

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3529	
GEF Agency project ID		3216	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		SIP: Harmonizing support: a national program integrating water harvesting schemes and sustainable land management	
Country/Countries		Djibouti	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP1: Drylands management in areas of intense competition for land resources SP2: Supporting Sustainable Forest Management in Production Landscapes	
Executing agencies involved		Djibouti Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and the Sea	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M) *
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.041	NA
	Co-financing	0.125	NA
GEF Project Grant		0.959	NA
Co-financing	IA own	0.1	0.67
	Government	2.14	2.63
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	10.318	9.2
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0.308	0.17
Total GEF funding		1.0	1.056
Total Co-financing		12.866	12.064
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		13.866	13.12
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2014	
Author of TE		Dr. Trinto Mugangu, Abdoukader Ibrahim Egueh, and Youssef Adbara Ali	
TER completion date		March 10, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

\* Final financial figures were not available at the time the TE was written. The 2014 PIR states that \$ 969,603.48 from the GEF grant had been disbursed so far.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	MU	--	MU
M&E Design	NR	S	--	S
M&E Implementation	NR	MS	--	MU
Quality of Implementation	NR	NR	--	MS
Quality of Execution	NR	S	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Due to its ecological and climatic conditions, Djibouti is very vulnerable to drought and desertification. This has led to a decrease in water availability, sedimentation, erosion, and salinization of groundwater. This lack of water has affected the livelihoods of pastoral communities. This project is “designed to provide support to the Government of the Republic of Djibouti to strengthen national frameworks to support Sustainable land management (SLM), while implementing measures to locally reduce and reverse land degradation and loss of ecosystem function and services that will, in turn, inform higher level policy decisions to achieve nation-wide benefits” (CEO endorsement, p.21).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project

The specific objectives of this project are twofold:

- 1) to implement a series of measures for surface water harvesting to fill drinking needs of the community and its livestock and to promote a more sustainable use of pastures by increasing the accessibility of areas currently not being exploited and
- 2) to strengthen national institutional, technical and human capacity at central and local levels.

(CEO endorsement document p.11)

This will be achieved through the achievement of two outcomes and linked components:

1. Surface Water Harvesting and Sustainable Land Management
  - a. Water and hydrological infrastructures
  - b. Sustainable land management
  - c. Enhanced livestock productivity
  - d. Conservation of threatened forest ecosystems in the Day Forest
2. National Capacity Development

- a. Capacity development for pastoralist communities
- b. Capacity development for government

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

There were no changes in the objectives or activities of this project during implementation.

#### 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as satisfactory due to the project's good alignment with Djibouti's national priorities and with GEF's priorities.

Djibouti has already been active in the area of drought prevention and food security. In 1997, Djibouti developed a National Action Plan to Combat Desertification. In addition, the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) includes measures against prevention and to improve food security. Finally, The Ministry of Agriculture's Triennial plan has the following objectives, to which this project will contribute:

- Poverty and eradication of thirst (including through enhanced access to food and water, sustainable natural resources management and employment)
- Reduction of the dependency on food aid (through agricultural diversification and enhanced productivity)
- Income generation (including through livestock and fisheries exports)
- Maintenance of rural livelihoods and decrease of rural migration (by rehabilitating rural infrastructures, community empowerment, decentralization and income generation).

(CEO Endorsement document p.18)

The project is also very well aligned with GEF priorities. Funded under the Strategic Investment Program (SIP) in SLM in Sub Saharan Africa, the project is located under the Land Degradation Focal Area. It is particularly relevant to the Strategic Program 1 (Drylands management in areas of intense competition for land resources) and 2 (Supporting Sustainable Forest Management in Production Landscapes). Project activities under outcome 1 will contributed to reducing land degradation, whereas activities under outcome 2 will contribute to creating an enabling environment for SLM.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	--

The TE rates project effectiveness as moderately satisfactory since “of the 13 impact monitoring and progress indicators, only two were achieved at 100% or higher”. Several planned activities did not take place. For the same reasons, this TER also rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory. Overall, while good progress has been made on ‘core’ project activities (water storage infrastructure, community committees and training), secondary project activities have not been implemented as planned. For this reason, a rating of moderately satisfactory is assigned. Below, we examine project achievements under the two main outcomes.

#### **Outcome 1: Surface Water Harvesting and Sustainable Land Management**

Accomplishments under this outcome were moderately unsatisfactory. The first component – the establishment of water harvesting structures – was successfully completed, with water now available to all target households. Indeed, “many water storage facilities (ponds) and underground tanks were built with a dedicated system for storing rainwater, with gabion walls or dams” (TE p.26). However, no management plan has been developed for the Day forest as planned in the project logical framework. The carrying capacity of pastures has not been measured. Overall, outcomes have been moderately unsatisfactory.

#### **Outcome 2: National Capacity Development**

Accomplishments under this outcome were satisfactory. Indeed, most of the indicators have been at least partially achieved, and several training sessions were held for project staff and stakeholders (TE P.26). 8 community rangeland and water management committees have been created, and water management and development plans have been set up for the 7 priority zones identified in the project. The team is now using Google Earth to monitor environmental outcomes, but more advanced GIS technology is not used as planned.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates efficiency as satisfactory, but provides very little evidence supporting this rating. This TER is unable to assess efficiency as neither the TE nor the PIRs provide information regarding the extent to

which the project was executed in a cost-effective manner, or the extent to which procedures and timelines were respected.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Unlikely</b>
--------------------	------------------------------------

The TE rates sustainability as moderately unlikely, largely due the lack of plans for the continuation of the project at the financial and institutional levels. This TER agrees with this rating.

#### **Financial Risks – Sustainability Unlikely**

At project end, several financial risks remained. According to the TE, “the project did not establish appropriate financial or economic mechanisms to ensure that the benefits continue” (TE P.29). According to the project managers, “income-generating activities have been developed in the Day region; specifically, honey production, ecotourism and carpentry” (TE p.29). However, the TE reports that those activities were not yet generating revenue. In addition, those activities reportedly use “expensive, cutting-edge tools that villagers cannot purchase, under current conditions, if the equipment malfunctions and if project support ends. Take, for example, the example of a circular saw that has already been damaged, which the project will have to order from Turkey” (TE p.29). The project team allegedly looked into getting additional funding from the GEF for a follow-up project.

Overall, there is currently no strategy in place to ensure the continuation of project benefits, and no evidence that additional sources of financing will be secured in the future.

#### **Socio-Political Risks – Unable to Assess**

The TE does not describe socio-political risks. However, this TER has seen no evidence that the project actively advocated with the national government to ensure better SLM policies be implemented, or to ensure political buy-in for the project. This TER therefore assumes that there are political risks to the continuation for the project. However, this cannot be adequately assessed.

#### **Institutional Risks - Sustainability Moderately Likely**

Unfortunately, the project does not appear to have established “organizational and regulatory measures to empower and ensure the continued existence of the local steering committees (LSCs) (...) Once the project’s external financing ends, the LSCs will no longer be able to meet or operate” (TE p.29). Similarly, “no regulatory or policy framework was created to ensure that village-based organizations will continue” (TE p.29). That being said, the project did develop water management development plans which, coupled with the training given to local committees, might contribute to some continuation of project activities.

#### **Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely**

No environmental risks were identified for this project.

## 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?

Almost all of the co-financing expected came through. Most of it came from multilateral organizations, but some of it came from the Government of Djibouti and the participating communities. Co-financing made up the bulk of the project, and the level of outcomes achieved could not have been as high without it.

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 were no reported delays in project implementation, and the project was completed in December 2014, as planned.

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:

The Government of Djibouti was, through its Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and the Sea, in charge of project execution. It took effective ownership of the project, although the project results are only moderately satisfactory. Local communities where the project operated also took ownership over the water harvesting projects. (TE p.28)

As mentioned above in the sustainability section, ownership does not appear to have been high enough to ensure the continuation of project benefits after project end. Indeed, no financial or institutional arrangements have been made for the continuation of the project.

## 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: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory. This TER also rates it as satisfactory due to its featuring of all standard features of a strong M&E framework.

The project results framework presented in the project document (CEO endorsement, p.19) proposes indicators for all project objectives and indicators. The indicators selected generally respect the SMART criteria and provide a good basis for project monitoring. The framework also proposes means of verification for the data. The PD (pp.14-18) also presents the M&E plan for the project, including a list of the proposed evaluation activities to take place during the project, as well as the planned monitoring reports to be written during implementation. Responsibility for those activities, as well as a dedicated budget, together with a timeframe for those activities is detailed. Overall, all standard elements of a strong M&E framework were accounted for.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory. This TER rates it as moderately unsatisfactory due to the project team having failed to conduct several of the planned M&E activities.

According to the TE, the project team failed to monitor several of the indicators specified in the logframe due to their lack of expertise. For example, they did not know how to measure tropical livestock carrying capacity, and were unsure as to how they should be measuring capacity building. (TE p.20)

While three team members were given M&E responsibilities, no one was responsible to ensure that the full M&E framework was being implemented, and several activities fell through the cracks. On the other hand, the planned evaluation activities (MTE and TE) took place as planned, and the PIRs were produced as scheduled, demonstrating that a basic level of care for M&E took place during the project.

## **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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--	--

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. The TE does not rate the quality of project implementation by the UNDP. This TER rates the UNDP's performance as moderately satisfactory due to the project having suffered from important issues related to project design.

The TE criticizes the UNDP for two important problems in the project logic. First, according to the TE, the logic of the project intervention was sound for two out of the three activity sites. However, for the third site – the Day Forest – the project intervention proposed was ineffective as the area has a completely different climate. “The water there is largely in the form of fog. It is captured by mountain vegetation adapted to the environment, such as juniper and boxwood. Strong grazing pressure from camels, cows and goats and, perhaps, the aging of the trees have led to the rapid degradation of the ecosystem near the villages of the transhumant populations. Under these conditions, a strategy focused on rainwater or runoff harvesting will not help to regenerate the vegetation in the Day Mountains, which is increasingly dying off” (TE p.19).

Another identified problem is that “the logical framework also provides for relying on non-governmental organizations (NGO) or community-based organizations (CBO) to help the State enlist the rural and transhumant populations in implementing this project. However, very few NGOs and CBOs exist and they could not be mobilized” (TE p.19). Those project formulation mistakes have affected the project and lead to lower-than-expected outcomes.

That being said, those two problems did not severely harm project outcomes, and the UNDP appears to have otherwise effectively managed the project. Indeed, the TE describes the UNDP as having provided useful and necessary technical assistance to the project and as having effectively used its comparative advantage in the area of sustainable land management to ensure the project was effectively and efficiently delivered (TE p.21).

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---	--

The executing agency for this project was the Ministry of Agriculture. The TE rates its performance as satisfactory. This TER rates its performance as moderately satisfactory due to the good management displayed by the team, but noting some inadequacies in the way the team handled project M&E.

The TE describes the team in laudatory terms: “The project was complex, with several development partners and funders. The project team did an excellent job of coordinating the contributions of the development partners in the field (...) The project team was very active. It was able to mobilize other partners, such as the World Bank (WB), and launched a similar project (PRODERMO), which already operates at three other sites in Djibouti where combating thirst and poverty is also an issue” (TE p.25).

It should be noted that the project executing team failed to keep track of project indicators throughout implementation. As mentioned in the M&E implementation section above, the team were not



adequately trained in M&E and did not know how to measure some of the logframe indicators. This should have been addressed earlier during project implementation.

## 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 in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. 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.

Little change has been monitored. However, the project observed forest regeneration and increase in the water supply, showing the restoration of land in the project area. (PIR 2014, p.11)

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.

Change is more likely to happen in the medium to long term. However, already, “access to water increased sharply for the populations and their livestock. This will continue as long as rains continue to fill the ponds and underground tanks in the transhumant’ villages and constitutes is a direct, positive change that the project sought. It came at the right time to combat thirst” (TE p.29).

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

Local capacity was created by setting up local steering committees and providing training opportunities for its members. Water management and development plans have been set up for the 7 priority zones identified in the project. Local communities' capacity in the area of sustainable land management has been enhanced. (TE p.26, PIR 2014 p.9)

#### b) Governance

Local committees were set up to make decisions related to land management at the local level. Unfortunately, the TE reports that those committees have not been properly strengthened and that their continuation after the end of the project is unlikely.

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 were no unintended impacts reported for this project.

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.

According to the TE, the project is being replicated at three additional sites in Djibouti by the World Bank (TE p.21).

## 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 TE proposes the following key lessons from the project

1. In order to further the objectives of the project to ensure the livelihoods of the local population, the project should be:
  - a. Working to maintain a forest ecosystem in Day in an arid mountain area;
  - b. Working to reduce, through management, the pressure imposed by livestock on natural resource (water and forage) and the transhumance corridors; and,
  - c. Enhancing local communities' sustainable land management capacity.

2. In terms of performance, the project was exemplary in mobilizing surface water by building ponds after rains and channelling run-off into underground reservoirs to supply water to the transhumant pastoralists' villages, along their transhumance corridors and for their livestock.
3. The project was also an example of success because at least six other initiatives are replicating its strategy elsewhere in the country in places that do not yet receive these services.
4. With regard to the issue of water in an arid country and the response that the PROMES-GDT offers Djibouti, many bilateral and multilateral projects learned to work together and carry out the project successfully.
5. Additional protective efforts, such as the use of piled rocks and wire mesh, should be encouraged.
6. Creative revenue-generating alternatives for the settled transhumant populations must be rethought and implemented, with regard to carpentry, ecotourism (including camping and visits), and beekeeping in Day and the commercialization and ownership of the three nurseries set up by the PROMES-GDT.
7. The project teams became expert in monitoring satellite images using Google Earth and were thus able to monitor the forest ecosystem in Day over time using successive scenes. This technique is a potential tool that the government could use to monitor and focus the management of the Day Forest, as well as the country's other water harvesting and storage facilities.

(TE pp.32-33)

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE makes the following general recommendations:

1. Rather than choose three sites during the project design phase, four should have been chosen, including three high-altitude sites and one in the Day Mountains, which constitute a separate ecosystem. The water cycle in arid and high-elevation areas near oceans is different than the water cycle in low-elevation arid areas.
2. The UNDP-GEF should consider extending this project by introducing the fog-water harvesting system using nets in Day to water the young juniper and boxwood plants and provide water to livestock and the transhumant communities. These harvesting systems have been developed in Eritrea.
3. With regard to monitoring, the project did not monitor certain indicators in the logical framework because of lack of expertise, specifically in terms of measuring the tropical livestock carrying capacity (TLU), or because of lack of knowledge of the complex calculation of the capacity building units introduced into the project by its designer, without adequate training for the monitoring/evaluation team.

The project makes the following recommendations to ensure the continuity or strengthening of the initial benefits :

4. Organizational and regulatory measures to empower and ensure the continued existence of the local steering committees (LSC) and take obtain legal status for them should be drafted.
5. The local communities should thus be trained so that they can take control of the productive system that produces valuable benefits for them.
6. Training should be provided to communities on maintaining the facilities to improve their longevity and returns, benefiting the local communities or their associations.
7. The members of local communities in the Day region should develop competence in and ownership of wood processing techniques and wood working trades.
8. A system for determining and sharing revenue should also be developed because there is considerable potential for conflict over sustainable management of the Day Forest.
9. The project team should immediately write a manual of national standards and procedures for harvesting and storing rainwater by building and managing ponds and underground tanks to provide the country with standards that can serve as a benchmark for such facilities.
10. A regulatory or policy framework should be created to ensure that the village-based organizations can function independently and carry on
11. A system should be created to develop and sustain the three nurseries that the PROMES-GDT project created in Day, Randa and Otoy by turning them over to local ownership.
12. A workshop should be held on harvesting and storing rain water in Djibouti to draw out the lessons learned through the actions of many partners and their coordination in PROMES-GDT, around the Ministry of Agriculture and the Environment (GEF focal point).
13. The PROMES-GDT project actors and managers should meet, as soon as possible, to discuss and implement the corrective measures necessary to ensure that the project's achievements are sustained before it ends.
14. A situation analysis workshop should be held to determine the root causes of the degradation and drying of the Day Forest.
15. The recommendations of this workshop should be used to design a new project phase focusing on the conservation of this arid mountain ecosystem.

16. (TE pp.30-32)

## 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?	All relevant outcomes are discussed, but not very thoroughly evaluated. Project impacts are also only very briefly mentioned.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. Very limited evidence is provided in the report. Some ratings are missing, are some could have been better substantiated.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses sustainability. Relevant risks are addressed, and the sustainability rating appears well grounded in evidence.	<b>S</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations are supported by observations made in the report. They appear comprehensive and relevant.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes up-to-date co-financing figures as well as overall project disbursements up to April 2014. The appendix contains the GEF budget for 2012 and 2013, but there not all activity costs are included.	<b>MS</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report adequately assesses M&E implementation, but only briefly mentions M&E design.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.