Comment on

BioRA Technical Workshop

15-19 Feb 2016, OSP

By TNMC

W. Miami
5. The order of the presentation is not appropriated for example the explanation of the important details such as how to selected focus area, what is the criteria expert to select indicators should have start at the beginning.

6. National

7. The national consultants need to know some background about the DRIFT before play the response curve for giving better recommendation.

8. How to make sure that the Member Country can use the DRIFT on their own effectively in the future.

9. There are too much activities in the short period it make participants confuse and tried.
9. The training material not enough, need information to follow for practice step by step.

10.
1. TNMC is still having some reservations on the development of the indicators and the response curve for FA 1, 2 and 3 since the whole process is based on mainly the general secondary data and very few specific information for FA 1, 2 and 3.

2. TNMC also concerns and has reservations on the newly proposed "ECD - CM8".

3. TNMC has strong opinion that the name of FA 1, 2 and 3 shall be modified to reflect it indicated the join boundary between the two regions.

4. MRCS / the BIORP team shall provide all NMC the new / additional reference and data as compiled by BIORP Team.
Additional Comment: These schools requested Secretary to remove an existing and plagued irrigation project to avoid misunderstanding, such as too much water structural map from historic experts.