater awareness of the scale of this project.

In a general sense, yes.

Not adequate for total biodiversity (eg. Plants, insects) or unusually, productive habitats.

A few specific locations, but more generally areas that may be used to target specific locations.

Yes, it helped pinpoint where the high value areas are for increasing connectivity.

Yes and no. I think they were evident to some; others were looking more for process, leading to an actionable map. It would include specific locations, but context as well.

Yes, but that was the easy part.

The facilitated session focused primarily on regions and municipalities. Specifying further in-session may have yielded more specific locations.

Yes.

Partially. Results seem to have I'd some other areas that need focus -- i.e data.

I think it was successful in identifying 1 or 2 specific locations but some locations seemed more like patches than corridors. But still found effective in identifying general areas.

Sort of. Seemed to focus mostly on what exists already.

It seems like the answer is yes, though its not entirely clear that this is new information for us.

Challenge to identify a prioritization, really needs two scales (high visibility vs. high value) and a

Yes.

2 What are important next steps now that this workshop has identified specific locations that need to
Really, really need to have an implementation workshop.

Drill down further spatially, identify risks and values, identify potential actions/strategies, then apply those actions to key value areas at risk.

Summary report back and what is coming next.

Solidify the selection/prioritization criteria; identify key partners in carrying out work (land trusts, GOA, etc.); increase social license.

Provide succinct report and maps.

Analyze what features and species are not adequately covered in general recommendations.

Make written-down commitments to these locations and the objectives.

Implementation

Communicate process going forward..

Implementation workshop.

Remaining in contact with individuals I've met.

Compile the report and find ways to implement actions.

Synthesize workshop learnings and identify areas that require immediate short-term and long-term action. Share results.

A plan to implement protection with appropriate landowners/governing bodies.

Useable tools; "low-hanging fruit" = act now and some big wins (eg. Pronghorn crossing); successful communications; data sharing.

Get started implementing projects on-the-ground and start building capacity in local municipalities.

Scale up the local projects and applied research work.

Open data (at least some wins); prioritization; follow through.

3 Was there enough time for discussion?

No! These types of discussions take days to come to consensus.

No.

Yes.

Yes, the only block that could have used more time was the 'location and significance' gallery walk.

Very rushed, but okay.

Yes.

Yes.

There is never enough time when discussing conservation biology.

Yes! Facilitator did good job to preserve this.

Perhaps too much for criteria.

Yes and no. Facilitator rushed us along at parts.

Yes. Break-out at 3:15 not as clearly defined. Needed more direction.

Yes.

Yes.

Sometimes.

Mostly, yes.

Yes, but.... Needs focus on implementation and funding.

Yes - great for the size of the workshop.

Did you have enough background information to contribute meaningfully to the workshop? Please

4 Comment:

Yes. I always want more information like most scientists. But there was enough for a meaningful discussion.

Webinar was helpful, but workshop should have focused down to where. Spatial webinar content was focused.

Didn't have a chance to see the O2 report.

Yes! The webinar and pre-reading materials were immensely helpful in priming for the workshop.

Yes. I was aware already.

Yes.

Yes -- from my own background.

Yes. The webinar and documents were very helpful in setting the table.

Yes, in terms of your efforts to prepare us. But I also have more to learn (a good outcome!).

Yes, but weak on social side.

Somewhat. My primary experience is the the US.

Yes.

Webinars were helpful - circulate maps before workshop, map of areas where successful conservation has been achieved.

Yes, background information was very helpful and informative.

Yes, the workshop meeting were beneficial.

As much as can be expected five my relatively new experience of the region.

Yes.

Yes - excellent to have the pre-workshop webinar.

5 How satisfied are you with the workshop?

Not satisfied 0

Satisfied 12

Very satisfied 6

6 What did you like most about the workshop?

Got to interact with most of the participants and share knowledge/information.

Great group of people, interesting discussion, lot of learning.

Conservation.

It was well facilitated! The rotating conversations really helped to refine ideas.

Good mix of people.

Hearing diversity of ideas and experiences.

Different contributors and backgrounds.

The networking.

Meeting new people, discussion.

Energy, knowledge and commitment (long-term).

The folks I met, how much I've learned about Canada's politics and government systems.

Networking and opportunities to learn from others.

The structure of the workshop was great!

Hearing others thoughts and ideas, group discussions. Leah did a great job facilitating.

Networking, learning about other existing projects.

Learning more about all the things happening around the region.

Expert participants.

Open discussion and excellent opening discussion/overview from Ian Dyson.

7 What did you like least about the workshop?

Needed more time for the last discussion and less for the mornings discussion.

Project/outcome/policy/education was too rushed, poorly structured.

Long afternoon.

It was a long day, although I don't know if I would change that.

A bit loose of instructions.

Could have had more time (maybe 2 days).

Motivation lacked towards the end of the day.

Time limits, it could have been broken down into 2 days.

The room.

Not enough on implementation.

Rushed, slightly confusing facilitator.

Can't think of anything.

At times, conversations were circular. Not certain what the absolute goal of the workshop was vs. what we accomplished.

Not enough time to dig into a few of the topics.

"Where and What" sticker exercise was not effective -- lost focus.

No dislikes.

8 What would have made the workshop better?

More representation from implementation organizations (MULTISAR, Cows and Fish, AFGA, etc.)

A tighter spatial focus.

2 shorter sessions - webinar was a good idea!

More short breaks.

More NGOs that implement.

There could have been recommendations assembled for indigenous groups (not enough time to organize properly).

Shorter activities in the afternoon.

N/A

Not seasonally practical, but a field trip, which could be more virtual explanation.

More focus on using info to implement and scale up what we are doing.

An overview of what the facilitated activities are accomplishing would help.

Circulate maps and background info (brief focus and accomplishments/projects of participating organizations).

Tie-back at the end to the original goal of the workshop.

More maps on the potential threats/likelihood of conflicts.

Possibly a circular and multi-level facility but remember this facility was free and was okay.

9 Other thoughts, ideas and comments or concerns:

Webinar should have been followed up with key data to inform the spatial discussion.

Great workshop!

Thanks for your work!

Implementation needs to be dealt with.

Thank you for a seat at the table. First Nation inclusion is key to increasing awareness and connectivity.

I'm glad PCF exists!

We need more friends.

Very much enjoyed!

Thank you.

Would like to see a focus and definition of GOA policy and opportunities to meet UCP objectives.

Municipal only workshop with regional planners - what is valuable to counties? Packaging data? Etc.

I do agree with the idea of having a: 1) a follow-up workshop (planning and implementation), 2) agree with potential contracting of some next steps.