

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS
Socio-Economic Effects Assessment Workshop
Feb 1-3, 2005

NOTE: Total registration number was 195.
74 Evaluation forms were received, not all were completed in full.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. I learned a lot from this workshop.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
61	7	5		1

2. I can apply what I learned from this workshop to my work.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
50	12	10		1

Additional Comments re Question 2:

I already do, but some of the presentations will enhance what I currently know and do.

3. I would enthusiastically recommend this workshop.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
53	11	8	1	1

Additional Comments re Question 3:

Too much talking at us.

4. This workshop gave me an excellent opportunity to meet people interested in the workshop topic.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
60	7	6		1

Additional Comments re Question 4:

Excellent!! Best thing about the workshop.
Yes, but too little time to meet them and talk.

5. The workshop description was accurate.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
44	8	19	1	2

Additional Comments re Question 5:

The first bit of info said socio-economic assessment "only", not environmental.
I thought I was going to learn more about the YESSA process.

6. The workshop CD (will be sent next month) will be a valuable resource.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
56	9	7		1

Additional Comments re Question 6:

Hope so!
 Can't wait.
 And more environmental friendly (saving paper).

7. The information content of the workshop was excellent.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
55	10	4	1	1

8. The workshop speakers were knowledgeable about the topic.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
64	5	4		1

Additional Comments re Question 8:

Some redundancy.

9. The small group discussions were useful.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
41	18	13	1	1

Additional Comments re Question #9:

Need more focused discussion, perhaps with an expert chair to structure discussion, presenters would be good.
 In a way – the topics/questions were weak but the contacts with people and where the discussions went was interesting.
 The repeated framing of the questions strongly directed the content of the discussions and limited it.
 To some degree, too rushed, great idea.
 The colored sheet exercise got a bit repetitive.
 Needed to have more opportunities with more time as discussions were limited.
 Needed more time.
 Questions needed to be clearer.
 Great way to get to know folks!

10. The facilities were comfortable.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
41	12	16	4	1

Additional comments re Question #10

Cramped, too many people, poor air quality.
 Very warm.
 The second and third days were stuffy and uncomfortable – too warm.
 Food wasn't great.

Question #10 ... continued ...

Warm on day 2.
Too crowded, noisy at times at back/near the wall.
Bad chairs.
Except a bit stuffy.
Poor parking.
Other than the chairs.

11. The food and beverage services were good.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
41	12	16	2	1

**12. I was able to see the materials presented with audiovisual equipment
(i.e. overheads, PowerPoint presentations, etc.)**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
32	11	16	10	1

Additional comments re Question 12:

Too much text on overheads.
Think people in the back of the room had difficulty seeing the overhead.
Depended on where I sat – at the back- no.
Some speakers used fonts that were too small.
Some PowerPoint presentations too lengthy.
Not always.

13. I could hear the speakers and questions well.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
61	6	6		

14. I am interested in attending a future workshop.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
50	11	11		1

Additional Comments re Question 14:

Depending on the content.

DETAILED COMMENTS:

A. What was the most important or useful thing you learned from this workshop.

I mostly valued the introduction by the First Nation Panel to historic perspective of important events in their society/community and lasting effects.

My concept of what is needed to make this process successful has been both broadened and clarified. My questions are more focused now.

History of current work from presenters on the need and current activities on socio-economic effects assessment.

Question A ...continued...

Great job in organizing this workshop!

How value driven SEA is – few hard thresholds: this emphasizes the importance of the people involved in implementing YESAA. The danger of “bureaucratic slippage” (or political slippage!). Will good things in YESAA actually properly implemented? Information about guideline documents etc. on the web.

Network of people; awareness of breadth of knowledge available.

People want to scope broadly.

Need for flexibility in implementation of Benefit Agreements ie: positive impact durability.

Focus – do things that will “make sense”.

Complexity of social side – health effects.

There is a strong tendency to re-generalize explicit questions and identified factors – whether from either bureaucratic or academic tendencies it is the explicit that reveals the nuance and culture of a project and community.

All is not lost. Others have already walked where we plan to stride - dispelling boogeymen.

Factors to be considered in environmental and particularly socio-economic assessment of projects.

Diversity and knowledge on the subject.

I learned how much I didn't know or have yet to learn.

Putting names to faces. The whole area of Socio-Economic was interesting along with each of the presenters.

What YESAA is!

Integrated thinking (outside the box) provides the most useful and instructive assessment.

Important communication/baseline data/teamwork is crucial. I enjoyed the group session when doing the scenarios. I would have enjoyed more of these throughout the workshop as it was more “hands on” and less lecturing.

That YESAA is an act for a process, rather than the body that makes the decisions.

There are a handful of people that really care and not many of us that are truly prepared to reduce the size of our footprint- see Arne Naess's 8 reasons for sustainability.

I found all of the presentations informative and well done. I appreciated the connection that was drawn between past projects and the potential to mitigate for these in the future. The question is how.

We're on the right track. We need to work collaboratively (all Governments and Yukon people) for local and regional “vision”. Can use other models to help us with implementing YESAA. Need more work in positive community local and First Nation consultation – hear all voices and values.

Question A...continued...

First Nation community is a community in healing.

Everything.

The variety of projects that it will affect, and hearing all the different perspectives.

Diversity of ideas.

The crucial role of community involvement while building capacity.

Networking.

The scope of the YESAA process.

How complex environmental assessment reviews can be.

In all aspects - social, economic and environmental effects of society.

Significance, need for guidance documents, overview of legislation. This will be hard to make it work.

There is a need to further define the YESAA process.

Value of the environment and the people who are guardians.

That people must be consulted in respect to the land, resources and environment.

YESAA process in assessment.

The importance of communities coming together for decisions.

Having the overview presentations on day 1 to give framework for rest of discussions.

How socioeconomics relates to environmental issues.

The health and social aspects. How important baseline data is.

History of Yukon YESAA process/historical context. That we're looking at socio-economic effects VERY LATE in the YESAA planning process. (What does this say?)

That community based participatory approach is still the way to go. Affirmation by all.

A global overview of the history leading up to YESAA.

Great to meet people, talk about things –ie. Social, economic that normally don't.

Factors to consider in making sure good YESAA implementation.

Community participation is crucial. What the board is doing.

We don't need to reinvent the wheel with respect to SEEA. We need to compile and review the existing theory and practice and synthesize a relevant and useable set of guidelines for Yukon.

About the complexity, yet basic simplicity, of SIA – the human dimension, the long term.

Question A...continued...

Indirect effects (social) need to be considered.

The fact that the three levels of government under YESAA will include communities and its members in Effects Assessment.

The info about determining significance.

Various scopes for different areas (environment, socio-economic).

There are many socio-economic considerations to assess.

The Environmental aspects on wildlife, communities and socio-economic effects information, presentations were useful.

That a person can only "Listen" for so long. It becomes gibberish after awhile – although content and speakers were valuable and knowledgeable.

The small groups.

What Socio-economic is about.

People are more enthusiastic than I expected.

Networking, like the multiparty nature of recent workshops (last week's Decision Body workshop) including this one. Fosters interdisciplinary.

Diversity of subject.

There are many good sources of info out there!

Interaction between speakers and table discussion. As discussed, it seems to be the process that was more important than the content, although I cannot say that those were not first class!

Vital role of public participation in SEIA.

Beginning of an understanding of the complex inter-relationship between socio-economic and environment assessment.

Health Canada presentation third day pm – practical stuff.

Consideration of Social Aspects (defined).

That community based participatory approach is still the way to go. Affirmation by all.

B. What ideas presented in the workshop remain unclear to you?

Lots of questions were never asked and several were never answered because the YESSA Board didn't seem to want to answer them (they should have at least stated why they didn't want to answer the questions).

Question B...continued...

The Weighting of and efforts across ENV/SE components remains very unclear. Scale of assessment from DO to Board level was not properly addressed – perhaps impossible to address except on a case-by-case basis. We can assess development – how do we determine it's boundaries – when do we slow or stop?

Mitigation tools for improving negative socio-economic impacts.

How issues that repeatedly come up (eg. Importance of scoping focus on these most affected) will be incorporated into YESAA, especially regarding timelines.

Are policy/planning to be assessed?

How we are actually going to assess and balance the environmental, socio and economic effects (positive and negative).

Relationship to community and regional planning.

Valuing of ongoing public/community participation in project cycle. Seems assessment takes precedence over communities acting as their own directions.

Mitigation for socio-economic effects???

How to ensure adequate consideration of socio-economic impacts. Details of YESAA implementation.

First Nation perspectives

Many ideas, there still remains a lot to be done.

How YESAA in general coordinates with some of the current processes out there.

How all of the information collected from communities for the assessment can be accessible for the communities to use.

How the YESAA process will unfold and how responsible authorities will be coordinated?

How it is all coming together.

How proponent will be accountable to follow through to the process when politicians make the decisions – eg. Devon properties have been afforded allowances by way of a political decision.

A lot of the presentations identified challenges and problems with the various assessments. At this time I am unsure of how these issues will be addressed. The answer to all the questions after the presentations was community involvement – unsure of how this will be accomplished.

Need to determine “timelines” for assessments and consultation.

Role of governments in process.

How we will make a decision in 30 (7) days. Huge task.

How they intend to insure community involvement in assessments.

How the challenge of incorporating socio-economic effects into assessment.

Question B...continued...

How YESAA will actually be implemented – who will do what?

How it's going to fit together.

How all these threads will be accommodated within the time and resources available.

All the presentations were well spoken and interpreted/enjoyed all three days.

Who does what and stages. Procedures to be used by design offices.

Next steps.

Government's role - regulators.

Where clear lines of authority starts and ends in respect to the YESAA board.

Who all the players are in the assessment in government.

Significance; how to tease out assumptions inherent in multiple perspectives.

How it will be implemented and what values will be given to the different values. How YESAA will relate with/to the other UFA Boards & Committees.

Who is required to obtain the data (government, the board or proponent)?

Who will do socio-economic impact analysis for projects.

Who will do what – YESAA ? - coordination of all those parties

Timelines? One stop shop for the proponent?

How this works in reality with present systems will be interesting.

Significance vs. Sustainability??? The speaker lost me on this one.

Governments (i.e. The Decision Bodies) role in contributing to SEE mitigation with respect to the implementation of recommendations coming out of assessments.

How we're going to make this real and realistic to do.

The details. Where is the board at? Where are governments at?

How will we ensure that all the considerations for socio-economic are looked at?

Who will follow-up on the mitigation? Who will determine significance? Who will determine a minimal effect (who says)?

Applicability to small - medium projects.

Application of YESAA

No. The sequence was wonderful, the depth was wonderful.

Question B...continued...

Details in all areas.

So **who** really is SEA done for? Isn't it the communities that are impacted so the technical academic jargon is sometimes a bit much.

Actually, most ideas were presented more than once, from different perspectives and so all were well covered.

Who will do? What is YESAA – Coordination of all those parties.

C. Do you have any suggestions about how we can improve the workshop?

Skip the prayer – not appreciated. This was a self-fulfilling conference: too big to ask questions Next a workshop with smaller groups and more opportunity for questions. More Case studies. Presentations had too much repetition.

Higher Screen, more structured and dynamic/focused group discussions.

Scenarios/discussions was not as useful as presentations and post presentation table discussions.

More concrete examples – Naomi's presentation was good this way. Fewer speakers, more time for each. Would be good to clarify what the results of breakout sessions will be used for in terms of YESAA implementation. Breakout questions (especially Day 1) weren't very useful – they often seemed to just 'test' whether we were listening. I wish politicians could be here – they might learn more about how EA should be done, then the folks here who are pretty up on it!

Table talk mostly reflected speakers comments (because they were very good); more time for speakers.

Move forward from this to explore tangible solutions to the assessment balance.

Rob Walker was weakest session followed by Berger.

How about an evening /social wrap-up on the second day to allow more networking and topic discussion before participants go back to the daily grind?

More time for meeting and mingling.

Excellent overview of socio-economic effects assessment but a lot of information over a short period of time.

Multiple projectors for back of room.

Listen to the participants.

Room is hot and stuffy. More time for First Nation speakers. Transfer this information to decision makers – politicians.

Give the guest speakers more time. The facilitators took up too much of the time before the speakers were introduced which made the time frustrating. Did not allow for enough time and it gave me the feeling of being rushed.

Question C...continued...

Introduce the YESAA board and give some background on how it was established at the beginning.

Less time spent on synopsis of lectures and intros- make sure you're very clear when doing intro. Intro for First Nation panel was a blatant "perceived" disregard. Also, include socio-lectures (third day) with first and second day lectures- an integrated approach to SE and EI.

None, the agenda was good, environment was good, food was good....

No, I think it was very well done.

More air circulation.

Make sure First Nations are informed well in advance about participation as speakers.

Less scenarios to work on in the last afternoon (brain overload).

Allow sufficient time for panel preparation and keep to the subject.

Allow sufficient time for presentations or adjust schedule if late starts. Speakers were cut short- weren't they aware of the time they had on the agenda? This consistently occurred over the course of the workshop.

I think this workshop was well planned. It worked well for everyone, with the speakers and the discussions between the table. This involves everyone and doesn't get boring.

Case studies to illustrate stages and roles. Provide reading materials on website prior to session. Forced seating was fine, worked well. Could have shifted at lunch time.

Visuals on both ends.

Have Yukon First Nation speakers on their feelings.

No, well presented.

None at this time.

More Social departments involvement.

No – it was great. It would have been beneficial to have had more time in group/table discussions but I wouldn't have wanted to exclude any of the presentations for more time to talk!

Less presenters and allow more focus on the key issues – timelines, implementation indicators.

Emphasize the value of examining past assessments to improve future assessments. Gary Kofinas (UAF) would have been a good presenter.

More involvement from delegates from health/social fields on what socio-economic project analysis could look like.

More specific questions to table re application to our situation.

Question C...continued...

No! Did Great!

Lack of interactivity in first 2 days. The way “discussion” questions were like homework. i.e. regurgitate what speaker said NOT real thought provocative sharing questions.

More time for networking – longer breaks. More time to relax, too. More interaction in presentations.

Why were panel members asked only a few days ago? Have a schedule available beforehand. Larger overheads (hard to see at the back).

2 screens for simultaneous viewing of PowerPoint presentations.

It would be a good idea to reformulate most of the discussion questions, in order to make them clearer and more focused (right now, many are so broad that people could understand them in very different ways and thus be answering really different things- and you have no way to know that).

Visual stuff too small for most at the back of the room.

Perhaps to have departmental information sessions (one to one).

More interaction of participants.

There is limited parking for vehicles, with this unwanted parking tickets. Maybe workshop organizers could pay for these tickets.

Provide parking spots.

Ensure that tables contain a mixture of gas, industry, consultant and First Nation representatives.

Presentations that fit allotted time on agenda.

No, excellent job!

In future, look at projects that will be about 90% of assessments done in Yukon.

Either diminish the scope or lengthen the time - there was information overload.

Ensure speakers have enough time for their presentations.

No – good job!

More specific question to re table re application to our situation.

D. Please suggest workshop titles or leaders for future workshops.

Include some “big” industry people – ask them how they perceive SEA and incorporate this.

Question D...continued...

Cumulative effects. Small-scale assessment. Visioning development in Yukon (Perhaps Yukon 2020) – criteria, indicators, thresholds. Weighting of positive and negative effects (matrices, Leopold tools for assessment). YESSAA, FN. Transition Workshop – how current assessment regimes (Water Board, YTG, Feds) will feed into the YESAA process - getting all the players into one room – decision bodies, regulators,

YESAA – 1 day Workshop on overview of how it will work.

Socio-economic indicators. Roles and responsibilities for SEEA.

Assessing SEEA; managing conflicting SEA issues.

Land Use Planning Council

George Lakey, Training for Change – world leader on facilitation for change, particularly in high-conflict situations.

“Hands-on” session on scoping socio-economic assessment for a project.

Dry run of YESA process.

SEEA values and indicators.

Would be great to have another workshop after the rules and regulations are in place.

Not at the moment.

How we can incorporate socio-economics into community development.

In a year or two – a follow up- how are we doing? Accountability.

Once YESSA is implemented or close to implementation, there should be a workshop for those individuals that will be responsible. I.e: proponents, funding agencies to come together and work through the processes – a clear understanding.

Those educated in environmental ethics (Bob Jickling?) and eco-feminism and those who understand the detriment caused by further, unnecessary development (a Suzuki type).

There should be community/First Nation awareness of YESAA.

Lindsay was great.

Specific case studies of socio-economic assessments for northern projects.

Mary Tapsell – excellent speaker, Kirk Cameron, Ed Schultz. This workshop (conference) will be excellent for the Public to be a part of, not just the government because they know already.

D – Body Process.

Final phase <> implementation

Leaders of industry.

For future of Yukon.

Question D...continued...

Same group, excellent and longer time made available to presenters.

“The Determinants of Health from a Northern Perspective – developing meaningful indicators”

Implementing YESAA – the guts.

More First Nations leaders and practitioners to talk. Would like to know YTG political leadership view of YESAA – their experience.

Health Canada – people doing actual Human Impact Analysis

The Road to YESAA

Total economic valuation – talk about some of the alternative methods for quantifying costs and benefits of biodiversity, etc. eg. Ecosystem services – clean water

Implementation (how to actually do this).

Coordination of Decision Bodies. Once the assessment is complete how do we best move forward.

“Where to from here” workshop. “Public” awareness campaign/communications. Value of traditional knowledge to process.

Without our environment, we have nothing.

Socio-economic assessment for the public. Not full of Government employees.

Work through real projects.

I really enjoyed the First Nation panel and would like to see more info delivered their way.

E. Please share any additional comments about this workshop.

SEEA is not new – it’s great it is finally here. The conference was a good start to introduce SEA principles. A few of us do the really big projects, but how does SEA apply to smaller projects – case studies are really important – this conference was very general. Otherwise well organized with interesting speakers.

Impressive turn out. Well done in keeping interest levels and attendance high – a testament to the quality of this event.

Cost was a bit prohibitive for community people/general public, yet this workshop was almost more geared toward people who don’t have a strong background/experience with EA – for people who’ve been working in/continuity to EA there wasn’t too much new. It’s good some subsidies were offered but this may not have been clear to the general public/communities. Not sure how to do this but some people in the communities didn’t hear about this workshop (or not until it was too late).

Question E...continued...

GREAT JOB!! Thank you for the opportunity to network with key people in all three of the disciplines and the community and FN members.

Liked the way you compiled information and rotated people.

Thank you for the CD. A greater variety of small group/experiential exercises would be revealing, help ground the information, and provide relief from the fatigue.

Great Workshop! Thank you all very much. Loved the knowledgeable speakers. Loved the inter-action even better.

Great job to keep things moving along.

Good first step, it is hard to see how to apply and promote development. Not all developments are bad for the communities.

Great job! Excellent facilitators.

I'd like to see this progress into community economic development.

Fabulous facilitation – great segues and context provided before and after speakers, encouraging dialogue – very successful.

This workshop was excellent and you could feel the energy throughout the 3 days. The participants were well represented from the interest groups within the Yukon. It gave the opportunity to network and share.

I would really like to have seen/heard at least one person who presented on environmental ethics. I think this perspective would get people thinking of the big picture- i.e. the natural world not just a resource but necessary for its intrinsic value. Necessary perspective if truly we are interested and believe life on the planet can be sustained.

My only request is to continue this process.

The workshop was very educational and provided good resources for future projects and assessments.

The organizers did a great job! Kudos to Corenn Kormos, Lindsay, and Lynn! The flowers and mints were a nice touch.

The workshop contained a lot of information, however, it was handled very well and was probably one of the best workshops I have attended. Lots of positive involvement by participants and a good level of enthusiasm.

I especially enjoyed presentations by Patt Larcombe as a First Nation participant. The other speakers were excellent, too. Great workshop!

The variety of perspectives present was very educational.

Would be good to have one computer available to people to check e-mail. Save having to go to the office (I know you don't want people distracted but it is a tradeoff between not present).

Greater involvement of the business communities, proponents and decision makers would be very beneficial.

Question E...continued...

Candies should be individually wrapped (spread germs).

Handouts in advance (presentations) works better re: taking notes to our own understanding (content) which I had to do.

Over all inspiring and very knowledgeable (learned so much). Thank you!

Examples of assessments from other areas/regions to illustrate methods. RRC on YFWMB members need to know this material but through non-technical presentations/workshops.

Have a workshop on how it affects community and First Nations.

Ensure all pertinent information is sent back to the delegates.

It was a useful workshop.

Lots of work beforehand resulted in a fabulous learning and sharing opportunity. Thank you!

There needs to be more community involvement – RRCs (Public) – UFA Boards & Committees. I think that the YTG Government has enough money to put on this workshop and doesn't need to charge \$275 for it. The majority of people were employees of YTG. It costs people enough just to come to Whitehorse – you talk about community involvement, but alienate them because of the high costs: the input is coming from government perspective and not from the people in the communities.

Need to do a better job of involving First Nations expertise – embarrassing that they were not given preparation time – other invited guests were. More time for technical speakers with lots of expertise – eg. Doug Zathan

Too much time on speaker intros and reviews. Please give the time to the presenters. It's disheartening to see them rush only to spend time reviewing their presentation. Give an sample project – moving through process. Clearly show point where socio-economic impact analysis happens, give people the context of analysis.

Generally it was great. Great facilitation.

Thank you! You did an excellent job of organizing.

Great Workshop! Thank you for all your hard work! It was good to have assigned seating, to get people working together.

More time/opportunity to learn about SEEA, particularly process, from other practitioners (i.e. Boards and decision makers).

Would have liked to hear more about measurement options like genuine progress indicators.

Very useful and informative workshop for Department Environment's perspective.

How are we "involving" the First Nations and the public in this process?

More breaks maybe after each speaker.

I enjoyed it very much. Thank you!

Question E...continued...

Should have given First Nation panel the table they had asked for! If the meeting did not start on time – should not rush people through their talks because of it! After all that's why we are here! And why they came!

Need to do a better job of involving First Nation expertise – embarrassing that they were not given preparation time – other invited guests were.