Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	102
GEF Agency project ID	36030
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-1
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	World Bank
Project name	Biodiversity Restoration
Country/Countries	Mauritius
Region	AFR
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP3 – Forest Ecosystems
Executing agencies involved	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Natural Resources; Mauritian Wildlife Appeal Fund
NGOs/CBOs involvement	secondary executing agency
Private sector involvement	beneficiaries
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	8/24/1995
Effectiveness date / project start	2/21/1996
Expected date of project completion (at start)	12/31/2001
Actual date of project completion	12/31/2001

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.2	1.09
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.2	0.2
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.15	0.15
	Private sector	0.05	0.05
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1.2	1.09
Total Co-financing		0.4	0.4
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.6	1.49

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	6/30/2002
TE submission date	2/3/2003
Author of TE	J. Mauremotoo and M. Simeon
TER completion date	10/19/2014
TER prepared by	Nelly Bourlion
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Joshua Schneck

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	HL	L	L
M&E Design	N/A	S	S	MS
M&E Implementation	S	N/A	S	S
Quality of Implementation	N/A	S	N/A	S
Quality of Execution	S	S	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			S	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project as stated in the PD (pg. 5) is to "help the Government of Mauritius to meet some of its outstanding global obligations, identified in domestic environmental strategies and plans, and specified under the Biodiversity Convention, for which full domestic funding is not forthcoming." According to the project document, the project will result in the preservation of flora and associated endemic fauna, and serve both as a model of ecosystem restoration and as a learning experience for similar projects in the region and elsewhere.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

There are two development objectives to the project (PD, pg.5):

(1) protect critically endangered biodiversity of international importance by restoring degraded small island habitats and propagating and reintroducing endemic species to these habitats; and
(2) strengthen capacity for the management and monitoring of biodiversity restoration.

The main outcome of the project is to support innovative efforts in habitat and species restoration, as well as strengthen local capacity and facilities to undertake the required horticultural, monitoring and managerial activities. The project focuses on Rodrigues and Round Islands and Ile aux Aigrettes. According to the PD (pg.6), these islands offer different but complementary opportunities for habitat restoration and species recovery.

There are four main outputs to this project:

(1) a survey for the identification of original habitat/community types for determining species recovery and habitat restoration targets at the three sites, and for the eradication or control of undesired exotic species,
(2) investment in required infrastructure for the propagation and cultivation of threatened plants,
(3) propagation, replanting, and reseeding of endemic plants, and reintroduction of endemic animals from captive-bred populations,
(4) technical assistance to strengthen the governmental and non-governmental institutions involved, based on a skills audit and training need analysis.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The TE mentions that the objectives of the project were never formally revised, but that some of the objectives could not be carried out as originally planned. For example, in Rodrigues the restoration work in the Mourouk valley could not be undertaken because it had not been declared a nature reserve. The extension of the runway of Plaine Corail Airport into the nature reserve of Anse quitor also hampered the project's work (TE, pg. 6).

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The project is relevant to both the GEF and the government of Matrious. The project addresses high priority issues identified in Mauritius' National Environmental Action Plan and Environmental Investment Plan, and complement the Black River Gorges National Park initiative. The project seeks to preserve highly threatened endemic species and ecosystems by going beyond traditional protection measures and establishing a replicable model for species reintroduction and habitat and ecosystem restoration and monitoring, which would be especially valuable for other island ecosystem and species projects (PD, pg. 6). The project involves a Government-NGO partnership, and brings together international, national, and private sector expertise and resources, to raise awareness and increase opportunities for future resource mobilization. The project is "consistent with priorities identified by the first Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity since it is a demonstration project to promote conservation of endemic species in small island ecosystems" (PD, pg.6). Additionally, the project's objectives are inline with those of GEF Operational Program 3 – which seeks to preserve globally significant biodiversity found in forest ecosystems.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The effectiveness of the project is satisfactory as the project largely achieved its principle objectives. Progress is detailed further at each targeted island below:

(1) The objective of making Ile aux Aigrettes a sustainable conservation area is met, through the direct achievement of island restoration and the good prospects of making the site self-sustainable through ecotourism. The coastal ebony forest is on its way to restoration with "90% of the island having been cleared of alien weeds and planted where necessary"(TE, pg. 8) and a secure funding base for the financing of the restoration programme is established.

(2) The work on Round Island is taken over by a new project (A WB-GEF funded MSP), since the Biodiversity Conservation project has laid down the foundation for restoration techniques and identification of pioneer plant species. Weed control and native planting techniques and capacity have been developed. They allow large-scale restoration to proceed.

(3) The work on Rodrigues is below expectations regarding the area planted, however, the nursery techniques are developed, and MWF is raising funds to expand the planting program.

Finally, the last output of the project was the awareness raising. The project contributed to a large increase of the level of public awareness, this resulted in an increase in the number of Mauritian volunteers to be involved in conservation work. The monitoring of restoration work and the experimental trials resulted in an improved knowledge in restoration techniques. Therefore, Mauritian conservation capacity has "vastly increased in both the Governmental and non-governmental sectors" (TE, pg. 8).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The efficiency of the project is Moderately satisfactory.

According to the TE, the project's objectives were concise and achievable and the timeframe to do this and verify the outcomes was realistic (TE, pg. 7). However, the risks of implementing such a project in remote areas were underestimated, and led to institutional problems and difficulties of logistics. In Round Island for example, there were less frequent visits and this resulted in high mortality rates for seeding and to the failure of some restoration activities. On the other hand, the work on Ile aux Aigrettes proceeded "relatively smoothly with MWF being granted a long-term lease (due to end in 2034) to manage the island for ecological restoration" (TE, pg. 7).

In the initial stage of the project document, budget categories were too general, and therefore cost estimates were not accurate. According to the TE, "the consultant who wrote the grant proposal did not use local sources to estimate cost" (TE, pg. 8). This created start up difficulties and led to changes in budget allocations to adapt to the realities of the project, and it had as consequences some confusion and delays in disbursement (TE, pg. 17). For example, the Ile aux Aigrettes restoration budget increased from US$0.18 to US$0.35 million, the Round Island budget decreased from US$0.02 million to US$0.01 million, the Rodrigues budget decreased from US$0.4 million to US$0.25 million, and finally institutional strengthening and technical assistance decreased from US$0.61 to US$0.48 million.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Likely**

Overall sustainability of the project is rated as Likely.

Environmental sustainability: Likely

The biological achievements and commitments of the stakeholders involved is such, that the sustainability of restoration outcomes is very likely (TE, pg. 16). For example, in Rodrigues Island, the project activities are expected to continue after the project's lifetime, thanks to the program of the Forestry Services and thanks to the continuing funds raised by MWF, the volunteer and the community groups participation.

Financial sustainability: Likely

The TE mentions that "the use of Ile aux Aigrettes as an ecotourism destination is one of the main avenues for sustainable funding of ecological restoration work on Ile aux Aigrettes and possibly on Round Island" (TE, pg.19). An ecotour has been developed during the project period and has attracted more visitors than initially estimated. The estimation for the years to come are high enough to cover all ecotour costs, to fund the management of Ile aux Aigrettes and the maintenance of both lie aux Aigrettes and Round Island (TE, pg. 14). Therefore, thanks to the eco-tourism income the long-term costs are expected to be sustained.

Institutional sustainability: Likely

The government has already decided to involve NGOs in the management of some of the areas covered by the project. In the Ile aux Aigrettes area, the National Heritage Trust (NHT) has been mandated to restore and manage Ile de la Passe. MWF will take responsibility for Fouquet, Vacoa, Marianne and Roche aux Oiseaux. Moreover, some proposals have been made by MWF to put under proper management a mangrove area. This project would include the construction of a visitor center that would help develop eco-tourism, and therefore make restoration and conservation efforts sustainable (TE, pg.19).

Socio-Political sustainability: Unable to Assess

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The Government of Mauritius co-financed the project ($200,000), as well as Mauritius Wildlife Foundation ($150,000), and private hotel owners on the islands (US$50,000). Regarding the leveraged financing, the project attracted US$520,000 for related conservation activities on the islands. For example, the visitor center built on Ile aux Aigrettes was funded by the Japan World Exposition Commemorative Fund (TE, pg. 9)

The overall budget was broken down as follow (TE, pg.6):

(1) Rodrigues Forest restoration $401,000
(2) Round Island restoration $017,000
(3) Ile aux Aigrettes restoration $175,000
(4) Institutional strengthening and capacity building $606,000

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There was no project extension or major delays reported in the TE and in the PIRs.

However, there was a minor delay reported in the TE (pg.17) regarding the formulation of a management plan for Round Island. This objective has only been partly met, and there is only a draft version of the management plan. This is because the development of restoration techniques took longer than expected. However, according to the TE (pg. 11), the management plan will be reviewed, adjusted and formalized in due course under the follow-up project.

Some minor delays also occurred in Anse Quitor area. The proposed extension of Plaine Corail Airport made planning of work difficult, and the weak cooperation of the Rodrigues Forestry Service made planning difficult and slowed down project implementation (TE, pg.17). No major consequences are reported in the TE.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Overall, the country ownership was strong. On one hand, the collaboration was very good between government and the implementing NGO, in particular to help solve the logistical problems of working on Round Island. However, on the other hand, some issues related to government ownership affected project implementation such as the proposed extension of Plaine Corail Airport that made planning work for Anse Quitor in Rodrigues Island difficult.

The community involvement efforts were very useful as awareness-raising exercises. The conservation work in Mauritius used mostly international volunteers. However, during the course of this project, the number of Mauritian and Rodriguan volunteers has expanded hugely, and shows the strong ownership of the project (TE, pg. 13).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

According to the TE, the initial M&E system to determine the success of the restoration programs was not robust. However, during the project implementation, it was replaced by more thorough surveys and some were designed as integral parts of PhD studies (TE, pg.10). Moreover, according to the TE (pg.4), the project had a sound logical framework with indicators that were used to measure progress towards the achievement of the objectives and to take corrective action as the project progressed. The PD had a budget allocated to the M&E system. There is however no indication on responsibility for M&E.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

There is very little information in the TE and in the PIRs about M&E implementation. However, the TE mentions that there was evidence of adaptive management (TE, pg.12). The M&E system evolved to provide measurable information on the restoration of the islands ecosystems. According to the TE, the project learned as it progressed, for example the project learned which species survived most and what where the needed conditions to increase survival rates of seedlings. Finally, an improved M&E system was used to verify the changes and to compare the actual with the expected achievements.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The quality of implementation is rated satisfactory.

The World Bank is the implementing agency of this project. According to the TE, its performance in project identification was satisfactory. The Government of Mauritius prepared a National Environmental Action Plan in 1990 and was the first country in the world to ratify the Biodiversity Convention. The project was designed to support Government policy and priorities in biodiversity management.

Moreover, according to the TE (pg.20), the project design was technically sound and the decision "to commission an NGO to implement the project demonstrated its merits". However, there were some shortcomings in the Project Design, especially the underestimation of the difficulties of working in such remote areas.

Even though initial supervision missions focused more on technical aspects and not enough on project management, this was corrected and the overall quality of the WB supervision was satisfactory (TE, pg.20).

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

Overall the Government's performance in project preparation was satisfactory. The priorities were established in line with Government's work. However, the TE states that detailed project preparation was left too much to consultants and resulted in some shortcomings in the quality of the project at entry (TE, pg. 21). The Government's execution performance during the project's course was also satisfactory. The collaboration between Government and the implementing NGO was very good, and it helped to solve the logistics problems.

One of the main difficulties in the project execution was the lack of agreement with the Ministry of Rodrigues who are responsible for the Rodrigues Forestry Department. Another difficulty was the lack of involvement of the MWF Plant Conservation Manager that is responsible for the technical management of the project. The first hired manager (from 1996 to 1999) was at the same time of the project studying for a PhD and therefore this slowed down the pace of restoration work. A new Plant Conservation Manager was hired in 1999, and this resulted in increased project productivity (TE, pg.21).

The execution agency (MWF) performance was satisfactory. The financial management was initially too casual, but this was corrected. MWF was proactive in seeking additional resources; they establish a staff

position for that purpose. The successful eco-tourism program developed for Ile aux Aigrettes was not part of the project at first but MWF actively developed it to secure financial sustainability (TE, pg. 21).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The following environmental impacts are reported in the TE:

(1) 90 % of the Ile aux Aigrettes has been weeded and planted at the end of the project (TE, pg. 8)
(2) A repeat vegetation survey conducted in 2001 indicated a decrease in weed levels, for example *Leucaena leucocephala,* possibly the island's most invasive weed species, decreased in cover by 50% between 1999 and 2001 (TE, pg.9)
(3) Of the 55 plant species propagated on Ile aux Aigrettes from 1997-2001 28 are endangered according to IUCN criteria. Due to the restoration programme on Ile aux Aigrettes five of these species are well on the way to being down-listed and over 100 individuals have been produced and planted of a further six of these species (TE, pg.9)
(4) Habitat is being established and native birds are starting to use the growing native forest at Grande Montagne as nesting habitat (TE, pg.12)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There is no quantitative socioeconomic changes reported in the TE. However, the on-going eco-tourism development at Ile aux Aigrettes is expected to contribute to the economy of Mauritius. The prospects for restoring more sites (Mahebourg Bay islets and mangrove, Flat Island and Ile Gabrielle in the North) is expected to increase further the contribution of eco-tourism to the national economy (TE, annex 3).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems,

including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Capacity changes have been reported in the TE:

(1) Increases in knowledge on the propagation of native plants have been achieved during the project. These have led to an increase in the Ile aux Aigrettes nursery production from 7,000 plants of 12 species in 1998 to 16,500 individuals of 35 species in 2001 (TE, pg. 9).

(2) The tour is being developed on the strictest principles of ecotourism, the purpose being to inform the public about the conservation work and to finance MWF on a sustainable basis in the future (TE, pg.10).

(3) The sub-projects funded under the GEF grant have been used to increase awareness about the biodiversity value of Mauritius and Rodrigues and the efforts being made for its conservation.

(4) An average of one article a month has appeared in the Mauritian media about one or more of the three sub-projects. The project has also been featured regularly on Mauritian television news and documentary slots and on the Mauritius College of the Air. The project has also been featured several times in international documentaries. In addition scientific findings of the project have been featured in peer-reviewed journals and in conference proceedings and several scientific works are in preparation (TE, pg.8).

(5) The work in Rodrigues has been used by the MWF Community Educator (project established in 1998) as material for presentation to Rodriguan children and community groups and for field excursions allowing direct experience of the process of ecological restoration. Project work has also been used as material for the Mauritian NPCS educator (TE, pg.13).

(6) Training opportunities have increased the capacity of Mauritian nationals in areas such as quantitative ecology, plant propagation, conservation of plant genetic resources and weed management. Developments within MWF have been paralleled by increases in the capacity of Government agencies to carry out conservation of native biodiversity (TE, pg.14).

(7) Within MWF 20 persons (18 Mauritian and 2 expatriates) have been employed directly on the project. Approximately 50 other MWF staff have been involved with the project from time to time. In addition another 50 people from other Mauritian organizations have worked directly on the project. All of these have benefited from on the job training (TE, pg. 16).

b) Governance

The only Governance change reported in the TE is the production of a management plan for Round Island. However, this management plan was not entirely produced. At the end of the project there was only a draft management plan, because it took longer than expected to develop the techniques that are now applied on the on-going follow-up project (TE, pg. 11). However, the TE mentions that the

management plan will be reviewed, adjusted and formalized in due course under the follow-up project (TE, pg. 11).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

There is no unintended impact reported in the TE and in the PIRs.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Several initiatives at scales have been reported in the TE and in thePIRs.

A project for Marine Biodiversity Conservation is being considered for GEF funding through UNDP, under the Ministry of Fisheries. The Government has also been discussing with the World Bank on a possible project to support implementation of the framework being developed not only to Mauritius Island but also for the Islets, the Outer Islands and Rodrigues (PIR, pg.5).

The Mauritius Forestry Service has established a Biodiversity Unit to carry out conservation in areas not currently conserved by MWF and the NPCS. The NPCS have expanded the area they are managing for conservation on the Mauritian mainland and have recruited additional staff.

Using Ile aux Aigrettes and Round Island as models of successful islets management the Government of Mauritius through the Ministry of Environment launched an Islets Taskforce to investigate the state of the islets of Mauritius and to propose remedies for those judged to be in need of improved management (Te, pg.15).

Some other funds have also been leveraged; a detailed list is given in the Table pg.15 of TE.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The following lessons are given in the TE (pg.17):

(1) The logistics of working on small islands is very heavy. This was clearly under-estimated for Round Island, but also applies to Rodrigues and to a lesser extend to lie aux Aigrettes. Partnerships are essential to overcome such difficulties.

(2) Collaboration with partners, and in particular collaboration between an NGO and public entities such as Government Departments, benefits from being clearly spelled out and is best organized through the use of formal memoranda of understanding. Such an MOU would have been most helpful for example in the case of Rodrigues.

(3) There is as much to learn from failure than from success, as illustrated by the learning process at Round Island, where trials and errors have eventually led to a full understanding of how the island can be restored. This has led to the development of a follow-up project, now on-going.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

There is no recommendation given in the TE and in the PIRs.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a well substantiated assessment of the achievements. The expected and actual objectives, outcomes, and outputs are given, and assessed in detail. However, the project's impacts are not comprehensive enough.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and evidence are convincing. However, some ratings are missing such as M&E implementation.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses the project's sustainability in details and shows how the project will be able to continue (especially through the eco-tourism activity, and the additional leveraged funds).	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidences reported in the report. However, there is no distinction in the report between lessons learned and recommendations.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes tables reporting actual vs. expected costs. However, there is no cost-analysis, and no clear cost-effectiveness assessment.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system at entry and during implementation is briefly described. More details are needed especially concerning the adaptive management of the project.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

(0.3*10)+(0.1*18)= 3+1.8=4.8

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).