

Appendix D¹: Comments from the Demonstration Areas (DAs) after the workshops for the Causal Loop Diagrams (CLD) development

Type	N	Criteria	Comments
Guidelines and processes	1	Purpose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The purpose of the model is clear 2. Yes 3. Not perfectly clear (grade 4) 4. Yes, It was clearly presented. 5. It still seems a little ambiguous in certain aspects 6. The purpose of the model was explained at the beginning of the first session, although perhaps some more time could have been dedicated to this, even prior to the workshop. 7. Yes 8. The purpose of the model was very clearly explained. However, in order to facilitate a more in-depth analysis of the aspects linked to the exercise, it would have been of great support to receive in advance the document explaining the context and detailed content of the components of the proposal, both CLD and PESTLE. 9. I understood that the model was being built as it was needed for the work progress of another work package. 10. It remains unclear how the model will be utilized to stakeholders or how it will inform future tools. 11. Although our DAs working group is comprised of ecologists, the rationale behind the model building was clear from the initial explanation. 12. Yes
	2	Usefulness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. The model is clear to us (modelers). It may need clarification/introduction to third party users 14. Both the modelers and 3rd parties. Not if presented without a full description of each model elements and a brief introduction. If presented with a introduction to the study area and a description for each elements yes to both. 15. Both; You should provide more information; You should provide more information; You should provide more information; 16. Modelers will develop the model, adapting for each site, and 3rd parties will use the model to understand the system. A full description of each model elements and a brief introduction should be provided to a better understanding. With the a briefing/introduction they will understand the model, but for use or make advantage of it will be need a better approach to transpose from the model to the reality. 17. The model should be for third parties. The format maybe easily understood by most end users, but not all thus, not all end users will be able to use the results of the model. For instance, the background of the user is of outmost importance to understand and make use of the model. 18. The model was constructed with its usage in mind, for both modelers and third parties, and adjustments were made when the practicality of the model was brought into question. Despite this, introductory explanations might be necessary in some cases. 19. I believe it can be used by both, the modelers and third parties. I'm not sure if all third parties will be able to understand the model and use its results.

¹ These comments were not edited for clarity or grammar edition. They are exactly the words the DAs sent as feedback, including the orthography mistakes.

			<p>20. The model is useful for the modelers, but it has a biased perspective from the experts.</p> <p>21. I believe that the model is well suited to users and to decision-makers, in that it includes qualitative information from the storytelling of the designed diagram. Furthermore, the PESTLE analysis carried out allows an approximation to those factors of the global context that will affect the projection of the model, and its effective implementation on a local scale.</p> <p>22. I have no idea who will operate the model, hence I have idea if they will be able to understand and use the model and its results.</p> <p>23. Considering the purpose being rather nuclear, it is difficult to assess how operators or future model users will interact/apply with the model. The model is the results of a two-day workshop. There therefore remain obvious limitations in its capabilities.</p> <p>24. It wasn't fully clear to me who should be the final users, but I think the process of building the model can be very useful.</p> <p>25. The application of the built model to third parties would require additional simplification as the model is quite complex and information would be difficult to access</p> <p>26. It is in an adequate and clear format for most users, but it still needs to be explained, adapted for some stakeholders, and tested with all stakeholders. Before being presented, an action plan on how to present the model according to stakeholders' capacities should be developed.</p>
	3	Presentation	<p>27. The model is fairly simple to read and should be intuitive to most people</p> <p>28. No maps or figures were used. Several loops are represented in a simplified way. If the model is presented with a introduction to the study area and a description for each elements, is easy to understand. BUT we did not try to present the model to 3rd parties.</p> <p>29. Maybe you should present easy understandable maps of the areas. This needs to be tested outside the group to identify snags.</p> <p>30. It depends on the audience (it was not present to any audience so far) and requires a good explanation about the model proposed. Individual loops should be presented when addressing to a specific topic. If its need to understand all the system there is a need to present in one big CLD. Several loops are represented in a simplified way. Some crossed lines can be double checked in order to reduce more is possible.</p> <p>31. If by audience you mean us, the answer is yes. The loops, although individually presented, in the end are difficult to individualize in the CLD. The number of cross lines were reduced as much as possible but are still too many.</p> <p>32. The model was constructed for its intended audience, regarding links between variables and the names chosen, and it was simplified when deemed possible. However, diagram organization was left to be improved, and no maps or figures were utilized. Loops were represented in a big general diagram.</p> <p>33. If we are considering the relevant audience, then yes. For third parties, I think we will need to add more information in the introduction, regarding the DA and to use more infographics to be more appealing.</p> <p>34. The diagram is not simplified, and it can be hard to follow.</p> <p>35. The model was presented in an adequate manner, supported by a ppt presentation and clearly explaining the key aspects for the development of the exercise. Some examples of simple diagrams were projected to understand the relationships between variables and to try to respond to the causality vs. correlation approach. As for the presentation of the loops, they were</p>

			<p>represented in a single CLD, which may be somewhat complex when developing the storytelling of the relationships between variables. Being a dynamic tool, it might be appropriate to analyse the simplicity of some of the information included in the CLD, in order to avoid redundancies in the variables and their content.</p> <p>36. I only have the Vensim model diagram at hand. The model has several loops. It a busy web of circular connections. The language used is mostly general language with one specialized scientific term (Maximum Sustainable Yield). There appears to be four crossed lines.</p> <p>37. The adequacy of the model is presentable, using little scientific language. However, lack of materials</p> <p>38. The model is represented as one large CLD. As mentioned in the previous comment it would need to be greatly simplified for the audience</p> <p>39. The model was constructed based mostly on team members' ideas and knowledge, and it has not yet been presented to stakeholders. Not all stakeholders will understand it.</p>
	4	Perspectives in Boundary-adequacy	<p>40. The model supports the views of the people that were present, which were fairly discussed, but it may be biased towards their view since the people involved in model creation only included few different stakeholders.</p> <p>41. No b) In a simplify way c) Yes d) Potentially yes, if each policy is an element of the model</p> <p>42. No; No; Yes; Not really</p> <p>43. Only on the scenarios presented. Although it does not take into account the stakeholders' perspectives.</p> <p>44. Scenarios presentation b) Yes, but without taking into account the strength of each variable. C) Yes they were presented d) No</p> <p>45. The different perspectives were actually biased in our case, since we were all academic and mostly biologists. Qualitative models are always a bit speculative so, I believe this model encompasses the most important aspects to be addressed with this type of research, and allowed discussion on the subjects mentioned here.</p> <p>46. The modeling process supported healthy discussion throughout, reaching agreements and promoting the participation of everyone involved. A) No, B) Yes, C) Yes, D) Yes.</p> <p>47. Yes, the model supports debate from different perspectives. However, in our case, I believe we here missing some relevant stakeholders to have a more holistic perspective on our model. Most of us are from academia, so we were a bit bias in the way we defined the CLD.</p> <p>48. Although several experts discussed the approach, most of them were biologist working in conservation/restoration, which can biased the final result.</p> <p>49. This adaptation has been possible, both in the discussion during the design of the CLD and during the analysis carried out from the political dimension (and other), within the PESTLE.</p> <p>50. As a biologist, I am lost in the questions posed here.</p> <p>51. It would be useful when building these models to have a mixed group of backgrounds to provide counter arguments to specific groups. As our DA is comprised of ecologist there is little disagreement in the model building.</p> <p>52. The model can support debate. no; b) yes; c) yes; d) very briefly</p>
	5	Norms/values in boundary adequacy	<p>53. The model supports the views of the people that were present, which were fairly discussed, but it may be biased towards their view since the people involved in model creation only included few different stakeholders.</p> <p>54. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties. For us (the modelers):a) yes; b) yes so is a 5</p>

			<p>55. Yes; Yes, but needs to be tested outside the group</p> <p>56. It does not take into account all actors /stakeholders sector perspective. Biased model</p> <p>57. There is no doubt that the model allows for the debate of different perspectives and values. Our opinions are tailored by our culture so this will always influence our vision of a desired state.</p> <p>58. As stated for the previous indicator, debates for this topic were held in an organized and polite way during the modeling process. However, no third parties were involved. A) Yes, for modelers. B) Yes, for modelers.</p> <p>59. I assume that this aspect has also been addressed by including relevant feedback from the stakeholder workshops, and is reflected in the relationship between variables in the diagram. A detail to highlight is the importance of transferring the content for consultation with all stakeholders, so that the suitability and applicability of the model in different contexts and situations can be determined from a dialogic approach.</p> <p>60. As a biologist, I am lost in the questions posed here.</p> <p>61. Certainly, it will support debate, but the debate with stakeholders has not happened yet. The model was built by biologists, and some biases need to be assumed. However, incorporating stakeholder opinions/discussions can suppress this bias and contribute to validating the model.</p>
	6	Trustworthiness or Guru status of the system dynamicist	<p>62. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties.</p> <p>63. I think it will depend up on the stakeholders and modeling team actions.</p> <p>64. Yes only with the perspective of the practical exercise made with the team. But if this question is related to stakeholders, the answer should be “0 – not apply”.</p> <p>65. I did not know the modeler prior to this exercise, but he was able to develop a positive atmosphere among the group</p> <p>66. Stakeholders were not involved in the modeling process, thus positive feedback could not be reported.</p> <p>67. We didn’t test this model with stakeholders.</p> <p>68. It’s possible to establish a good relationship between stakeholders and the modeling team, but it didn’t happen in this exercise.</p> <p>69. The assessment of this indicator is based on the good dynamisation carried out by the person in charge during the workshop. When talking about stakeholders, we consider the participants belonging to partner entities of the project, which, from the relations of the consortium in the DA of Macaronesia, have promoted a continuous and fluid dialogue, based on a code of conduct established at the beginning of the first session.</p> <p>70. Overall experience of working with pelagic fishing industry stakeholders in my home country is positive relationship. This applies to several projects outside scope of Marine Sabres</p> <p>71. Hard to say, because I am not in direct contact with the stakeholders, plus we did not have the possibility to show those result to anyone yet</p> <p>72. The model was not yet presented to stakeholders</p>
	7	Meaningfulness of the process	<p>73. It was a fun exercise to create the modeler. So I can only reply as such.</p> <p>74. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties. But I had a lot of fun building the model!</p> <p>75. Yes, not much; not much</p> <p>76. 0 – not apply, since it was not presented to external stakeholders. And 4, if the team counts as stakeholder in this model results.</p>

			<p>77. There were no stakeholders in the modelling exercise</p> <p>78. Stakeholders/actors were not involved in the modeling process, so they could not participate in discussion.</p> <p>79. We didn't test this model with stakeholders. However, I enjoyed the workshop and exercise we made together. (If this WK will continue to be online, my only recommendation would be to use tools such as Canva, Miro, Padlet or others, since they allow participants to add information and comments at the same time as the discussion runs. This allows the organizer of the WK to receive feedback from everyone, bearing in mind that in an online call, it is sometimes difficult to have the opportunity to speak without running over others.)</p> <p>80. Only the modeling team participated in the process.</p> <p>81. It was really a very enriching process, with great participation of all attendees, and with a debate that incorporated aspects from different knowledge and sectoral approaches, providing specific examples of each of the archipelagos that make up the Macaronesia DA, within the framework of the project.</p> <p>82. Stakeholders did not participate in building the model.</p> <p>83. Hard to say, because I am not in direct contact with the stakeholders, plus we did not have the possibility to show those result to anyone yet</p> <p>84. Again, in the current form I believe the model would be difficult for stakeholders to access. I think a simplified CLD or a series of worked scenarios or examples would be useful for stakeholders</p> <p>85. The same as above [The model was not yet presented to stakeholders]. However, the process of construction of the model with the team was good.</p>
Specific model tests	8	Structure- verification	<p>86. I am happy with the breadth and accuracy of the model, but as mentioned earlier, it may showcase a biased view of the system.</p> <p>87. A) yes B) I hope so, yes C) yes D) we don't have delays</p> <p>88. Yes; Yes; Yes; Yes, but I think we are on schedule</p> <p>89. A) The model represents as much as it could possible the structure of the real system. B) For some variables we can say that stated unambiguously, but for others there is a need to explain better the variable used otherwise it can cause some ambiguously. C) Yes D) No, Delays are not represented</p> <p>90. I believe the model represents satisfactorily the system and the variables are clearly stated. The connections had + and – signals implying causation. As for the delays I have no opinion</p> <p>91. The model represents the system and its issues satisfactorily. The variables are generally stated unambiguously, although some could be improved. Connections represent causation, but delays in response were not incorporated into the model.</p> <p>92. I think that the model has resulted in a good representation of the system, however, I feel that perhaps some social/economic aspects are missing or misnamed. In other words, they are represented to a certain extent, but perhaps we haven't been able to name them in the right way, so that they can be more easily interpreted by third parties. Causation is well represented.</p> <p>93. There was some difficulty in determining the inclusion of some variables within others, so I am not sure whether, at the time of storytelling the diagram, there might be some ambiguity in explaining to users of the model, the focus of those variables. An example of this is the concepts of carrying capacity and heritage (tangible and intangible). As for the establishment of 'causation' and non-correlations between variables, from my point of view, the previous instructions provided by the</p>

			<p>facilitator, and the fluency of the discussion allowed the relationships between variables to be adequately established. With regard to delays, I do not recall that symbolism has been included in this sense, reflecting delays. However, temporality was very much present in the analysis.</p> <p>94. Yes, I consider the model structure represents the real system and its issues.</p> <p>95. The model represents a highly simplified view of the System although any more complex and it would be unwieldly/impractical. Without data and experimentation the connections simply represent an assumed correlation.</p> <p>96. In my point of view connections represent correlation and only potentially they can represent causation.</p> <p>97. Yes</p>
	9	Loop Polarity	<p>98. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties.</p> <p>99. Needs to be used outside.</p> <p>100. We did not test the model with other stakeholders/"clients".</p> <p>101. There were no stakeholders in the workshop, apart from us, academics</p> <p>102. With regards to the identification of relevant loops by stakeholders, they were not involved in this process. Polarity was properly determined and there was convergence into variables of interest. There were clear goals, but loops were not named.</p> <p>103. We didn't test this model with stakeholders</p> <p>104. Not all stakeholders identified the relevant loops, just the modeling team.</p> <p>105. I think this indicator does not apply since the workshop was not addressed to stakeholders but to members of the Macarosia DA consortium.</p> <p>106. Stakeholders did not participate in the model building. I consider loop polarity properly determined. Loops are not named.</p> <p>107. Depends on the time scale (long vs. short term)</p> <p>108. The tool has not been represented to stakeholders?</p> <p>109. We did not focused on loops during the workshop.</p> <p>110. The model was not tested.</p>
	10	Boundary adequacy (as structure)	<p>111. There is some level of aggregation in order to keep the model simple.</p> <p>112. Some variables are aggregated to simplify the model</p> <p>113. Yes, most of them</p> <p>114. Some variables</p> <p>115. There was a good identification of the relevant variables, and although some of them could be overlapped, there was a quite good representation of these relevant variables</p> <p>116. The aggregation level of the model constructed was adequate and relevant structures were accounted for. Relevant variables were incorporated explicitly.</p> <p>117. Since we had to simplify the model, some variables are aggregated with others.</p> <p>118. The variables are well represented</p> <p>119. Although it is possible that there may be some overlap between variables, I believe that the relevance of the variables included in the diagram was very well agreed and analyzed</p> <p>120. I consider all important variables explicitly represented</p>

Policy			<p>121. I think the most relevant elements have been included. We also avoided to be too specific and we aggregated some similar elements.</p> <p>122. To simplify the model some variables were masked. However, this may be a positive for any attempt to engage with stakeholders</p> <p>123. The model represents well the structure of system</p>
	11	Family-member	<p>124. I believe the model can be applied to similar “problems” or similar geographic areas (e.g. insular regions) with minor adequations.</p> <p>125. Yes B) Yes</p> <p>126. A) yes b) yes with some careful</p> <p>127. Absolutely (grade 5)</p> <p>128. Model application for minor adequations was not tested. However, the model could retain applicability at a more local scale with minor adjustments.</p> <p>129. Yes, I fully agree with the description of this indicator.</p> <p>130. I do not have the knowledge and experience to answer this question.</p> <p>131. I am not sure, this is a very specific case in the end</p> <p>132. Yes</p>
	12	Extreme-conditions	<p>133. Not sure I understand this, since the model is not numerical.</p> <p>134. ? numerical? It is qualitative. Yes, it will behave the same in extreme conditions. Yes, it is possible to infer this</p> <p>135. I have doubts and lack capacity to come to a conclusion regarding this.</p> <p>136. Being a qualitative model so far, yes it could be done, but there is a need to adequate the model for extreme-condition if its quantitative (weighting coefficients)</p> <p>137. Our model was not numerical</p> <p>138. Model behaviour under extreme conditions of variables was not tested or considered during the modeling process. Nevertheless, given the present model, appropriate functioning could be inferred.</p> <p>139. Numerical model?</p> <p>140. I think that under extreme conditions and in a numerical approach, the complexity of the analysis and the deviations in causation between variables, would make inference very difficult.</p> <p>141. I think so.</p> <p>142. Not sure about this</p> <p>143. This should be tested</p> <p>144. In general, I think this approach can be hardly used to make inferences.</p> <p>145. It is possible, but not as it is. The variables/connections between variables should be pondered and scores added to the interactions</p>
	13	Insight generation capacity	<p>146. The model still needs validation from different stakeholders in order to test its applicability or ability to generate recommendations.</p>

		<p>147. Not really because we did not directly recommend policies. BUT is it possible to infer that policies are needed to regulate some elements</p> <p>148. I do not think the model leads to this</p> <p>149. We did not directly recommend policies. But it is possible to infer some recommendations and policy needed to regulate some variables.</p> <p>150. It is hard to do any policy insight or recommendation strictly based on our model</p> <p>151. Discussions during the modeling process led to some insights and considerations regarding the influence of geopolitics, protection of key species and the Macaronesian corridor, among other topics.</p> <p>152. I don't believe we discussed policy recommendations yet, but the model sure does have the potential to help build some PLoR for the DA area.</p> <p>153. It wasn't tested yet, so no.</p> <p>154. Although not applicable in our case, if the model were to be implemented through a participatory process with a multi-stakeholder approach, I believe that this tool would be very useful in identifying recommendations and influencing policy and decision-making (strengthening governance).</p> <p>155. No, it did not.</p> <p>156. Not yet, it just captures the current state so far</p> <p>157. It is possible to derive some recommendations</p>
14	Relevance and Fertility of PLoR	<p>158. The model does imply that in order to accomplish its purpose, a few policy changes may be required owing to the geopolitical nature of the system.</p> <p>159. I do not think it should lead or if it is relevant</p> <p>160. Policy insight or recommendation were not established</p> <p>161. Does not apply to our model</p> <p>162. Policy insights and recommendations arisen from the modeling process were relevant for sustainable system functioning and management.</p> <p>163. not applicable (yet)</p> <p>164. This item does not apply.</p> <p>165. I have no experience with PLoR and cannot evaluate if a PLoR can provide innovative solution to manage the system.</p> <p>166. What is the insight/recommendations? This is premature question</p>

	15	Congruence of PIoR with culture	<p>167. Not sure how/if this applies</p> <p>168. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties</p> <p>169. Still needs to be applied outside the group</p> <p>170. It was not presented to the stakeholders.</p> <p>171. Yes</p> <p>172. The measures and policy insight brought up in the modeling process were agreed by those who participated, but the workshop didn't involve any stakeholders or governance representatives.</p> <p>173. not applicable (yet)</p> <p>174. Yes, I totally agree with this item, valuing the creative process that took place in the workshop.</p> <p>175. There is no PIoR.</p> <p>176. What is the insight/recommendations? This is premature question</p>
	16	Boundary adequacy (as policy)	<p>177. The model only identifies policy boundaries as a potential issue in accomplish its purpose but makes no clear recommendations.</p> <p>178. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties</p> <p>179. I have doubts and lack capacity to come to a conclusion regarding this.</p> <p>180. It was not tested. However, it could be done by using some weighting coefficients to the variables and prioritized them, depending on the location (depending on the strategic guidelines).</p> <p>181. Yes. I believe so. A larger system would be difficult to approach because it would carry many more variables</p> <p>182. A change in the scope or boundary of the model is likely to affect the policy considerations brought up in the process. If applied to a larger system, policy insights are likely to be adjusted to a more general socio-ecological scenario, as opposed to the current focus on the Macaronesian Demonstration Area.</p> <p>183. not applicable (yet)</p> <p>184. I think so. The model makes an approximation by establishing relationships at the level between the different variables considered, also from a socio-cultural perspective, so such a modification would be necessary. In the case of application to a wider system, a revision would be fundamental, as it would entail a greater number of variables to consider and, therefore, a more complex process of establishing causation.</p> <p>185. There is no PIoR.</p> <p>186. It is already a quite large system, but is still missing out some important nations involved (Norway, EU, Russia, UK). I think it may be hard to apply to a different locations...it is quite specific</p> <p>187. What is the insight/recommendations? This is premature question</p> <p>188. We tested the model for the TA and so the policy recommendations are useful for this case study</p>
	17	Learning	<p>189. As mentioned above, the model was created by a poorly-diversified pool of stakeholders (mostly biologists) who tend to share a "common" view of the problem.</p> <p>190. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties. But I enjoy the process.</p>

Administrative, review, and overview			<p>191. Still needs to be applied outside the group</p> <p>192. It was not presented to the stakeholders. However, as participant (team member), it could be considered a 4.</p> <p>193. Yes because these aspects were already within our knowledge. If we want to learn more, we know where to look.</p> <p>194. Participants of the modeling process reported a satisfactory learning experience from the workshop. There was also support on ways to further learning.</p> <p>195. We didn't test this model with stakeholders.</p> <p>196. Yes, I think the workshop facilitated the learning, from a practical application and co-design approach. We also know where and how to expand the information, if needed.</p> <p>197. I did learn new things about the socioeconomical part of the model. If I express interest to learn more, I am confident Marine Sabres project members would assist me</p> <p>198. The modelling process was very informative and I was satisfied with the process. Following the modelling meeting I have since been supported in learning more about the DA</p>
	18	Engagement	<p>199. I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties</p> <p>200. Still needs to be applied outside the group</p> <p>201. No</p> <p>202. Yes, I think so in the discussions that followed the built of the model</p> <p>203. Stakeholders did not participate in the modeling process, thus could not engage with the team.</p> <p>204. We didn't test this model with stakeholders.</p> <p>205. We have not yet had the opportunity to have a space for discussion with stakeholders following the modelling exercise. If the item is associated with the workshop participants, then the rating for this indicator would be 5, as we jointly validated the design. Likewise, after the construction of the CLD, a PESTLE analysis was carried out, identifying a variable in the diagram linked to each dimension (political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental).</p> <p>206. Stakeholders did not participate during the model exercise.</p> <p>207. Hard to say, because I am not in direct contact with the stakeholders, plus we did not have the possibility to show those results to anyone yet</p>
	19	Ease of Enrichment	<p>208. The model as is and the way it was created should be easy to accommodate alterations that are deemed necessary.</p> <p>209. I think this is NA because 1-we did not include a specific policy and 2-we did not use quantitative data.</p> <p>210. I have doubts and lack capacity to come to a conclusion regarding this.</p> <p>211. Maybe with a more specific model, for a specific question, could benefit more with an enrichment to perform new policies.</p> <p>212. It depends on the new information and where it will fit, because the model was already too complex</p> <p>213. New information and variables could easily be incorporated into the current model, with a relative increase in complexity.</p> <p>214. I believe new information can easily be included in this model, to update or test the effects of new policies.</p> <p>215. Data can be easily added.</p> <p>216. It depends on the information to be incorporated and changes in the context. In this sense, the complementarity of the analysis by applying a PESTLE can be very useful.</p> <p>217. I believe that can be done.</p>

		218.It is possible, but not easily.
20	Time & Cost of the Intervention	<p>219.The model was created within the time expectation.</p> <p>220.Yes. Yes, the biography send before the exercise was useful, as having a brief discussion within the DA team. Have at least someone from politics and economy department would have improved the exercise.</p> <p>221.Yes; have people from other backgrounds.</p> <p>222.Yes. Brief discussion and bibliography were essential.</p> <p>223.The time to build the model was a bit too long although I understand the reason why. Actually, the moderator prevented it from being longer. I have no suggestion to improve this aspect</p> <p>224.The modeling process concluded within the expected schedule, although some time was cut from the planned breaks. As a recommendation, it would be helpful to communicate the purpose of the exercise ahead of time in order to be better prepared.</p> <p>225.My only recommendation would be to make the WK (if online), more inclusive, by using the tools I mentioned earlier. And I believe it would be helpful to have someone helping the session moderator to manage the speeches and the chat while the notes are being recorded.</p> <p>226.It lacked the involvement of more stakeholders and more time to reach a consensus.</p> <p>227.I think the time was adequate, although at the beginning I had the feeling that the definition of variables was done very quickly, which I found difficult to integrate. As for the cost, I have nothing to comment</p> <p>228.We almost managed to finish the model within the allocated time but not completely. There are no recommendations to improve efficiency</p> <p>229.It would have been very helpful to have had this workshop at the very beginning of the project.</p> <p>230.We did all the process within the planned time</p> <p>231.Yes. Th bias from mentioned before could be minimized if not only Biologists be involved in the construction of the model. Scores should be added to connections.</p>
21	Documentation	<p>232.The rationale model creation is well fundamented, but the thought-process behind the choice of each parameter present in the model, although discussed, was not documented.</p> <p>233.We should have record the discussion the we had while constructing the model.</p> <p>234.Maybe there should have been a manual-like report.</p> <p>235.A step-by step document could help to in the modeling process replicable (and/or video examples).</p> <p>236.Yes</p> <p>237.Unsure of whether or not the modeling process and changes along the way were documented to allow for replicability.</p> <p>238.Yes, the bibliography shared previously was helpful.</p> <p>239.No, I'm not aware of any document about the process of making the model.</p> <p>240.Yes, I believe that the available documentation facilitated the development of the modelling exercise.</p> <p>241.It is documented but I cannot say if it is satisfactory.</p> <p>242.Who is writing the documentation?</p>
22	Replicability	<p>243.The rationale model creation is well fundamented, but the thought-process behind the choice of each parameter present in the model, although discussed, was not documented.</p>

		<p>244.No, because we did not officially write a document while we were constructing the model</p> <p>245.Lacks a guidebook</p> <p>246.Although the written documentation is useful, for replicability will be better to have a facilitator/moderator, that would helps to understand better the construction for the model (or a short video with some examples, to allow to understand the models design).</p> <p>247.I hope so</p> <p>248.Unsure of whether or not the modeling process and changes along the way were documented to allow for replicability.</p> <p>249.There is no written documentation.</p> <p>250.Although it would be desirable, perhaps the replication process should be accompanied by training sessions to define and understand the different aspects of the model</p> <p>251.I am not sure.</p> <p>252.Well, there is a lot of specific expert knowledge involved (biologists/social scientists/economists/etc.)...not sure.</p> <p>253.I have not seen any documentation</p> <p>254. Not all the independent third parties</p>
23	Audit or cross-validation	<p>255.I was involved in the model process</p> <p>256.I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties</p> <p>257.Everything looks like in order</p> <p>258.The model was not validated by the stakeholders</p> <p>259.Model makes sense and it doesn't contradict any physical law or rigorous social norms. No, to the last question</p> <p>260.The model and PIoR make sense according to the team, and no legal and social norm contradictions were detected. Likewise with previous experiences.</p> <p>261.We haven't defined PIoR.</p> <p>262.Unable to measure even with someone outside the modelling process. However, I respect the questions raised in this, I believe that the model makes sense and does not contradict any law or social norms in its possibility of application.</p> <p>263.I was involved in the modeling process.</p> <p>264.Well, I have been involved in all of this...</p> <p>265.The model makes sense, has no contradictions, and is valid. However, we didn't test it, so it is difficult to measure its adequacy.</p>
24	Higher-level Model review	<p>266.I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties</p> <p>267.Still needs to be applied outside the group</p> <p>268.It should be considered by present the model to decision makers. However, takin into account that those decision makers were not involved into the model process, it could be more difficult to understand the model.</p> <p>269.Yes, to my opinion</p> <p>270.The model built managed to fulfill the expectations and objectives of the proposed exercise.</p> <p>271.I believe it will fulfill the expectations.</p> <p>272.This item does not apply at the moment.</p>

			<p>273.I was involved in the modeling process.</p> <p>274.I am still not 100% sure what the expectations are really to be honest, as we are not sure yet how exactly the results of the workshop will be used in further process</p> <p>275.This has not been done</p>
	25	Walkthroughs	<p>276.I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties</p> <p>277.Still needs to be applied outside the group</p> <p>278.The model was not presented to any other groups besides the project team members.</p> <p>279.I believe this does not apply because we had no documentation</p> <p>280.Despite being unsure of whether or not the modeling process and changes along the way were documented to allow for replicability, the model seemed correct according to the team. Main issues were also accounted appropriately, as well as considerations regarding policy.</p> <p>281.We didn't test it and we don't have PIR yet.</p> <p>282.This item does not apply at the moment.</p> <p>283.I was involved in the modeling process.</p> <p>284.Hard to say, because I am not in direct contact with the stakeholders, plus we did not have the possibility to show those result to anyone yet</p> <p>285.This has not been done</p>
	26	System-improvement	<p>286.I think this is NA because we did not test the model with 3rd parties</p> <p>287.It was not performed. However, an adaptative capacity should be consider (improved by software used to build the model) to include the system changes, to updating the model.</p> <p>288.We are not yet able to answer this</p> <p>289.System behaviour response to policy implementation not yet tested for the model built.</p> <p>290.Not yet, but we have the potential to do it.</p> <p>291.This item does not apply at the moment.</p> <p>292.Was not done during workshop.</p> <p>293.Not sure about this</p> <p>294.I agree it should be verified. It is possible to connect some changes, but this was not done yet.</p>