Methods

To assess the impact of the investment on ES-Core theme trainings, we compared the adoption and implementation of Ecosystem Services assessment tools between practitioners that participated in the trainings, with a group of ecosystem services researchers that did not participated. For this, participants and non-participants were contacted to answer a survey that captured information on ES studied, assessment tool used, among other subjects.

Data sources

Information about participants of ES-Core Theme trainings was obtained from participation lists of the 5 workshops implemented. This information included institution of affiliation, training received (RIOS/InVEST OR Costing Nature/WaterWorld) and contact information from 110 participants.

To gather information about non-participants, two data sources were used: the CGspace database and ISI Web of Science.

A) CGspace database:

We selected all document types in the CGspace published since 2014 that contained one or more of the key words associated with Ecosystem services (Table 1). This search threw a database containing 136 documents that included journal articles, books, websites, briefs, case studies, datasets posters, presentations, thesis and working papers. The set of documents was later filtered using the following criteria:

I. Duplicated documents (36)
II. Documents that were not duplicated, but contained the same information that a journal document in the database (e.g. dataset, poster, presentation) (9)
III. Literature reviews (7)
IV. The document assessed an ES not included in the trainings, focused on theoretical framework, development of new tool, or was not related to ESs at all (e.g. estimation of phenotypic variability) (37)
V. Briefs calling to action or raising future research questions (2)
VI. Author has more than one document type (e.g. brief, article, dataset, webpage) in the database, where they address the same study (15)

In addition, it was not possible to find an email address for four of the authors, leaving 21 authors from the search using CGspace.

Table 1. List of key words used as search criteria

water provision	carbon stocks	nursery habitats	nutrient filtration
water quality	water provision	habitat services	sediment reduction
water supply	Fresh water	Recreation	sediment retention
waste-water treatment	water supply	flood buffering	erosion control
water purification	water regulation	flood mitigation	soil formation
water filtration	nutrient runoff	flood protection	pollination

habitat maintenance	nutrient retention	flood regulation	aesthetic value
nursery function	soil fertility	flood control	scenic views
nursery populations	nutrient cycling	flood attenuation	scenic beauty
carbon storage	recreation	nutrient retention	scenic quality
carbon sinks	ecotourism	carbon sequestration	Tourism
			Ecosystem service*

B) Isi Web of Science database:

To complement information gathered on the CGspaece, we carried out a literature review using ISI Web of Science database. We selected all documents types published since 2014, that contain the terms CGIAR or one of the research centres under the tag of author association, and the terms "ecosystem service*" or "environmental service*" on their title[1]. A second search was done, this time using the same key words previously used (Table 1). From the results obtained, we selected articles that did an assessment of one or more ecosystem services, either identification, quantification, mapping or valuation, independent of the methods used, as modelling or participatory research. Reviews were excluded from this selection, and authors that were also present in the CGspace database, to avoid double counting. Finally, we collected 25 journal articles. The affiliation and contact information of the first author was gathered from the publication.

Finally, the database of non-participants was composed by 46 individuals.

Survey Design

To estimate how the ES approach and the tools to assess them has been adopted among participants and non-participants, two online surveys were designed. The survey directed to participants collected general information about researchers, pre- and post-training information (e.g. level of familiarity with the tools previous the training), application of the tools, difficulties faced, benefits generated from the trainings and interest in future training, among other aspects. Specific information was asked depending if the respondent i) successfully applied the tool after the training, ii) tried but did not succeed, iii) or did not tried to apply it. For this, the survey was designed using skip logic, so it would send the respondent to the correct section depending on their answer to previous questions. The survey directed to non-participants, contained questions regarding ES assessed and type, scale and tool used in the assessment. Also, non-participants were asked about interest in future training in the tool. The surveys were designed and implemented using Google Forms.

[1] Criterio de Busqueda: OO= (Bioversity OR cgiar OR AfricaRice OR cifor OR icarda OR ciat OR icrisat OR ifpri OR iita OR ilri OR cimmyt OR cip OR irri OR iwmi OR icraf OR worldfish) AND TI= (ecosystem service* OR environmental service*)

Finally, the survey was sent to 156 individuals, among participants for the trainings and not participants that are currently assessing Ecosystem Services. Two written reminders were sent. In addition, in case that a contact number was available, were tried to contact survey recipients up until there occasions via phone call to improve the response rate among respondents. When the direct phone was not found, respondents were tried to contact by calling the regional o0ffices. In total, 20 survey recipients were successfully contacted by phone, obtaining 52 survey responses, between participants and non-participants of the training (Table 2).

Table 2. Follow-ups to survey recipients by email and phone call

Initial number of survey respondents (participants and non-participants)	156
Respondents that answer the survey after the written reminder	32
Respondents not contacted by phone because contact information was not available	34
Respondents contacted by phone	91
Respondents does not work there any more	13
Could not place the call because of poor connection	30
Respondents did not answer	28
Number of respondents effectively contacted by phone call	20
Number of new responses after the phone call follow up	20
Total number of survey responses	52