Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2020

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	5178
GEF Agency project ID	00090395
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-5
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP
Project name	Strengthening Capacities to Measure, Report and Verify Indicators of Global Environment Benefits
Country/Countries	Papua New Guinea
Region	Asia
Focal area	Multi-Focal Area (CCCD)
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	CD-2; CD-5
Executing agencies involved	Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA)
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Not applicable
Private sector involvement	Not applicable
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	April 17, 2014
Effectiveness date / project start	October 7, 2014
Expected date of project completion (at start)	October 7, 2017
Actual date of project completion	April 30, 2019

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		.5	.5
Co-financing	IA own	.05	.04
	Government	.6	.4
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
	Other		
Total GEF funding		.5	.5
Total Co-financing		.65	.44
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.15	.94

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	July 25, 2019
Author of TE	Jean-Joseph Bellamy
TER completion date	March 10, 2020
TER prepared by	Laura Nissley
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Sohn

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	UA	MS	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	--	ML
M&E Design		S	--	MS
M&E Implementation		MS	--	MS
Quality of Implementation		MS	--	MS
Quality of Execution		MS	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is to "strengthen national capacities to measure, report and verify internationally agreed targets and indicators of global environment benefits" (PD pg. 57).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not cite any Development Objectives separate from the Global Environmental Objective.

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

While there were no changes to the objective and expected results of the project during implementation, its overall strategy did change over time. At the inception workshop, the decision was made to focus on the preparation of national reports and meet Papua New Guinea's obligations under the UN Convention of Biological Diversity. As a result, a one-year agreement between UNDP (on behalf of the executing agency, CEPA) and the Bishop Museum in Hawaii was signed in January 2016 (pg. 14; 21). This partnership ended at the end of 2016, without an information system to manage environmental data. A consultant was then hired in 2017 to support the design of an integrated Environmental Management Information System (EMIS). The project team adopted the consultant's recommendation of partnering with the regional GEF INFORM Project to avoid duplicating efforts and reducing costs for developing an EMIS (pg. 21).

4. GEF IEO 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 TE assesses the project as relevant to Papua New Guinea's national priorities and international commitments (pg. 35). The project was designed to strengthen Papua New Guinea's capacity to implement the Rio Conventions, particularly its data and information management capacities, as indicated in its National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA). As a Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) Project, it is also aligned with GEF-5 programming priorities, particularly CCCD Objective 2, which calls for strengthening capacities to generate, access, and use information and knowledge. The project also contributes to CCCD Objective 5: *Enhancing Capacities to Monitor and Evaluate Environmental Impacts and Trends* (PD pg. 5). Additionally, the Project Document notes that the project's multi-focal approach addressed the implementation and monitoring of Papua New Guinea's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan; the National Communication on climate change; and national reports on land degradation (pg. 16). The project's objective was also aligned with Papua New Guinea's *Strategic Plan 2010-2030* and the *Strategy for the Development of Statistics 2018-2027* (TE pg. 35). Overall, this TER assesses project relevance as **Satisfactory**.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project was designed to strengthen Papua New Guinea's capacities to measure, report, and verify internationally agreed targets and indicators of global environment benefits. In support of this objective, the project initially partnered with the Bishop Museum in Hawaii to strengthen existing systems to manage biodiversity data. Although that partnership produced a large volume of biodiversity data, little progress was made on developing an EMIS, and the partnership came to an end in 2017(TE pg. 21). The project then hired an international consultant to design the system, who concluded that the project should collaborate with a similar GEF regional project, INFORM, to (1) develop an open data portal; (2) map data flow and identify gaps in capacity; and (3) develop a Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA) data sharing policy (pg. 32).

Despite changes in the project's implementation strategy, the project's expected results remained the same. The TE indicates that many of the targets elaborated in the Project Document were not achieved,

however overall, stakeholders in Papua New Guinea did have a greater capacity to monitor the environment and report the status of the environment to the Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) (pg. 28). Ultimately, an open environmental data portal was developed, as well as a data sharing policy, both of which were launched at a national workshop in March 2019 (pg. 31). At the time of the TE, little progress had been made on reforming institutions; incorporating global environmental commitments into planning and monitoring process; or demonstrating EMIS value (TE pg. 32).

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

Outcome 1: A capacity to manage and use integrated information systems for Rio Convention implementation

Under this outcome, it was expected that (1) a data storage and management system for all MEAs monitoring and reporting would be established; and (2) technical capacity to manage and use integrated information systems for Rio Convention implementation would be strengthened. The TE indicates that the targets under this outcome were expected to be completed by the end of the project. By the time of the TE, a functional open environmental data portal had been established using the web-based opensource management system, Drupal-Based Knowledge Archive Network (DKAN). Training modules on the use of the open data portal were developed, and trainings were held on data analysis for the Convention for Biodiversity indicators (TE pg. 33).

Outcome 2: Institutional strengthening for improved monitoring of the global environment and capacity to replicate successful environmental information management and integration practices

Under this outcome, it was expected that the following would emerge: (1) institutional and organizational reforms to enable incorporation of global environment commitments into planning and monitoring processes; (2) data flow system and tracking; and (3) EMIS demonstration. As noted above, limited progress was made under this outcome, largely due to the fact the data portal was only launched in March 2019. The TE does indicate that essential biodiversity data for CEPA was reviewed and updated by the Bishop Museum (pg. 32). Additionally, a data sharing policy was developed to encourage the free exchange of data. Data sharing agreements with five agencies were also drafted and awaiting signatures at the time of the TE (TE pg. 31).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. Overall, the TE notes that project implementation was "bumpy," with many administrative and management difficulties affecting its progress (pg. 36). In particular, the TE indicates that the Project Board was initially ineffective at mitigating issues faced by the project, in part because most partners had little knowledge of information systems and information management. Moreover, the TE notes that there was "no clear vision of what the project should do and where the project should

go" (pg. 20). This led to periods of slow progress where little was achieved by the project. The project's initial strategy of partnering with the Bishop Museum in Hawaii did not yield an Environmental Management Information System (EMIS). The project course corrected, eventually partnering with the regional GEF INFORM project to develop an EMIS. Additionally, the TE indicates that the project team was able to reengage project partners during the last 18 months of implementation (pg. 37). The project's end date was extended from October 2017 until April 2019 in order for the project team to complete activities, however little progress was ultimately made under Outcome 2 (TE pg. 32). The TE does indicate that the project was ambitious given its timeframe and available resources, and it was therefore noteworthy that the project was able to deliver on some key results, such as the EMIS and data sharing policy (pg. 36).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Likely** for the overall sustainability of project outcomes, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Likely**, given moderate risks to financial resources and institutional frameworks

Financial Resources

The TE assesses the sustainability of financial resources as **Likely**. The TE indicates that the national government's commitment to strengthening the monitoring of the environment and sharing information is strong, however the government will need to increase its budgetary resources, particularly for the "recurrent cost of web-hosting and domain registration as well as the human and financial resources to maintain, update and upgrade the platform over time" (pg. 39). The TE does not indicate whether there was a plan for this in place by the end of the project.

Sociopolitical

The TE assesses sociopolitical sustainability as **Likely**. The TE indicates that there are no socioeconomic risks to sustainability. The TE notes that stakeholders, particularly the executing agency, CEPA, were committed to sustaining project benefits. Overall, the TE notes that project supported the development of "building blocks" on which the government or other donor-funded projects could expand upon in the future, if resources are available (pg. 39).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Likely**. The TE indicates that there are no institutional or governance risks to sustainability (pg. 39). The TE notes that the project achievements, particularly the EMIS, are "well institutionalized" within CEPA, which has committed to training staff in implementing the system beyond the life of the project (pg. 38). The TE also notes that the CEPA Data Sharing Policy should be sustainable over the medium and long-term (pg. 38). However,

the TE also notes that there are weak links between national, provincial, district, and local tiers of government which limits the rolling up of environmental data (pg. 34). Additionally, the full institutional and organizational reforms envisioned in the project design had not been achieved by project end. Further work is needed to enable the incorporation of global environment commitments into planning and monitoring processes.

Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability as **Likely**. The TE did not find any environmental risks to the sustainability of project outcomes. The TE notes that the data portal should provide "better environmental information to decision-makers and policy-makers and contribute to a more sustainable approach for managing natural resources in PNG [Papua New Guinea]" (pg. 39).

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?

Actual co-financing ($.44 million) was lower than expected ($.65 million). UNDP provided only 72% of their cash co-financing commitment due to the lack of available UNDP TRAC funds. Additionally, the executing agency, CEPA, did not contribute their anticipated cash co-financing ($.3 million), although the project reported that CEPA's in-kind contribution was higher than anticipated ($.4 million vs. $.3 million). The TE also indicates that the partnership with the GEF INFORM project allowed the project to draw on additional resources (pg. 25). The TE does not indicate if or how the lower than anticipated co-financing affected the achievement of project outcomes or sustainability.

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?

The project received a no-cost extension to complete key activities, in particular the launch of the data portal and the data sharing policy. The project's end date was extended from October 2017 until April 2019. The TE indicates that the project experienced administrative and management challenges early in the project, including an ineffective Project Board and the absence of a dedicated project manager until 2017 (pg. 36). Additionally, the project's initial strategy of partnering with the Bishop Museum in Hawaii did not yield an Environmental Management Information System (EMIS). Although the project eventually course-corrected, these initial delays meant that key results under Outcome 2 were not achieved by project end.

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 TE indicates that ultimately country ownership over project achievements was strong, as evidenced by the mainstreaming of the EMIS into the management systems and instruments used by the executing agency, CEPA (pg. 37). However, the TE notes that support from CEPA was initially limited, particularly after project implementation stalled in 2017, following the end of the project's partnership with the Bishop Museum in Hawaii (pg. 29). This meant that CEPA was slow to address critical issues, which resulted in delays, and ultimately affected the achievement of results under Outcome 2.

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**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project's results framework is logical and hierarchical, outlining the expected project outputs, outcomes, and objectives. The TE indicates that the 20 indicators provided in the results framework are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timebound), however this TER finds them to be of mixed quality. In particular, some of the indicators are duplicates of the project's results statements. For example, an indicator at the objective level, "Capacity to use the information management system for monitoring and reporting of PNG's [Papua New Guinea's] MEA [Multilateral Environment Agreement] targets and indicators" is virtually identical to Outcome 1: *A capacity to manage and use integrated information systems for Rio Convention implementation*. Similarly, another objective-level indicator, "An integrated environmental information management system for monitoring and reporting of PNG's MEA targets and indicators" is the same as Output 1.1: *A data storage and management system for all MEAs monitoring and reporting*. Additionally, it is confusing that the results framework proposes more targets than there are indicators. On the other hand, the Project Document does include a detailed M&E plan outlining the anticipated M&E activities, responsible parties, and timeframe for implementation (PD pg. 30). A dedicated budget of $40,000 (or 8% of the GEF grant) is also provided for monitoring and evaluation, which the TE indicates is adequate for a project of this size (pg. 25).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, and this TER concurs. As envisaged in the Project Document, the project's results framework and M&E plan were reviewed during the inception phase and altered slightly to emphasize the establishment of data sharing agreements (pg. 27). Additionally, the project completed a "scorecard" to establish a baseline for Papua New Guinea's capacity to develop and maintain an environmental information management system. However, the TE indicate that this scorecard was not updated during the life of the project, making it difficult to assess changes in capacities over time (pgs. 27; 34). Additionally, the TE indicates that the project opted not to produce project implementation reports (PIRs). Although PIRs are not required for a project of this size, the TE notes that the limited reporting by the project team made it difficult to get the "full picture" of how well the project progressed over time (pg. 28).

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: **Moderately Satisfactory** |

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation, and this TER concurs. The implementing agency for the project was the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The TE indicates that support from UNDP was initially limited, particularly when the implementation of the project stalled in 2017. The TE proposes that this was partly due to the relative size of the project, noting that it may have been "secondary to larger projects implemented/executed by UNDP and CEPA." However, the TE indicates that UNDP's contribution to the project improved following the approval of the no-cost extension in late 2017. The TE notes that "a common vision seemed to have emerged," and the project was able to achieve key results post-2017, including the launch of the EMIS and the data sharing policy (pg. 29).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project execution, and this TER concurs. The executing agency for the project was the Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA). The TE indicates that CEPA was very involved in the project design, however, like UNDP, CEPA's support for project implementation was initially limited. A Project Advisory Board was formed at the onset on the project; however, it also oversaw the implementation of two other projects. The TE indicates that this setup "contributed to a low engagement of stakeholders in the project, prevented a close monitoring of the project progress, limited the review of issues at hand and the decisions to make for corrective actions" (pg. 22). A new, dedicated, Project Advisory Board was formed in 2018, however it had only met once by the time of the TE. Additionally, the project did not have a dedicated project coordinator until 2017. The TE indicates that the hiring of a project coordinator, as well as the approval of the no-cost extension, "re-energized key partners," and allowed the project to make significant progress toward results during the last phase of the project. The TE also notes that, ultimately, "the good engagement of CEPA should ensure the legitimization of project achievements; hence contributing to the long-term sustainability of project results" (pg. 29).

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.

> Not applicable because the project is primarily related to strengthening Papua New Guinea's capacity to manage and use environmental information systems.

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.

Not applicable because the project is primarily related to strengthening Papua New Guinea's capacity to manage and use environmental information systems.

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

By the time of the TE, an open environmental data portal was developed and populated with some key datasets on biodiversity. The portal was launched in March 2019, and available to the public and decisionmakers (pg. 3).

b) Governance

By the time of the TE, the project had launched a data sharing policy which encourages the exchange of data within CEPA, as well as with other government agencies and institutions with Papua New Guinea (TE pg. 3). Additionally, five data sharing agreements between CEPA and other agencies were expected to be signed by the end of the project (TE pg. 33).

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.

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

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.

The TE notes that the EMIS was being mainstreamed into government management systems and instruments by project end (pg. 37). However, the TE also indicates that it is "too early to discuss demonstration and too remote to envisage replication and scaling up" (pg. 40).

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 provides the following lessons learned (pg. 5):

- It is critical for such project to have a dedicated Project Board from its outset to serve as the executive decision-making, to provide strategic directions and management guidance.
- Despite not being a GEF requirement for such project, the completion of Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) using the GEF template is a good management practice. It is a tool to measure – and record - the progress made by the project.
- Adaptive management is a key management instrument for this type of project, providing the necessary flexibility to review and reinvent the approach to implement the project as needed.
- A project that is a response to national needs and priorities is often very relevant for stakeholders and beneficiaries and its chance of being implemented effectively are maximized.
- It is critical to conduct an extensive assessment of existing capacities during the formulation phase of such project in order to design a strategy, which should be achievable during the lifetime of the project and within its allocated budget.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pg. 4-5):

Recommendation 1: To develop a roadmap for the way forward after the end of the project. Continuing to strengthen monitoring of the environment and share this information is a priority for CEPA. In order to help CEPA move forward, the project needs to identify a roadmap for the way forward focusing on the critical milestones to be met in the future. This roadmap should also include the key achievements supported by the project. It would also help CEPA to keep this priority on its agenda for the years to come, as part of implementing its SDGs

Recommendation 2: To develop a project concept, which could become part of the GEF-7 resource mobilization in PNG. Within the context of the GEF-7 STAR allocation for PNG and the fact that PNG is still at an early stage to plan the use of GEF-7 financial resources, there are funding opportunities for projects related to the GEF strategies in climate change, biodiversity, and land degradation. A project concept should be developed to further help CEPA in developing its capacity to monitor the environment and store, manage and report this environmental information, with a particular focus on the international reporting obligations under MEAs ratified by PNG.

Recommendation 3: To include gender mainstreaming into all development projects in PNG implemented by UNDP. The need to consider gender into all projects in PNG could not be overstated. The role of women in the management of natural resources in PNG is critical and that gender considerations complying with international standards is a must in any conservation projects. All projects developed by UNDP should include gender mainstreaming into project strategies, including the

need to conduct gender-sensitive risk assessments and the use of a gender scorecard to assess the performance in gender mainstreaming.

Recommendation 4: All funded activities to prepare multilateral convention reports should use the open environmental data portal. PNG is now equipped with a data infrastructure to store, manage and report environmental information. All funded activities to prepare convention reports should use this platform. It will reinforce/demonstrate the usefulness and consolidate/validate the portal.

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 IEO 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 satisfactorily assesses the project's outcomes and impacts.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidence presented generally supports its ratings. This TER did downgrade ratings in the areas of project efficiency and sustainability based on the evidence presented in the report.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses project sustainability, although it does not give enough weight to some risks to financial and institutional sustainability.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual co-financing used and actual costs, in total and per project outcome.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report adequately assesses M&E systems, however this TER did find some moderate shortcomings with the M&E design not addressed by the report.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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