Subject: Inquiry Regarding WESP-AC Tool Results

Dear Dr. Paul Adamus

I hope this email finds you well. I wanted to discuss some interesting observations we've made while using the WESP-AC tool recently.

Upon analyzing the results, we noticed a significant trend: more than half of the outcomes display function or benefit scores of either 0 or 10, while the remaining results fall within a small range in the middle.

We're curious to understand the reasons behind this pattern. It's possible there are factors influencing the assessment mechanism that we haven't yet considered. Could you please shed some light on why this might be occurring?

Understanding the underlying reasons for this distribution could provide valuable insights into optimizing the tool's effectiveness and accuracy in evaluating outcomes.

I suggest we schedule a meeting to delve deeper into this matter and explore potential insights or adjustments that could enhance the tool's performance. Please let me know your availability for such a discussion.

Looking forward to your insights and collaboration on this matter.

Best regards,

Innov-CCNB team.

SR

If a wetland lacks a surface-flow outlet, i.e., is isolated, then the highest possible score for this function (10.00) is assigned automatically

NR

If a wetland lacks a surface-flow outlet, i.e., is isolated, then the highest possible score (10.00) for this function is assigned automatically

PR

If a wetland lacks a surface-flow outlet, i.e., is isolated, then the highest possible score (10.00) for this function is assigned automatically, based on an assumption that most phosphorus is associated with suspended sediment. However, some amount of phosphorus is soluble and could still escape in groundwater. That pathway cannot be estimated with a rapid assessment method